



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT & RESIDENTS' SERVICES
SELECT COMMITTEE
13 January 2014

TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM

Report of the Cabinet Member for Transport and Technical Services – Councillor Victoria Brocklebank – Fowler

Report Status: Open

Classification: For Scrutiny Review & Comment

Key Decision: No

Wards Affected: All

Accountable Executive Director: Nigel Pallace, Bi-Borough Executive Director for Transportation & Technical Services /
Lyn Carpenter, Bi- Borough Executive Director for Environment, Leisure and Residents' Services

Report Author: Chris Bainbridge, Bi-Borough Head of Transport Policy and Network Management

2. Contact Details:
Tel: 0208 753
E-mail: chris.bainbridge@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Congestion is a serious threat to London's economy and environment, and Hammersmith & Fulham is one of the most congested boroughs in London. Without interventions, the problem is set to get worse with the projected increase in population and employment in London. The Council tackles congestion through Network Management, Planning, Engineering and Enforcement and this report gives an account of our activities in these areas and their effects.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

To review and comment on the contents of this report and make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Technical Services and the Director for Transport and Highways.

3. INTRODUCTION

“Maintaining London’s position as the driver of the UK’s economy will involve dealing with increasing levels of road congestion. Every year Londoners spend hours in cars and buses while the city loses hundreds of millions of pounds in lost activity due to traffic jams, road works and emergencies. The effect on people’s health, the environment and investment can be severe” – London Assembly Transport Committee report on congestion, 2011.

3.1 TfL’s Roads Task Force report, published in July 2013, said that London’s road congestion costs the economy £4 billion per year, with an average cost of £17 per hour of vehicle delay. The forecast increase in congestion resulting from the projected increases in population and employment by 2031 will add another £1 billion annually to this cost.

3.2 A report published by Transport for London in 2006 showed Hammersmith and Fulham to be the most congested borough in London. More recent reports show some fluctuations but we are consistently among the most congested in London, and the country as a whole. Reducing congestion and “getting H&F moving” is a key priority for the Council. This is reflected in the Council’s LIP (Local Implementation Plan for Transport), which has seven objectives, one of which is to “increase the efficiency of our roads”. The LIP is a statutory document which all boroughs have to produce, showing how they intend to implement the Mayor of London’s Transport strategy in their borough.

3.3 This report details the measures which the Council is taking to manage and reduce congestion and their effectiveness.

4. REPORT

4.1 In 2011 the Council initiated its “Get H&F Moving “ campaign, in association with our LIP, to explain what we were doing to reduce congestion and improve transport in the borough. As part of this campaign, we undertook a leaflet drop and distributed A2 posters across the borough using our own poster sites which are positioned in high footfall areas such as town centres and parks. In addition, the Council sent a leaflet to 85,000 homes in June 2013 to raise awareness of the issues and the role CCTV has to play in reducing delays on the road. The intention of the communication was to explain the rules and hence reduce further contraventions. A copy of the leaflet is appended.

4.2 Our strategy to improve the quality, safety and efficiency of our transport system consists of five elements: **Management, Planning, Engineering, Education and Enforcement**

The table below shows the causes of congestion as identified by Transport for London and which of our workstreams address them

| Factor | % of | Measures to tackle |
|--------|------|--------------------|
|--------|------|--------------------|

| | congestion attributed | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| Collisions | 28 | Management, Engineering, Education, Enforcement |
| Traffic Volume and other (e.g. spillages) | 21 | Management, Planning, Engineering, Education, Enforcement |
| Highway authority work | 19 | Management |
| Utilities works | 19 | Management, Enforcement |
| Special Events | 4 | Management, Education, Enforcement |
| Vehicle breakdowns | 9 | Management |

We have no specific figures for LBHF, but as we have three professional football clubs in the borough, and we host the Oxford and Cambridge universities boat race and the Aegon Tennis tournament at the Queen's Club, and more recently the "Ride London" cycling events, special events may account for a somewhat higher proportion of congestion causes than is the case in the average London borough. Apart from this, we would expect the causes of congestion in the borough to be similar to those in London as a whole.

Network Management

4.3. The Road Traffic Act 2004 places a duty on boroughs to manage their highway networks efficiently. Highway authority works, utilities works and special events, then account for some 42% of congestion. There are some 10,000 roadworks in the borough per year. The Council is very active in reducing disruption from this source. We introduced the London Permitting Scheme for roadworks in 2010, which gives the council greater ability to co-ordinate both its own and the utilities' roadworks. This has resulted in some 64 fewer days' disruption per year. We have been working with utility companies to route new telecom cables through disused sewers, which will mean less need to dig up the roads to access them. We are also actively pursuing the introduction of a lane rental system, which will give undertakers further incentives to minimise the amount of time in which they occupy roadspace. We liaise closely with the boat race organisers and the Queen's Tennis Club and TfL as the organisers of Ride London to control their events and minimise disruption and risks from them, and have recently signed Memoranda of Understanding with the football clubs, giving them responsibility for managing matchday traffic.

Planning

4.4. We use the land use planning system to influence future levels of traffic, by, for example, using the PTALs (Public Transport Accessibility Levels) methodology to encourage development to locate in areas with good public transport. We also restrict commuter parking, secure parking permit free housing in certain areas, require large new developments to produce travel

plans, and require developers to pay for or contribute to the cost of infrastructure necessary to enable their development to happen. An example is the Westfield Development at White City, where we secured new Underground, Overground and bus stations, with the result that 60-80% of shoppers get there by public transport. Another example is the St George's development at Imperial Wharf, where we secured new bus routes and a new Overground station. But the full effects of these planning policies will only be fully realised in the longer term.

Engineering

4.5. Engineering projects include improvements to the efficiency, capacity and safety of the road network for all users: pedestrians, cyclists, bus passengers and general traffic, as well as meeting the needs of residential and business frontages. A good example of such a project was the Fulham Palace Road slip road scheme, which we completed in the Spring of 2012 and which improves the performance of buses and general traffic by reducing conflicts between these different users and providing more surface level crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme has been well received and the work has been continued along Fulham Palace Road, as part of our LIP corridors programme, with improvements to the junction with Lillie Road, the introduction of pedestrian countdown, the co-ordination of traffic signals on the SCOOT system, which allows more time to be given to particular junction arms as queues develop, and the replacement of pelican crossings by puffins, which give pedestrians more time to cross when they need it but reduce delays to motor traffic when no-one is crossing. It should be noted that signal timings are not set by the Council but by TfL. There is a consultation procedure with boroughs but they do not always inform us of day to day changes they make.

4.6. Much of our road network dates back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when vehicular traffic was a fraction of what it is now, and the network struggles to cope with the present day demands that are placed upon it. Because of the intensity of development of the borough, only small scale increases in capacity are possible. Even if major schemes were possible, the whole road network is subject to congestion, so such increases would be likely to draw in traffic from a wider area and negate many of the benefits of the scheme. We are now looking at more radical measures, such as replacing the Hammersmith Flyover with a tunnel. But this is driven by the desire to improve the environment of Hammersmith Town Centre and reconnect it to the river rather than to increase vehicle capacity.

Education

4.7 Education is a major and wide-ranging part of the transport strategy, from informing road users of the need for and meaning of regulations, teaching children to use the roads safely, training for cyclists and motorcyclists, helping to reduce collisions and thereby congestion. We also encourage walking, cycling and public transport use through, for example, school and workplace

travel plans. A high proportion of deaths and serious injuries to cyclists result from collisions with Heavy Goods Vehicles, and our award-winning cyclist and HGV driver training and mutual awareness sessions aim to tackle this situation. About 20% of the peak time congestion attributable to traffic levels is caused by the school run. In LBHF we have reduced the numbers of children being driven to school by some 20%, which equates to a 4% overall reduction in traffic level related congestion at a much lower cost than major infrastructure projects.

Enforcement

4.8 But management, planning, engineering and education alone are not enough to keep our roads running as smoothly and efficiently as possible. Traffic and parking regulations and controls are needed, and compliance with the regulations needs to be secured by effective enforcement.

4.9 London borough councils are now responsible for the enforcement of parking controls on all roads except those which are part of TfL's network (in LBHF the A4, A40 and A3220). Our parking controls are predominantly enforced by our Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs). Parking controls are determined first of all by the need for the safe and efficient operation of the highway network. Parked vehicles obstructing the flow of traffic have been recognised as a problem since the nineteenth century, when the Metropolitan Police Commissioner said that Her Majesty's Highway should not be used as a stable yard. Our system of Controlled Parking Zones, which was first introduced in 1969, progressively extended in the 1990s and completed in the 2000s, determines what roadspace can be safely and efficiently allocated to parking. We aim to provide parking firstly for residents, as most homes in the borough do not have off-street parking, and then for visitors and businesses. Our zonal system contributes to the reduction of congestion by discouraging short distance car trips, reducing potential congestion around tube stations and shopping centres and the different times of operation of the controls in different zones allow us to respond to the needs of businesses and residents in those areas. With a few exceptions, our parking bays are shared use between permit holders and pay and display, and this enables maximum turnover and use to be made of our limited parking space. Overall, we aim for an 80% occupancy rate of parking spaces, which reduces congestion caused by vehicles driving around looking for parking spaces.

4.10 Enforcement by CEOs is now supplemented by the use of CCTV cameras for enforcement of certain contraventions at certain locations within the parameters set out in the Government's Statutory and Operational Guidance. Our use of CCTV is described below.

Enforcement by CCTV Camera

4.11 The Council has a CCTV system consisting of about 800 cameras in all. They are used for a range of purposes, with community safety the top priority.

The system is owned and maintained by the Environment, Leisure and Residents' Services (ELRS) Community Safety CCTV section. Parking services is one of the main long term stakeholders in the system. There is a long agreed protocol of hierarchy of use whereby a Police Officer or Community Safety Officer can take over a camera being used by one of our CCTV Officers whenever it is needed for crime and disorder purposes.

Of these 800 CCTV cameras, about 55 are currently used for traffic-related enforcement (some of these cameras are also used for other purposes). All of these cameras are in fixed locations, but officers can control their direction (i.e. they can be zoomed or tilted.) We do not use vehicle-mounted cameras, nor do we use automatic detection cameras. Our only use of cameras is by officers witnessing contraventions as they happen and recording the evidence.

The Council has developed its CCTV enforcement system slowly and methodically over the past fourteen years. We have a long history of participating in CCTV pilot schemes (see below). The original system was a VHS tape based and had become obsolete by 2011 when the decision was made to move to a new digital platform which was introduced in July 2012.

Traffic Enforcement Purposes for which CCTV is used

4.12 There are three types of traffic related enforcement for which the council uses CCTV cameras:

- Parking enforcement
- Bus lane contraventions and
- Moving traffic contraventions, including box junctions.

In each of these respects it is important for the law to be effectively enforced, for reasons of road safety and to minimise congestion.

Some moving traffic contraventions can be particularly dangerous, e.g. disregarding a keep left sign and driving on the wrong side of a road, or making a banned turn that other road users, including motorists, cyclists and pedestrians would not anticipate. Similarly, parking on corners can impede the view of other drivers and pedestrians seeking to cross at that point.

Box junctions reduce congestion by ensuring that queuing vehicles do not block entrances and exits to junctions. Bus lanes help regulate traffic flow and give priority to the most efficient vehicles. According to TfL's Roads Task Force report, in central London in the morning peak a car driver/passenger uses fourteen times as much roadspace as a bus passenger.

Legal Basis of the Council's Powers

4.13 In relation to parking enforcement, the council's powers were originally derived from the London Local Authorities Act 2000, which was superseded by the Traffic Management Act 2004.

The Council's powers in relation to bus lane enforcement derive from the London Local Authorities Act 1996 and for other moving traffic offences from the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003. The powers of enforcement under the 2003 Act were initially exercised by Transport for London (TfL) and six London boroughs, including LBHF, under a pilot scheme. That scheme was approved by the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) of the Association of London Government (ALG – now known as London Councils). The pilot scheme was concluded in 2005. All London boroughs now have powers, with the approval of TEC, for CCTV enforcement of moving traffic offences with the exception of the Royal Boroughs of Greenwich and Kensington and Chelsea.

Why do we need to use cameras?

4.14 The London Bus Priority Network (LBPN) was introduced in 1994, in recognition of the need to improve the speed and reliability of bus services. Congestion in London was growing, and it would take many years before increases in tube and rail capacity would come into effect. As well as bus lanes, the LBPN included measures which were of benefit to general traffic flow, such as reviewing and strengthening waiting and loading restrictions. However, councils soon received complaints from bus operators that the measures were ineffectual because of lack of enforcement. Various means of improving compliance were tried in different boroughs, such as Civil Enforcement Officers travelling on buses and jumping out and issuing FPNs to cars parked in the bus lanes, but they were found to be highly labour-intensive, and therefore expensive, with limited effectiveness. Hence the CCTV enforcement pilot and its subsequent widespread adoption.

4.15 If the Council were to abandon the use of cameras, it would need to rely on enforcement by officers physically present at various locations within the borough. This would be wholly impractical and unrealistic. Council officers have no power to require vehicles to stop; even if they had such power, its exercise would worsen the very problem of congestion which the council is seeking to address. It would be a matter of chance whether council officers were able to note down the registration numbers of vehicles which were involved in contraventions. Even where they did so, there would be no clear evidence of any contravention; in any disputed case, there would be conflicting accounts by the driver and the council officer, with no objective way of resolving the dispute. Box junction evidence could rarely be obtained from the roadside, as officers would not be able to view multiple traffic lanes at the same time. It would also not be possible once a stopping vehicle was identified to back track to see the state of the traffic when it entered the box.

Impact of Using CCTV

4.16 The aim of using CCTV enforcement is to secure greater compliance with the regulations. Evidence of its success in this respect is as follows:

Bagley's Lane/New King's Road Junction : in 2011-12, 40,634 PCNs were issued for moving traffic offences; in 2012-13, the figure was 30,164, a reduction of just over 25%

Gliddon Road U-turn ban: Following numerous complaints from residents, enforcement of this banned turn began in November 2010. In the first five months of CCTV enforcement of the ban to March 2011, 6,378 PCNs were issued. In the whole of 2012-13, just 3,981 PCNs were issued for this contravention.

“Keep left” restriction in Harwood Terrace: In response to residents' concerns about the level of dangerous offending where vehicles entered Harwood Terrace from Imperial Road on the wrong side of the traffic island, we began CCTV enforcement here at the beginning of 2011-12. 6,755 PCNs were issued in that year, but this reduced by 70% to 2024 in 2012-3, once again showing the success of CCTV enforcement in deterring illegal actions by motorists.

Bus Lanes: in 2002-3, 38,426 PCNs were issued for bus lane contraventions. In 2012-3 the figure was only 11,614. These LBHF figures are reflected Londonwide. Between 2005 and 2012 the number of PCNs issued for bus lane contraventions in London s declined from 835,454 to 233,201, despite an increase in the number of bus lanes observed.

Selection of Locations for Enforcement

4.17 We do not use CCTV enforcement at all box junctions, bus lanes or prohibited manoeuvres in the borough. The main locations are given below:

Box Junction: Talgarth Road/Butterwick

Box Junction – Great West Rd near Talgarth Rd

Bus lane – Shepherds Bush Road, southbound offside.

Box Junction – Hammersmith Bridge Road s/w bound under Talgarth Road

Northbound u-turn ban Gliddon Road ban between Talgarth Road and Edith Road

Southbound right turn turn ban Bloemfontein Rd j/w Bryony Road

Box Junction – Harwood Road j/w Effie Road

Box Junction – Shepherds Bush Green, East End

Loading Place, goods vehicles only, King Street

All of these locations have the highest rate of congestion as measured by TfL (more than 1.5 minutes vehicle day per vehicle kilometre – see Appendix) with the exception of Gliddon Road, where the u-turn ban was initiated as a result of a high collision rate and concerns of residents, and Bloemfontein Road, where the right turn ban was introduced in 1990 as part of a scheme to protect residents from rat-running traffic.

The key north-south route in the borough is Fulham Palace Road, which is consistently in TfL's “most congested” category. Some ten years ago, London Bus Priority Network studies showed that one of the main causes of delays to

buses and other traffic was queuing behind vehicles waiting to turn right. A central reservation was installed which effectively enforced the right turn bans. However, this was adding to congestion as there was insufficient space on each side of the reservation for large vehicles to overtake each other. The central reservation has recently been removed and we will shortly start enforcing with cameras when we are satisfied that we are compliant with DfT and Information Commission regulations. We have received complaints from residents about increased rat-running in side streets in this period between the removal of the central reservation and the implementation of camera enforcement.

4.18 Framework for Enforcement

In addition to the primary legislation referred to above and the Government Guidance issued under the Traffic Management Act 2004, the Council is also obliged to adhere to the requirements of the London Councils Code of Practice for CCTV Enforcement, the Data Protection Act and the proportionality provisions of the Human Rights Act. These are all components of best practice in CCTV enforcement.

We have also developed our own guidance for staff for each location where we enforce moving traffic contraventions through CCTV. This enables us to have protocols that recognise the intricacies of each location and make appropriate allowances.

The enforcement process itself is a two stage one. The officer carrying out the initial real time enforcement records and details all cases where he/she feels a contravention has occurred that merits the issue of a PCN, The recording is then reviewed by a second officer who must also agree that the case merits the issue of a PCN.

The Traffic Management Act 2004 introduced new requirements in relation to the infrastructure used to carry out parking enforcement through CCTV. This required the whole system used to be documented in detail in a Technical Construction File that was approved by the Secretary of State. It was envisaged at the time that this requirement would be extended to bus lane and moving traffic enforcement through CCTV but this has yet to happen.

4.19 Adjudication in Relation to CCTV Penalty Charge Notices

The process for challenging PCNs is set out in the various applicable primary legislation. If the making of written representations to the Council does not result in cancellation of the PCN the motorist has the right of appeal to independent adjudication at the Parking and Traffic Appeals Service (PATAS). Adjudicators can consider all aspects of the case in reaching their decisions including the Human Rights concept of proportionality and collateral issues. LBHF has long enjoyed a very good success record at PATAS as shown in Appendix A.

How are we doing in relation to reducing congestion?

4.20 While we have demonstrated earlier that camera enforcement increases compliance with the regulations, how does this contribute to our overall aim of reducing congestion and improving road safety?

Figures from TfL show that between 2007-8 and 2009-10, average a.m. peak speeds in LBHF increased by 5.9% from 13.3 to 14.1mph, compared with a 2.6% average increase in inner London, from 12.3 to 12.6mph. Average vehicle delay reduced by 13.4% from 1.16 minutes to 1.02 minutes, compared with the inner London average of 1.2 to 1.12 – a reduction of 5.9%. The figures for the inter peak and pm peak periods tell a similar story. However, the most recent figures issued by TfL, for 2011/12, show that congestion increased and speeds reduced in 2011-12. This period coincided with the failure of the Hammersmith Flyover and its closure for several weeks, so it is likely that this is a major contributor to this setback.

4.21 A good method of measuring the performance of the road network is TfL's satellite based i-bus system. Real time progress of all bus services can be tracked. This is a good proxy for general traffic performance as buses serve all the borough's main roads and unlike cars, cannot divert into side road "rat runs" when congestion is heavy. I-bus has only been fully operational for the past two years or so and therefore cannot give access to historical data, but will be useful for future measures of highway performance. The LIP has chosen two routes for monitoring – Route 220, which runs the length of the only complete north-south route in the borough, the Fulham Palace Road-Shepherds Bush Road –Wood Lane –Scrubs Lane Corridor. Between April 2011 and April 2013, delays on Route 220 reduced by 26% (using TfL's standard measure "excess wait time" – decline from 2.01 to 1.49 minutes). The east-west route chosen in the LIP, Route 94, shows a 32% reduction, Route 295, which runs through the Bagley's Lane/New Kings Road junction, shows a 37% reduction, and Route 391, which approaches the junction from Bagley's Lane, has shown a 31% reduction. (NB excess wait time is the difference between how long passengers on average have to wait for the bus compared with how long they would have to wait if all buses ran in accordance with the timetable).

4.22 We will also in future measure the performance of individual junctions by comparing the time taken for buses to get to and from the stops at either side of the junction over time, and with junctions which are not enforced, which will help us to evaluate the camera enforcement. However, the effects of enforcement are likely to be felt beyond the junctions which are enforced as drivers may have some doubt as to whether a particular junction is camera enforced and are more likely to comply with the regulations if they know that some of the junctions nearby are enforced.

Collision Trends

4.23. Overall our collision rates are reducing in line with those in London as a whole, with targets being met or exceeded in most areas except for cyclists

and motorcyclists. Because the number of collisions at individual locations is very low, we cannot give a statistically valid assessment of the effect of enforcement at each location, but it is worth noting that in 2006 there were 16 personal injury accidents at the main locations described in para 8.6 above, while in 2012 there were 10, a reduction of 27%.

Conclusion

4.24 This report has given an account of the policies and measures we are taking to reduce and control congestion. We cannot in any absolute sense separate the effects of the different parts of the strategy – education, engineering and enforcement, or unravel the many factors which affect congestion in a particular area, such as roadworks, development and traffic growth, but we believe that all the elements of the strategy are vital. It appears from the available evidence that we are meeting our targets for reducing congestion and improving road safety, but our road network will come under increasing pressure from population and employment growth. Without interventions, the situation will deteriorate. We will continue to monitor the situation and refine and target our interventions so that they have the greatest effect.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

| No. | Description of Background Papers | Name/Ext of holder of file/copy | Department/ Location |
|------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. | Mayor of London, Mayor's Transport Strategy, May 2010 | Chris Bainbridge, 3354 | Transport and Technical Services |
| 2. | A Transport Plan for Hammersmith & Fulham: The Second Local Implementation Plan (LIP2) 2011-2-31 | Chris Bainbridge 3354 | Transport and Technical Services |
| 3 | Transport for London: Travel in London, Report 5, 2012 | Chris Bainbridge 3354 | Transport and Technical Services |
| 4 | The Vision and Direction for London's Streets and Roads Mayor of London's Roads Task Force, July 2013 | Chris Bainbridge 3354 | Transport and Technical Services |
| 5 | RNPR Traffic Note 4, total Vehicle | Chris Bainbridge | Transport and Technical |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Delay for London, 2008-9, TfL, January 2010 | 3354 | Services |
| 6 | Average annual weekday speed and delay trends, 2007-8,2008-9 and 2009-10; TfL | Chris Bainbridge 3354 | Transport and Technical Services |

Insert here a list of all background documents which have been materially relied upon in the production of the report and have not been previously published. You do not need to list primary or secondary legislation.

Appendix A

Parking PCN Appeals 2006-13 (Figures include PCNs issued by both CEOS and through CCTV).

| | Appeals Decided | % success | London ave % success | London ranking |
|---------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| 2006-07 | 1233 | 53 | 32 | 9 |
| 2007-08 | 1108 | 47 | 28 | 14 |
| 2008-09 | 895 | 64 | 27 | 4 |
| 2009-10 | 1116 | 56 | 37 | 7 |
| 2010-11 | 1835 | 62 | 50 | 7 |
| 2011-12 | 1349 | 64 | 51 | 3 |
| 2012-13 | 1076 | 61 | 52 | 12 |

Bus Lane PCN Appeals 2006-13

| | Appeals Decided | % success | London ave % success | London ranking |
|---------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| 2006-07 | 89 | 74 | 54 | 3 |
| 2007-08 | 23 | 61 | 51 | 12 |
| 2008-09 | 15 | 73 | 41 | 3 |
| 2009-10 | 11 | 73 | 40 | 4 |
| 2010-11 | 55 | 65 | 56 | 8 |
| 2011-12 | 69 | 41 | 58 | 21 |
| 2012-13 | 97 | 64 | 54 | 8 |

Moving Traffic PCN Appeals 2006-13

| | Appeals Decided | % success | London ave % success | London ranking |
|---------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| 2006-07 | 55 | 85 | 43 | 2 |
| 2007-08 | 132 | 69 | 40 | 2 |
| 2008-09 | 137 | 77 | 35 | 1 |
| 2009-10 | 218 | 75 | 34 | 1 |
| 2010-11 | 324 | 73 | 49 | 1 |
| 2011-12 | 819 | 78 | 62 | 2 |
| 2012-13 | 715 | 75 | 62 | 4 |

Adjudicators have the power to award costs in the event of them viewing either party to have acted frivolously, vexatiously or wholly unreasonably.

The table below shows the number of cases between 2006-13 where costs were awarded by Adjudicators in relation to LBHF cases.

PATAS Costs Awards In Relation to LBHF 2006-13

| PCN Type | against Council | | to Council | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | no | total £ | no | total £ |
| Parking | 5 | £366.62 | 7 | 440.95 |
| Bus Lane | 0 | £0.00 | 0 | £0.00 |
| Moving Traffic | 1 | £23.50 | 0 | £0.00 |

**Appendix B: Get Hammersmith & Fulham Moving Leaflet,
June 2013**

Appendix C: Average Traffic Delays in Hammersmith & Fulham