



HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

5 September 2017

Subject Heading:

**GIDEA PARK CROSSRAIL
COMPLEMENTARY MEASURES
Outcome of public consultation**

SLT Lead:

Dipti Patel

Report Authors and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Chris Smart
Principal Engineer Regeneration Officer
01708 433751 01708 432150

Policy context:

mark.philpotts@haverling.gov.uk
Havering Local Development Framework
(2008)
Havering Local Implementation Plan
2017/18 Delivery Plan

Financial summary:

TfL has made £28.5m available London wide to fund public realm improvements at Crossrail stations in outer London. This programme is called Crossrail Complementary measures. Havering has secured an indicative grant of £4.1m available from 2015/16 – 2018/19, subject to separate funding Confirmation Applications. Currently £1.0m is earmarked for Gidea Park Station. TfL has released £0.112m from 2016/17 and an additional £0.050m from 2017/18 for fees associated with project development and consultation and more recently detailed design, leaving £0.538m 2017/18 and £0.300m 2018/19 to be draw upon.

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Communities making Havering | [x] |
| Places making Havering | [x] |
| Opportunities making Havering | [] |
| Connections making Havering | [x] |

SUMMARY

This report sets out the responses to a consultation for a variety of measures to improve the levels of pedestrian access, comfort and safety in an area around Gidea Park Station and recommends that the proposals be implemented.

The scheme is within **Squirrels Heath** and **Romford Town** wards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the report and the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services and Community Safety that the following measures set out in this report and shown on Drawings B2272700UD-06 and B2272700-0101-A-002 are implemented:

- 20mph Zone immediately around the station comprising the following area:
 - All of Station Road
 - Balgores Lane between Nos.146 and 168
 - Crossways between Balgores Lane and No.89
- Traffic calming of the 20mph Zone area:
 - Round topped road hump outside 93 Crossways
 - Flat topped road hump, 60 metres long to cover the area either side of the Crossways station car park entrance,
 - Flat topped road hump on Balgores Lane between Nos.148 and 156, including the entrance to Crossways,
 - Changing the existing zebra crossing outside No.166 Balgores Lane to a humped zebra crossing,
 - Changing the existing zebra crossing outside No.4 Station Road to a humped zebra crossing,
- New zebra crossings:
 - Balgores Lane – outside No.152 (on proposed flat topped road hump),
 - Upper Brentwood Road, just north of Thomas Drive
- Crossways – a reallocation of parking on the south side by the station entrance to provide:
 - Pay-and-display parking (4 spaces),

- Replacement of taxi rank with a 5 minute drop-off bay for general use (3 spaces),
 - Provision of a blue badge parking bay (2 spaces),
 - Balgores Lane
 - Removal of the loading bay and pay-and-display parking outside Nos.152 to 156 in order to provide the new zebra crossing.
 - Station Road
 - Reduction of the existing 5 minute drop-off bay from 3 to 2 spaces,
 - Provision of a new taxi rank (3 spaces).
2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £0.838m for implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2017/18 – 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan Gidea Park Station Crossrail Complementary Measures.

| |
|----------------------|
| REPORT DETAIL |
|----------------------|

1.0 Background

- 1.1 As part of the delivery of the east-west London Crossrail scheme, Transport for London has set aside funding to improve the public realm around stations on the route, including Romford, Gidea Park and Harold Wood.
- 1.2 For Gidea Park Station, a number of proposals have been developed which are primarily intended to improve pedestrian access, comfort and safety but also include parking management changes.
- 1.3 Initially Lead Members were consulted on a one to one basis to seek their support for all three Crossrail Complementary Measures schemes which includes Gidea Park
- 1.4 Before detailed design work commenced, design presentations and workshops were held with the Gidea Park & District Civic Society (9th July 2016) and the Havering Association for People With Disabilities and Sight Action (HAD, 21st July 2016) respectively. Councillors Misir, Crowder and Dervish attended the Civic Society presentation as part of the audience and the HAD workshop was attended by Councillors Light and Eaglin. The key themes from the workshop are contained in Appendix I.
- 1.5 After further design development work took place, a public exhibition and consultation took place at Gidea Park Library and was publicised through the Council website, social media and posters in the library which ran between 4th and 23rd November 2016. The exhibition was staffed 10am to

2pm on 11th November and 4pm to 8pm on 18th November – no Councillors attended on these particular days but may have attended during the times it was not staffed. Consultation material was also provided on the Council's website with an on-line questionnaire. Appendix II provides a summary of the issues raised and discussed.

- 1.6 After reviewing the issues raised through the workshops, exhibition and consultation process, a series of proposals were developed which were then subject to internal review and a TfL design review process. This was then developed into a package of physical measures. The review process confirmed the final extent of the scheme because as the funder, Transport for London required certainty on scope, area and likely scheme costs.
- 1.7 The project has an ultimate budget and so it simply wasn't possible to include all of the issues people wanted dealt with and so the scheme proposals reflect as much as possible the feedback provided. The scheme proposals are as follows.
- 1.8 A 20mph zone around the station area to include all of Station Road, Balgores Lane between Nos.146 and 168 and Crossways, between Balgores Lane and No.89.
- 1.9 Traffic calming (road humps) within the proposed 20mph Zone as follows;
 - Round topped road hump outside 93 Crossways
 - Flat topped road hump, 60 metres long to cover the area either side of the Crossways station car park entrance,
 - Flat topped road hump on Balgores Lane between Nos.148 and 156, including the entrance to Crossways,
 - Changing the existing zebra crossing outside No.166 Balgores Lane
 - to a humped zebra crossing,
 - Changing the existing zebra crossing outside No.4 Station Road to a humped zebra crossing
- 1.10 A new (humped) zebra crossing outside No.152 Balgores Lane (with footway widening on the south side of the street) and a new zebra crossing (no hump) on Upper Brentwood Road, just north of Thomas Drive.
- 1.11 The 20mph Zone, traffic calming and new zebra crossing in Balgores Lane were proposed to improve pedestrian access, comfort and safety in the immediate station area. The zebra crossing on Upper Brentwood Road was proposed in order to assist people with crossing the road at the end of the alleyway which runs adjacent to the railway between the station and Upper Brentwood Road.
- 1.12 Some of the proposals to assist pedestrians require changes to parking management in the area and some other parking management changes were proposed. These issues, together with the 20mph Zone, road humps

and zebra crossings require statutory advertisement and public consultation, notwithstanding previous consultation taking place.

- 1.13 In order to accommodate the new zebra crossing in Balgores Lane, the loading bay and pay-and-display parking outside Nos.152-156 was proposed to be removed (3 spaces). The loading bay outside No.140 would remain.
- 1.14 In Crossways, the parking would be rearranged on the southern side of the street either side of the station access to provide 4 pay-and-display parking spaces, a 5-minute drop off bay (3 spaces) and a blue badge bay (2 spaces). The pay-and-display parking would operate Monday to Saturday, 8.30am to 6.30pm and the drop off bay/ blue badge bay would operate at all times. The access to the station would have “at any time” waiting restrictions. The parking on Crossways would be effectively placed in laybys with footway widening at each end and at the station entrance.
- 1.15 In Station Road (outside the station, northern side) there would be 2 drop off parking spaces and a new taxi-rank (hackney carriages) with 3-spaces. Both in operation all the time and with “at any time” waiting restrictions between them.
- 1.16 Because of the locally important nature of the station letters were sent to those within an 800m radius of the station, which represents a 10 minute walk. This equates to some 4,700 letters being sent out dated 14th July 2017. In addition, details of the scheme were provided on the Council’s website and traffic notices were advertised. The closing of 4th August 2017 was given for comments to be provided.
- 1.17 In addition, ward councillors, HAC members and standard consultees (London Buses, emergency services, interest groups etc) were sent a set of the consultation information.
- 1.18 The scheme was also discussed at the monthly Engineering Services Traffic Management Liaison Meeting (TMLG) held on 6th July 2017. The TMLG comprises of staff from the Council and local Transport for London, emergency services representatives and others where large public projects are in progress (such as Crossrail).

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 53 responses were received from the public which are summarised in Appendix III. In addition, comments were received by standard consultees.
- 2.2 London Buses support the scheme on the basis the humped zebra crossings are constructed in accordance with Transport for London’s guidance on Traffic Calming Measures for Bus Routes.

- 2.3 The London Ambulance Service object to any vertical traffic calming. The North East London Stakeholder Engagement Manager commented;

“this slows our speed of response to life threatening calls and may cause discomfort or injury to ill and injured patients. These measures may also hinder treatment for a patient en-route to the Emergency Department of the hospital”

- 2.4 The Metropolitan Police Roads & Transport Policing Command Road Safety Engineering Liaison Officer requested information on traffic speeds on the roads affected which was provided.

- 2.5 In relation to responses made by the public, 31 respondents supported or partially supported the proposals, although some made comments on or in relation to some parts of the scheme. General themes were;

- Agreement with the scheme, but the traffic calming/ 20mph Zone should be larger (the most common comment from supporters)
- Unqualified agreement with the scheme,
- Agreement with the scheme, but requests for further measures such as more crossings and parking management,
- Agreement with the scheme other than the tree removals and provision of taxi rank,
- Agreement with the scheme other than the road hump element, with some citing the Government's Air Quality Action Plan.

- 2.6 16 respondents objected to all of the proposals or particular parts of the proposals without indication of support for the rest of the proposals. General themes were;

- Disagrees with the scheme in total,
- Disagrees with the scheme, especially the road humps (and some citing the Government's Air Quality Action Plan),
- Objects to the trees being removed,
- Objects to parking management proposals

- 2.8 Other comments included concerns about waiting drivers idling, railings at the station being an eyesore, requests for maintenance works and comments unrelated to scheme. The Committee should note that in some cases, respondents did not state if they agreed with the scheme or not and so these are noted in that section.

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 The new humped zebra crossing on Balgores Lane and the conversion of existing zebra crossings to humped crossings are primarily designed to

create a level crossing point for people walking and especially those with limited or impaired mobility. The humped crossings along with other road humps enable the provision of a 20mph zone around the area where pedestrian activity is highest.

- 3.2 Staff note the comments made by the London Ambulance Service. The service is routinely consulted about highway schemes and this is the first time in many years that a response has been provided. The comments are not scheme specific and Staff disagree that the scheme will have any significant impact given that on Balgores Lane and Station Road, the humped zebra crossings are designed to accommodate buses.
- 3.3 Some people objecting to the proposals suggested that road humps cause pollution, with some citing media reports of road humps being removed due to the Government Air Quality Plan (July 2017). The Action Plan is specific in dealing with nitrogen dioxide. There is a single reference to road humps in the section relating to “clean air zones” as a potential consideration. There are no clean air zones in Havering and the advice of Staff is that properly designed and installed road humps are perfectly acceptable and indeed, there is no evidence to demonstrate that road humps “cause” pollution. The safety benefits far outweigh any concerns in this regard.
- 3.4 On the matter of the trees (at the junction of Balgores Lane and Crossways), the Committee should note that they are conifers and not generally suitable as street trees. There is concern about their impact on buried utilities, they are causing damage to the footway and they shade the adjacent building. The area within which these trees are planted would be redeveloped with new planting and new trees which are appropriate for the location.
- 3.5 Many of those offering support have indicated that a larger area should be considered for traffic calming and the 20mph Zone; this was also commented on during the initial consultation and exhibition. The funding provided by TfL is finite and cannot possibly deal with wider desires. This might be an area requiring further work and additional future funding bids.
- 3.6 During the long design development and public engagement process, the scheme has been well received and with the statutory consultation, the scheme has been generally positively received, despite the very poor level of response. Staff therefore recommend that the scheme be implemented.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

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

TfL has made £28.5m available London wide to fund public realm improvements at Crossrail stations in outer London. This programme is called Crossrail Complementary measures. Havering has secured an indicative grant of £4.1m available from 2015/16 – 2018/19, subject to separate funding Confirmation Applications. Currently £1.0m is earmarked for Gidea Park Station. TfL has released £0.112m from 2016/17 and an additional £0.050m from 2017/18 for fees associated with project development and consultation and more recently detailed design, leaving £0.538m 2017/18 and £0.300m 2018/19 to be draw upon.

TFL have made available to the London Borough of Havering the 2017/18 allocation of £0.538m.

The delivery of work at Gidea Park Station would have no new funding implications for Havering, apart from the involvement of existing staff resources in Economic Development. Maintenance of the proposed works would be from existing budgets in Street Management.

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 Neighbourhoods 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.

The Council's power to make an Order altering speed limits in highway maintainable at public expense is set out in Part VI of the HA 1980 and its power to

make an order charging for parking on highways is set out in Part IV of the RTRA 1984.

Before an Order is made, the Council should ensure that the statutory procedures set out in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England & Wales) Regulations 1996 (SI 1996/2489) (as amended) 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 statutory 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 are taken into account prior to a decision being made.

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.

The provision of crossing facilities makes it easier for all sectors of the community to cross busy streets or have more confidence in crossing streets. This is especially helpful to disabled people, children (lone and accompanied), young families and older people.

Good quality footways and reduced street clutter can help pedestrians negotiate and navigate the public realm and is especially helpful for disabled people.

Traffic calming can help reduce traffic speeds, traffic volumes and the risk of collisions, especially involving vulnerable users. Older and younger people find it more difficult to judge traffic speed and they are especially at risk of being involved

in a collision. Some people may be intimidated by traffic speed and so traffic calming may assist in reducing this intimidation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

APPENDIX I
SUMMARY DESIGN WORKSHOPS OUTCOME SUMMARY

Table 1 : Feedback and Designers Responses from the Civic Society workshop

| No. | Design Comment/Issue | Designers Response |
|-----|---|---|
| 1 | The raised table along Crossways in front of the northern entrance was considered a good idea and had general consensus. | Noted and will be taken forward with the design development. |
| 2 | It was suggested that the parking along Crossways should be moved to the northern side, away from the station entrance. | This will be explored in further design development, bearing in mind opening of existing surgery. |
| 3 | Proposed raised table should be extended to the east or other measures (e.g. cobblestones) should be implemented to lower the speed of traffic around the right-hand bend into Crossways – there is an existing speed issue. Cobblestones were suggested. The raised table should not encourage parking on footways, appropriate street furniture to avoid this like cycle racks to be considered. | This has been noted. Additional traffic calming measures will be explored to the eastern part of Crossways. There are significant maintenance issues with cobblestones, hence alternative surface treatment like asphalt with coloured chippings may need to be considered. |
| 4 | Concerns over drop off/pick up and rat running on Crossways causing conflict with pedestrians. Pedestrian crossing would be beneficial. | Highlighted crossing point in front of station entrance will be explored. |
| 5 | Raised/highlighted crossing within car park considered a good idea. | Raised or highlighted pedestrian route through the car park will be explored. |
| 6 | The recently erected high fence along Crossways was considered inappropriate for the Conservation Area. However, the fence on the railway side of the alleyway is okay, especially as it won't become a graffiti-ridden. | Noted and will be discussed further with various stakeholders. |
| 7 | Additional cycle parking suggested. The provision of an open, double tiered cycle hub suggested. | Will be noted in further iteration. |
| 8 | Developing the area at the intersection of Crossways and Balgore Lane as a public node had general consensus. However concern was raised that this space should not encourage people to linger outside the station. Youths have been spotted outside the station littering etc, plus trains are frequent so no need to wait at the station for long periods. Space for an interpretive sign about Conservation Area can be identified for placement later by Civic Society. | This concern has been noted. Minimal and individually placed seating in well-lit area will be provided to avoid lingering in groups. The design will explore a more visually open area to dissuade anti-social behaviour. Design will be discussed further with community safety groups and the police. |
| 9 | New crossing across Balgore Lane had general consensus. Exact location was questioned and may need to be reconsidered. | This has been noted. This crossing will be explored further in detailed design for feasibility and location. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 10 | A mixed response to the idea of a 'blended crossing' across Crossways at its junction with Balgores Lane – some people were very much in support of the idea, while others were against it. Issue raised about drivers not being able to turn into Balgores Lane from Crossways due to high traffic volumes. | This will be considered further in next iteration to provide a pedestrian friendly crossing that does not impede the function of the junction. |
| 11 | Install a left turn lane at the exit of Crossways onto Balgores Lane to help alleviate the current traffic issues. Drivers already overrun the footway to turn left onto Balgores Lane. Other members of the table disagreed with this suggestion as it would make the crossing worse for pedestrians. | Concerns noted. Scheme is to improve public realm, so unless there is a major benefit, we would not widen carriageway and make pedestrian movements worse. |
| 12 | Need measures to discourage people from parking/stopping on Balgores Lane south of the proposed crossing. | Noted. Inset parking bays near take away shops could be considered to reduce on street car parking and make the new crossing a bit more visible. |
| 13 | Issue regarding unkempt property near takeaways on the east of Balgores Lane was raised. Potential funding to improve façade suggested. | Although this is considered a good idea, it may be out of the scope of this TfL funded study. |
| 14 | Need more taxi/minicab bays as they currently park unlawfully on Station Road and in the bus cage. | Will be noted in further iteration. Additional bay for mini-cabs pickup being considered in front of new plaza space to avoid mini cab parking in public space. |
| 15 | The "notches" at the ends of the parking bays on Station Road considered inappropriate as it either encourages drivers to drive into road or override them. | Noted and to be considered in further iteration. |
| 16 | Suggestion that bus stop on Station Road could be moved to the east to allow for more drop off/pick up capacity. | This could be discussed further with TfL buses but it is considered preferable to keep bus stops as close to station as possible for better interchange environment. |
| 17 | There was general consensus on Station Plaza design. It was emphasised that seating and general design should not encourage lingering and use by anti-social elements. | Noted. Minimal and individually placed seating will be provided to avoid lingering in groups. Additional lighting, high quality materials etc will be considered to create a more inviting yet safe plaza. Design will be discussed further with community safety groups and the police. |
| 18 | General consensus on improving surface along eastern part of Station Road. Parking retention near post office emphasised. | Noted. |
| 19 | There was general consensus on improving the surface treatment and lighting along the alleyway. People were in favour of the fence on the rail-track side of the alleyway being open (as it currently is), to create a sense of security, but noted that the vegetation on the railway embankment grows very quickly and that this somewhat | All noted and will be considered in further iteration. Maintenance regime for vegetation to be considered and discussed further with Network Rail. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | negated this effect. | |
| 20 | While there was general consensus on the need for a new crossing across Upper Brentwood Road, there was a concern if there would be too many crossings in short distances in this area. | The need for a crossing and exact location will be considered further in next iteration. |
| 21 | The proposals for interventions within alleyway should be low-maintenance (e.g. no wooden seating, trimming of vegetation etc). | Noted |
| 22 | There was general consensus on the use of Rain Gardens as it was considered an interesting sustainable drainage solution. However, concern over maintenance of planting was raised as existing vegetated areas like that near Balgores Lane and Crossways intersection has littering issues. Views should not be obstructed by new planting. General consensus on removal of existing conifers to make that a more clear space. | All noted and will be reflected in further design development and detailing. Provision of new bins to be considered to reduce littering. |
| 23 | Agreement that bright street lighting in the car park area could discourage anti-social behaviour. Some light columns considered too high. | Noted. Good lighting design to be considered in all parts of the study area. |
| 24 | Strong agreement among the group that the scheme should not be contemporary in style but sympathetic to the surrounding architecture. New design and signage should consider the character of the old station building along Station Road. | Noted. All new design, products, design elements, surface treatments, signage and lighting will be proposed with due consideration of the Conservation Area. |
| 25 | 20 mile per hour zone suggested in study area, and potentially all through the Conservation Area. | Noted and to be discussed further with LB Havering. |
| 26 | Greater parking enforcement is required because people park within the Conservation Area to access the station. Parking on Sundays to be removed on Crossways. | Noted and to be discussed further with LB Havering. |

Table 2 : Feedback and Designers Responses from the workshop with HAD and Sight Action Havering

| No. | Design Comment/Issue | Designers Response |
|-----|---|---|
| 1 | High traffic speeds along Crossways is a concern. No safe crossing point at Station entrance along Crossways. Raised table considered a good idea but further highlighted pedestrian crossing to be considered. Providing a raised crossing point with rest of the area visually highlighted may be considered. The footway along raised table should have minimum upstand needed for guide dogs to recognise change in use. Good visual contrast suggested between footway and raised table. | Noted for further design development. |
| 2 | Suggestion made about adding several, short raised tables along Crossways. Additional traffic calming suggested in the eastern part of Crossways. | Although this was considered an interesting idea in terms of slowing traffic, it provides too much up and down movement, especially for ambulances and also parking arrangements will be disrupted. Alternative options for traffic calming will be considered in the next iteration. |
| 3 | Pick up/drop off point for dial a ride/taxis to be provided along Crossways. | Noted and to be considered in next iteration. |
| 4 | Disabled parking to be considered in the car park. | This will be communicated to the car park management. |
| 5 | Need for clear and accessible route for persons of all abilities needed through the car park. Raised path suggested. | Highlighted path to be considered through the car park in further iteration. |
| 6 | The speeding traffic along Balgores Lane is considered an issue with no safe crossing point. The exit from the car sales place is especially dangerous. The new crossing across Balgores Lane had general consensus but it was felt that traffic calming measures should be considered earlier to the north to slow speeds. There were questions raised about exact location of crossing and may need further consideration. | Further traffic calming along Balgores Lane to be considered in further iterations. Exact location of crossing will go through further design development. |
| 7 | There was general consensus on the threshold treatment at the intersection of Balgores Lane and Crossways. If the threshold treatment idea does not go ahead, then the islands should be improved with enough refuge space for a wheelchair. | This suggestion will be considered in further iterations. Island will be improved. Appropriate tactile paving and dropped kerbs will be considered. |
| 8 | Developing the area at the intersection of Crossways and Balgores Lane as a public node had general consensus. However this area should feel safe and provide appropriate seating of the right height and | All suggestions noted. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | with arm rests to make it easy to use. | |
| 9 | There was general consensus on the use of Rain Gardens as it was considered an interesting sustainable drainage solution. But the edges should have upstands to be used for tapping. Views should not be obstructed by new planting. General consensus on removal of existing conifers to make that a more clear space. | All suggestions noted. |
| 10 | Too much parking along Balgores Lane. Makes it very congested in the evening. | Noted. Inset parking bays near take away shops could be considered to reduce on street car parking clutter and make the new crossing a bit more visible. |
| 11 | There was general consensus on the design along Station Road. However the need for proper drop off and pick up point was highlighted. The parking area to be consolidated but with clear signage. | This is noted and additional drop off and pick up for mini-cab will be provided. The parking area will be consolidated. |
| 12 | Parking/drop off is considered an issue in the front area in general. | This is noted and further investigation of drop off/pick up provision in this area will be considered. |
| 13 | There was general consensus on Station Plaza design. It was emphasised that adequate seating should be provided of the right height and with arm rests. Materials should not have too much contrast but kerb lines must be clear. | All suggestions noted. Adequate seating with arm rests will be provided. Additional lighting, high quality materials etc will be considered to create a more inviting yet safe plaza. Appropriate materials with muted tones, based on existing design, will be used in this area. |
| 14 | There was general consensus on improving the surface treatment and lighting along the alleyway. CCTV to be considered. | All noted and will be considered in further iteration. CCTV suggestion will be discussed further with maintenance company. |
| 15 | There was general consensus on the new crossing across Upper Brentwood Road. Location considered ideal as it leads to the Estate entrance. The build outs were considered a good idea. | All noted. |
| 16 | Wooden seats not considered ideal from a maintenance point on view. Concrete seats like the ones used in Hornchurch suggested. | Suggestions noted. Maintenance of seating and all street furniture will be considered in decision process. |
| 17 | All materials used should have low contrast, muted tones and should be visually cohesive to avoid visual confusion by vulnerable users. | Suggestions made about tone and contrast will be considered in further detailed design. |
| 18 | Clear signage should be considered to make the area more legible for people of all abilities. | Noted. |
| 19 | The need for groups associated with Dementia issues to be consulted about proposed design. The need to involve Community Safety groups. | A consultation session with local group involved in dementia related issues, local community safety group and the police to be organised shortly. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 20 | Designers should keep in mind that access to the bus stops at the front of the station is very important. | Noted |
| 21 | The design of the Hornchurch scheme should be looked at as an example of good design. | Noted |
| 22 | 20 mile per hour zone suggested in study area to improve pedestrian safety. | Noted and to be discussed further with LB Havering. |

APPENDIX II
PUBLIC EXHIBITION AND CONSULTATION OUTCOME SUMMARY

| No. | Design Issue/ Comment | Designers Response |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Street furniture | | |
| 1 | There should be bins acting as natural barriers to cars parking instead of using bollards as these can be knocked down and look unattractive. | This will be looked at in the detailed design. |
| 2 | Cycle racks should be moved away from bus stops as school children will congregate at bus stops and play with the cycles left. | Cycle racks suggested within the design are closer to the station entrance than the bus stop, making it easier access as well as avoiding anti-social behaviour. |
| 3 | There needs to be more bins near the bus stops as a lot of school children congregate there and leave litter. | This will be considered within the detailed design. |
| 4 | There are too many seats around the takeaways which encourage youths to loiter. | The design has been cautious of this, in suggesting single seating generally in pairs and avoiding benches. |
| 5 | Seating is a good idea, but it needs to be single seating to stop youths loitering. | This has been taken into consideration in the design. |
| 6 | Seating should have high back support for the elderly. | This will be considered in detailed design. |
| Car Park | | |
| 7 | The car park needs to be improved, including access into the car park. | The resurfacing of the car park will be suggested in the design layout, but this will be need to be raised with TfL/NCP who own and manage the car park. |
| 8 | There needs to be a 5 minute pick up point at busy times. | This has been suggested within the design both north and south of the station. It has been suggested that a 5 minute drop off and pick up point will be provided, 2 spaces south and 3 spaces north of Station. |
| 9 | The area is untidy; the entrance to the car park is a hazard to pedestrians. There should be a separate pedestrian footpath from Crossways into the station. | This has been considered in the design. The proposals are for a pedestrian footpath from the pavement to the station entrance via the car park. Again, this will be need to be raised with TfL/NCP who own and manage the car park. |
| 10 | The pavement outside of the station needs to tilt towards the road/ a drain as the car park is always flooding. | The proposed resurfacing of the car park should assist with this, however, it is the responsibility of TfL/NCP. |
| 11 | The car park spaces are too small and need to be repainted. | There is a possibility that the car park will be resurfaced therefore will need to be repainted. However the spaces will be allocated by TfL and NCP as they operate and maintain the car park. |
| Public Footpaths and crossings | | |
| 12 | A crossing between Balgores Lane and Crossways need to be implemented as a lot of people use the alleyway at the back of 'Balgores Best Kebab' from the Station. | This idea has been taken further in the design. A new zebra crossing has been suggested between Balgores Lane and Crossways. |
| 13 | The zebra crossing at the southern entrance needs to be a signalised crossing as cars do not stop for the zebra crossing. | The zebra crossing is looking to be retained, however, traffic calming features and interventions to slow speeds will be implemented. |
| Planting | | |
| 14 | I would like to see more planting along Balgores Lane e.g. more bright flowers. | There are plans within the design to create raingardens at the Balgores Lane |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | & Crossways junction. |
| 15 | Concern over raingardens not being maintained and it looking untidy in the long-term. | The landscape detailed design will take into account maintenance issues, which is also why raingardens were chosen as they require very little maintenance. |
| 16 | Planting should be secure and robust. Often these are damaged by local residents or by road collisions. | This will be considered while developing the design. |
| 17 | More greenery. There is too much pavement which makes the area bland. | This has been considered within the design. There will be trees planted across the design area and rain gardens at the Balgore Lane and Crossways junction. |
| 18 | There should be a hedge along the fencing at the car park. | The option of a hedge is not possible due to maintenance implications. |
| Car Park Fence | | |
| 20 | The existing fence is extremely ugly. We need a heritage fence and a hedge that runs along the car park fence. | Based on discussions with TfL about who would maintain this interface, a hedge is considered difficult to maintain. However, a heritage style fence is being proposed as an alternative to the existing palisade fencing. |
| 21 | Gidea Park is a conservation area built in 1911, there needs to be fencing and hedges which is in keeping with the heritage of the area. | This has been considered and the option of a low maintenance heritage style fence has been suggested. The option of a hedge is not possible due to maintenance implications. |
| 22 | The existing fence at the Northern entrance surrounding the car park looks terrible and needs replacing. | This has been considered and a heritage style fence is being proposed as an alternative to the existing palisade fencing. |
| 23 | The car park look terrible, the fencing needs to go and the car park needs resurfacing as it's 'bitty'. | This has been considered and a heritage style fence is being proposed as an alternative to the existing palisade fencing. The resurfacing of the car park will be suggested in the design layout, but this will be need to be raised with TfL/NCP who own and manage the car park |
| 24 | The north entrance looks too concrete heavy and utilitarian, it need more hedges and trees instead of green palisade fencing. | This has been considered and the option of a low maintenance heritage style fence has been suggested. The option of a hedge is not possible due to maintenance implications. |
| 25 | Fencing needs to be painted a colour which is sympathetic to the conservation of the area i.e. black. | Black fencing will be considered. |
| Lighting | | |
| 26 | The street lighting around the station needs to be in keeping with the conservation of the area and should stay the same style as what is already there. | This has been considered within the design and heritage style lamps have been suggested. |
| 27 | The car park lighting needs to be improved, and generally the north side of the Station is not well lit. | The car park is owned and managed by TfL / NCP. This comment will be passed to TfL / NCP. |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| 28 | The lamp posts need to be in keeping with the existing lamp posts surrounding the station. | The lamp posts suggested in the design are the same as those that are already installed along Crossways. |
| Enforcement | | |
| 29 | There are issues with minicab drivers. They park in the drop off bays which means private cars have no spaces and block up the road. | This has been taken into consideration and there will be spaces north and south for drop off and pick up which will be limited to 5 minutes. |
| 30 | There needs to be enforcement on minicab drivers parking outside of the station and using drop off spaces. | This will be raised with TfL. |
| 31 | Taxis are parked on both sides of the northern entrance at peak times, there needs to be more enforcement on black cabs. | This will be raised with TfL and signage provided. |
| 32 | There needs to be more islands on Station Road to prevent cars from performing U-turns in the road. | This will be considered in detailed design. |
| 33 | There needs to be double yellow lines north and south of the station. But there also needs to be enforcement of these yellow lines, otherwise people will ignore them. | There are double yellow lines included in the design of the north entrance to the station, in order to stop congestion on crossways. |
| 34 | There should be CCTV to stop people parking illegally on roads. | This will be raised with TfL and LBH. |
| 35 | Declutter front of the Station. There are lots of waste bins front on the street. | This issue will be considered within the design by suggesting a fence within the Station Plaza where the waste bins can be relocated. Solutions will need to be confirmed with MTR who own the bins. |
| 36 | The lighting, bins etc. should be placed so that cars cannot drive on the paving. | This suggestion will be taken into consideration and will be looked into further as a form of enforcement . |
| Traffic Calming | | |
| 37 | There should be a speed limit on the corner of Crossways and Balgores Lane. | There will be a raised table at the Balgores Lane and Crossways junction with road humps in other areas considered to slow the traffic down. |
| 38 | Extension of 20mph speed limit to residential roads around the station could help improve road safety and make the area a more pleasant place to shop and visit. | This will be raised with LBH as it will have to be part of a separate development scheme. |
| 39 | The whole conservation area should have 20mph speed limit and should have a 7.5 ton limit. | This will be raised with LBH. |
| Signage | | |
| 40 | There needs to be more signage, particularly towards Romford Main Road. | This has been noted and will be considered in detailed design. |
| 41 | There needs to be a sign from the station interiors to the taxis. | This will be part of Crossrail's design |
| 42 | There shouldn't be too many signs as then more people will use it as a through road. | This will be considered in detailed design. |
| 43 | This signage should be in keeping with the heritage style of the area. It shouldn't be too urban. | This will be considered in the detailed design. |
| Paving | | |
| 44 | The area is untidy. The entrance to the car park is a hazard to pedestrians. There should be a | This has been considered in the design. The proposals are for a pedestrian |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| | dedicated pedestrian footpath from Crossways into the station. | footpath from the pavement to the station entrance via the car park. Again, this will be need to be raised with TfL/NCP who own and manage the car park. |
| 45 | The pavement outside of the station needs to tilt towards the road/ drain as the car park is always flooding. | This will be considered in the detailed design. |
| 46 | Extra care should be given when using natural stone. Even though it looks very nice it needs to be maintained and monitored, so if broken then it can be fixed so it's not a trip hazard to pedestrians. | The construction and use of natural stone will be considered in detailed design to look to avoid potential for slabs becoming broken. |
| 47 | Consideration should be given to widen the alleyway paving alongside track in the future if possible to provide a more pleasant route to and from the station. | This was a design consideration, however there is residential housing on south of the alleyway and Network Rail own the land on the adjacent side making this proposal difficult to develop. |
| 48 | The alleyway needs to be improved at the back of 'Balgores Best Kebab'. It's always littered and when it rains becomes very muddy, new paving is needed. | This land is privately owned, therefore will not be improved by LBH as part of this scheme. |
| Other comments | | |
| 49 | Bus stops should have countdown timers installed and the Station should have on street walking and cycling maps (Legible London) installed to help encourage people to use more public transport. | This will be considered within the detailed design subject to funding by TfL for Legible London monoliths. With regards to a bus countdown timers, this will have to be discussed with TfL as they are usually part of bus improvement funds. |
| 50 | Consideration should be given to improving the look and feel of the wider local area (Carlton Road, Fairholme Avenue and Balgores Lane) to encourage further regeneration and growth in the area. | This will be raised with LBH as it may need to be part of a separate development scheme. |
| 51 | Concerned about lack of marked cycle routes through the area and feel these should be considered as part of the scheme. | This will be raised with LBH for further consideration as it may be part of a separate scheme. |
| 52 | There aren't enough restaurants in the area. | This was suggested within the design, however could not be taken further due to TfL having prior lease commitments with the minicab office. |

APPENDIX III
SUMMARY OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION COMMENTS

Summary of responses from public in support of the scheme

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Balgores Square | 1 |
| Carlton Road | 1 |
| Crossways | 4 |
| Heath Park Road | 1 |
| Meadway | 2 |
| Repton Avenue | 2 |
| Repton Gardens | 1 |
| Squirrels Heath Avenue | 7 |
| Stanley Close | 1 |
| Station Road | 1 |
| No Address Given | 10 |
| Total | 31 |

| Comment | Number of similar comments |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| General indication of agreement with scheme with request for traffic calming/ rat-running should be dealt with and/ or 20mph Zone to be much larger | 20 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme | 3 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, expect for tree removal | 3 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme with request for a wider area of parking management | 2 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, expect for reduction of drop off bay on Station Road and provision of taxi rank | 1 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, but concerns about road humps citing press reports of Government Air Quality Plan discouraging use of road humps | 1 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, but also requests zebra crossing at eastern end of Station Road | 1 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, but also requests crossing in Crossways | 1 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, but objects to road humps | 1 |
| General indication of agreement with scheme, but concerned that new zebra crossing in Balgores Lane will help people park on footway | 1 |
| Agreement with works to alleyway | 1 |

Summary of responses from public objecting to the scheme

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Balgores Lane | 1 |
| Fairholme Avenue | 1 |
| Hall Road | 1 |
| Heath Park Road | 1 |
| Haynes Road | 1 |
| Repton Gardens | 1 |
| Slewins Lane | 1 |
| Stanley Avenue | 1 |
| Squirrels Heath Avenue | 1 |
| Tudor Drive | 1 |
| No Address Given | 6 |
| Total | 16 |

| Comment | Number of similar comments |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Disagrees with all parts of the scheme | 5 |
| Objects to trees being removed | 4 |
| Objection to road humps citing pollution and/ or press reports of Government Air Quality Plan discouraging use of road humps | 4 |
| Objects to road humps | 3 |
| Objects to humped zebra crossing as a bus user | 1 |
| Objects to drop offs in Crossways | 1 |
| Concern that wider issues of speed and traffic flow in Crossways are not being addressed | 1 |
| Concern that not enough provision is being made for dropping people off at the station. Pavements should be narrowed to provide more space. | 1 |
| Scheme will displace traffic into other streets | 1 |
| Impact on shop parking | 1 |

Summary of responses from public requesting other measures/ other comments

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Pemberton Avenue | 1 |
| Squirrels Heath Avenue | 1 |
| No Address Given | 6 |
| Total | 8 |

| Comment | Number of similar comments |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Further parking controls needed on station side of Balgores Lane to deal with restaurants and business parking | 1 |
| Further parking controls needed in Station Road (double yellow lines) | 1 |
| Balgores Lane requires traffic calming with mini-roundabouts at various side roads | 1 |
| Compton Avenue requires traffic calming | 1 |
| Pemberton Avenue should be in 20mph Zone | 1 |
| Needs to be more space for dropping off | 1 |
| Squirrels Heath Avenue should be left as it is | 1 |

Summary of other comments

| | |
|---|---|
| Action required on engine idling by those waiting to collect people | 1 |
| Railings at station are an eyesore | 1 |
| Request for road or footway resurfacing | 1 |
| Comments made in relation to unrelated schemes | 3 |
| Further parking controls in wider area required | 1 |
| Comments on lack of street lighting | 1 |