



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

5 September 2017

Subject Heading:

**WINGLETYE LANE ACCIDENT
REDUCTION PROGRAMME –
PROPOSED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS
(The Outcome of public consultation)**

CMT Lead:

Dipti Patel

Report Author and contact details:

**Velup Siva
Senior Engineer
01708 433142
velup.siva@havering.gov.uk**

Policy context:

**Havering Local Development
Framework (2008)
Havering Local Implementation Plan
2017/18 Delivery Plan**

Financial summary:

**The estimated cost of £85,000 for
implementation will be met by
Transport for London through the
2017/18 Local Implementation Plan
allocation for Accident Reduction
Programme.**

**The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council
Objectives**

| | |
|--|------------|
| Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for | [X] |
| People will be safe, in their homes and in the community | [X] |
| Residents will be proud to live in Havering | [] |

SUMMARY

Wingletye Lane – Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by Transport for London for funding. A feasibility study has recently been carried out to identify safety improvements and zebra crossing, humped zebra crossings and humped pelican crossings are proposed to minimise accidents. A

public consultation has been carried out and this report details the finding of the feasibility study, public consultation and recommends that the safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation be approved.

The scheme is within **Emerson Park and St Andrews** wards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services and Community Safety that the safety improvements as detailed below and shown on the relevant drawings be implemented as follows:
 - (a) Wingletye Lane between Upminster Road and Minster Way (Outside Havering Sixth Form College) (Plan No:QQ006-1)
 - Humped pelican crossing
 - Humped zebra crossing as shown
 - (b) Wingletye Lane north of Lee Gardens Avenue (Plan No:QQ006-2)
 - Humped pelican crossing as shown.
 - (c) Wingletye Lane / Parkstone Avenue / Wych Elm Road Junction (Near Emerson Park Academy) (Plan No:QQ006-3)
 - Zebra crossing as shown
 - Humped zebra crossing as shown
 - (d) Wingletye Lane south of Campion School Entrance (Plan No. QQ006-5)
 - Humped zebra crossing as shown
2. That, the Committee having considered the representations made in response to the public consultation process, recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services and Community Safety that the mini roundabout proposal at the Wingletye Lane / Sylvan Avenue Junction as shown on Plan No. QQ006-4 be omitted from the original proposals.
3. That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £85,000, can be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2017/18 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Accident Reduction Programme.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In October 2016, Transport for London approved funding for a number of Accident Reduction Programmes as part of 2017/18 Havering Borough

Spending Plan settlement. Wingletye Lane Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study has been carried out to identify accident remedial measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing accidents and recommended safety improvements. Following completion of the study, the safety improvements, as set out in this report, are recommended for implementation as they will improve road safety.

- 1.2 The Government and Transport for London have set targets for 2020 to reduce Killed or Serious injury accidents (KSI) by 40%; Child KSIs by 50%; pedestrian, cyclist KSI's by 50% and slight injuries by 25% from the baseline of the average number of casualties for 2005-09. The Wingletye Lane Accident Reduction Programme will help to meet these targets.

Survey Results

- 1.3 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 1300 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Wingletye Lane by Lee Gardens Avenue.

A speed survey was carried out and the results are as follows.

| Location | 85 th ile Speed (mph) | | Highest Speed (mph) | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| | Northbound | Southbound | Northbound | Southbound |
| Wingletye Lane north of Lee Gardens Avenue | 36 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| Wingletye Lane between Sylvan Avenue and Copthorne Gardens | 34 | 35 | 40 | 45 |

The 85th percentile traffic speed (the speed at which 85% of vehicles are travelling at or below) along Wingletye Lane exceeds the 30mph speed limit. Staff considers these speeds to be undesirable and a contributory factor to accidents.

Accidents

- 1.4 In the five-year period to October 2016, thirty one personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Wingletye Lane. Of the thirty one PIAs in Wingletye Lane, four were serious; four were speed related; eight involved pedestrians and six occurred during the hours of darkness.

Details of PIAs are as follows:

| Location | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total PIAs |
|--|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Wingletye Lane between A127 Southend Arterial Road and Grassmere Road | 0 | 1 (1-child ped) | 2 | 3 |
| Wingletye Lane between Wilshire Avenue and Great Nelves Chase | 0 | 0 | 1 (1-Ped) | 1 |
| Wingletye Lane between Essex Gardens and Hubbards Chase | 0 | 1 | 1 (1-Dark) | 2 |
| Wingletye Lane / Sylvan Avenue Junction | 0 | 1 (1-Ped) | 2 (2-Dark) | 3 |
| Wingletye Lane / Parkstone Avenue / Wych Elm Road Junction | 0 | 0 | 6 (1-Child ped) (1-Dark) | 6 |
| Wingletye Lane between Poole Road and Lee Gardens Avenue | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Wingletye Lane in the vicinity of Lee Gardens Avenue Junction and pelican crossing | 0 | 1 (1-Child ped) | 3 (1-speed) | 4 |
| Wingletye Lane / Woodhall Crescent / Dury Falls Close Junction | 0 | 0 | 2 (1-speed) | 2 |
| Wingletye Lane between Woodhall Crescent and Maywin Drive | 0 | 0 | 4 (1-speed) | 4 |

| | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Wingletye Lane / Maywin Drive / Minster Way Junction | 0 | 0 | 1 (1-Ped) | 1 |
| Wingletye Lane between Maywin Drive and Upminster Road | 0 | 0 | 4 (2-Ped) (2-Dark) (1-speed) | 4 |
| Total | 0 | 4 | 27 | 31 |

Proposals

1.5 The following safety improvements are proposed along Wingletye Lane to reduce vehicle speeds and minimise accidents.

- Wingletye Lane between Upminster Road and Minster Way
(Outside Havering Sixth Form College) (Plan No:QQ006-1)
 - Humped pelican crossing
 - Humped pedestrian refuge
- Wingletye Lane north of Lee Gardens Avenue (Plan No:QQ006-2)
 - Humped pelican crossing
- Wingletye Lane south of Parkstone Avenue / Wych Elm Road
(Near Emerson Park Academy) (Plan No:QQ006-3)
 - Zebra crossing
 - Humped zebra crossing
- Wingletye Lane / Sylvan Avenue Junction (Plan No:QQ006-4)
 - Mini Roundabout
- Wingletye Lane south of **Campion School Entrance**
(Plan No:QQ006-5)
 - Humped zebra crossing

2.0 Outcome of public consultation

2.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 400 letters were delivered by hand and via post to the area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Nineteen written responses from Local Members, HAC Members, cycling representatives, Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade and residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix.

3.0 Staff comments and conclusions

- 3.1 The accident analysis indicated that thirty one personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Wingletye Lane. Of the thirty one PIAs in Wingletye Lane, four were serious; four were speed related; eight involved pedestrians and six occurred during the hours of darkness.
- 3.2 The proposed safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation would minimise accidents along Wingletye Lane. It is therefore recommended that the proposed safety improvements in the recommendation should be recommended for implementation.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

This report is asking HAC to recommend to the Cabinet Member the implementation of the above scheme

The estimated cost of £85,000 for implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2017/18 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Wingletye Lane (A2594). The funding will need to be spent by 31st March 2018, to ensure full access to the grant.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs of the scheme, should all proposals be implemented. It should be noted that subject to the recommendations of the committee a final decision then would be made by the Lead Member – as regards actual implementation and scheme detail. Therefore, final costs are subject to change.

This is a standard project for Environment and there is no expectation that the works cannot be contained within the cost estimate. There is an element of contingency built into the financial estimate. In the unlikely event of an overspend, the balance would need to be contained within the overall Environment Capital budget.

Legal implications and risks:

The Council's power to construct road humps in highway maintainable at public expense is set out in Part V of the Highways Act 1980 ("HA 1980"). Before making an order under this provision the Council should ensure that the statutory procedures set out in section 90C, Part V of the HA 1980 and the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 are complied with. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 govern road traffic signs and road markings.

The Council's power to create a pedestrian crossing on roads is set out in Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA 1984"). Before making an order under this provision the Council should ensure that the statutory procedures set out in Part III of the RTRA 1984 and the Zebra, Pelican and Puffin Pedestrian Crossing

Regulations and General Directions 1997 are complied with. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 govern road traffic signs and road markings.

Section 122 RTRA 1984 imposes a general duty on local authorities when exercising functions under the RTRA. It provides, insofar as is material, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. This statutory duty must be balanced with any concerns received over the implementation of the proposals.

In considering any responses received during consultation, the Council must ensure that full consideration of all representations is given including those which do not accord with the officer's recommendation. The Council must be satisfied that any objections to the proposals were taken into account.

In considering any consultation responses, the Council must balance the concerns of any objectors with the statutory duty under section 122 RTRA 1984.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

The Council has a general duty under the Equality Act 2010 to ensure that its highway network is accessible to all users. Where infrastructure is provided or substantially upgraded, reasonable adjustments should be made to improve access. In considering the impacts and making improvements for people with protected characteristics (mainly, but not limited to disabled people, the young and older people), this will assist the Council in meeting its duty under the Act.

There would be some visual impact from the proposals; however these proposals would generally improve safety for both pedestrians and vehicles.

| |
|--------------------------|
| BACKGROUND PAPERS |
|--------------------------|

1. Public consultation responses.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

| RESPONSE REF: | COMMENTS | STAFF COMMENTS |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| QQ006/1 (Local Member 1) | No queries on these proposals | - |
| QQ006/2 (Local Member 2) | No objections to these proposals | - |
| QQ006/3 (Local Member 3) | The proposals put forward seem to be positive and well thought out. | - |
| QQ006/4 (HAC Member 1) | It looks good to me | - |
| QQ006/5 (HAC Member 2) | Fine with me | - |
| QQ006/6 (Metropolitan Police) | Have some concerns about speeds and zebra crossings. - If speeds are 45mph, it is above safe threshold for introducing zebra crossing. - Stacking at zebra crossing could be caused across the mini roundabout - A lot of road markings shown within controlled area | The 85% percentile speeds are below 35mph which is a safe threshold. Stacking would not cause a significant problem. Any road markings amendments will be considered at the detailed design stage. |
| QQ006/7 (London fire brigade) | Whilst I welcome any accident reduction in the borough, the proposals will undoubtedly have an impact on fire service and attendance times. Can mini roundabout painted mini instead raised area? | Staff considered that the provision of longer ramps and speed table would not cause significant problems on the attendant times. Due to objections, mini roundabout will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/8 (EPAGRA) | (1)I am somewhat confused in the middle of major road works at A127, the Council are proposing to cause more congestion in Wingletye Lane. (2) Why it is considered that there is a need for another zebra crossing near Parkstone Avenue. (3) I cannot understand the reasoning that another zebra crossing near Campion School. | (1)Staff considered that the proposals would not cause a significant congestion along Wingletye Lane. (2)Second zebra crossing are proposed to serve the pupil from the south side of Parkstone Avenue. (3)A formal crossing and speed table are necessary for Campion school children. Other formal |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | crossings are far away from this location. |
| QQ006/9 (Ray Whitehouse, Cycling representative) | As you know I support all proposals which try and make our roads safer. I cannot support as they stand as they will have minimal effect. Request for 20mph speed limit along Wingletye Lane to make it safer. | Staff considered that the current proposals are adequate to minimise accidents at present. Further proposals such as 20mph speed limit could be considered at a later date if necessary. |
| QQ006/10 (The resident, 78 Wingletye Lane) | It is my view that the safety of the areas mentioned is already more than satisfactory and no further measures required. | - |
| QQ006/11 (The resident, 127 Wingletye Lane) | I agree with all the proposals except mini roundabout at Sylvan Avenue Junction which will cause problems getting on and off our vehicle crossover. | Due to objections, mini roundabout proposal will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/12 (The resident, 350 Wingletye Lane) | A raised roundabout creates safety issues for` cars reversing or pulling onto the driveways of 350 and 352 Wingletye Lane. If speed is the issue we need a speed hump prior to the browse of the hill. | Due to objections, mini roundabout proposal will be removed from the original proposals. The further proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary. |
| QQ006/13 (The resident, 352 Wingletye Lane) | It is not a good idea to put mini roundabout outside my property. It will not cut speed but could be more dangerous. It will be so difficult to pull on and off our drive. | Due to objections, mini roundabout proposal will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/14 (The resident, Emerson Park Group) | The proposed raised crossings spread along Wingletye Lane will have the desired result of slowing vehicles; however I would like to object to the proposed mini roundabout at the junction of Sylvan Avenue due to various reasons. | Due to objections, mini roundabout proposal will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/15 (The resident, 352a Wingletye Lane) | Putting a mini roundabout outside my house I believe would cause more problems for number reasons. My family and I would have to use the roundabout to enter our driveway which may cause accident. | Due to objections, mini roundabout proposal will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/16 (The resident, 273 | I only have access to my driveway via Sylvan Avenue and due to the increase | Due to objections, mini roundabout |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Wingletye Lane) | flow of traffic, a blind spot and a large tree. It is extremely difficult to manoeuvre in and out of my property if mini roundabout installed. | proposal will be removed from the original proposals. |
| QQ006/17 (Wingletye Lane resident) | I wish to object to the proposals to install humps at the proposed crossings. I am not objecting to the crossings, especially the pupils are inclined to walk into the road without looking whilst looking at their phones. | Staff considered that the proposed safety improvements including speed tables would reduce vehicle speeds and accidents along Wingletye Lane |
| QQ006/18 (Wych Elm Road resident) | We are writing to agree with the proposal for the new zebra crossing South of Parkstone Avenue and Wych Elm Road. This will make it very much safer for residents and school pupils to cross very busy Wingletye Lane without having to cross Parkstone Avenue in order to reach the existing zebra crossing. | - |
| QQ006/19 (Havering resident) | It is my view that the present crossings do not need to be replaced with humped crossings. There is already one zebra crossing close to Parkstone Avenue so why it is necessary for another zebra crossing. A pedestrian refuge adjacent to Herbert Road would seem to be more appropriate. | Staff considered that the proposed safety improvements including speed tables would reduce vehicle speeds and accidents along Wingletye Lane. Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary. |