



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

23 October 2018

Subject Heading:

**MAIN ROAD CASUALTY 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
2018/19 Delivery Plan**

Financial summary:

**The estimated cost of £0.090m for
implementation will be met by
Transport for London through the
2018/19 Local Implementation Plan
allocation for Casualty Reduction
Programme – Main Road (A2910).**

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

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People will be safe, in their homes and in the community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Residents will be proud to live in Havering	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

Main Road – Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved

by Transport for London for funding for 2018/19.

A feasibility study was undertaken to identify safety improvements including humped zebra crossings, pedestrian refuges with speed cushions, speed cushions, road markings and road signs to reduce the casualty rate along the street.

A public consultation was carried out and this report details the findings of the feasibility study, the results of the public consultation and taking account of the feedback from local residents, recommends that elements of the scheme do not proceed to implementation.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment in consultation with the Leader of the Council that the safety improvements as detailed below and shown on the relevant drawings be implemented as follows:
 - (a) Main Road between St Edwards Way and Kingston Road
(Plan No:QR004/1)
 - Hump within existing zebra crossing outside property No. 29 and Hill Court west of Pettits Lane
 - (b) Main Road between Repton Avenue and Crossways
(Plan No:QR004/3)
 - Hump within existing zebra crossing outside property Nos.109 to 113/234/236/238 Main Road
 - (c) Main Road between Links Avenue and Castellan Avenue
(Plan No:QR004/4)
 - New pedestrian refuge outside property Nos. 260a-c/260 Main Road
2. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment following consultation with the Leader of the Council that the safety improvements as detailed below and shown on the relevant drawings be rejected because of the level of objections:
 - (a) Main Road between St Edwards Way and Kingston Road
(Plan No:QR004/1)
 - Speed cushions outside Magistrates Court west of Junction Road
 - Speed cushions outside Texco Express and Petrol Station east of Junction Road
 - Speed cushions west of Kingston Road
 - (b) Main Road between Lodge Avenue and Repton Avenue

(Plan No.QR004/2)

- Speed cushions outside Gidea Park Primary School and outside property No. 43 Main Road
- Speed cushions outside Gidea Park Primary School and outside Royal Jubilee Court.

(c) Main Road between Repton Avenue and Crossways

(Plan No:QR004/3)

- Speed cushions outside property Nos. 69/156 Main Road
- Speed cushions outside property Nos.206/208 and Gidea Park Hotel

(d) Main Road between Links Avenue and Castellan Avenue

(Plan No:QR004/4)

- Speed cushions outside property Nos. 260a-c/260 Main Road
- Speed cushions outside property Nos. 129/260a/260 Main Road
- Speed cushions outside property Nos. 157/161/163/280 Main Road

2. That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £0.090m, can be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Accident Reduction Programme.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In October 2017, Transport for London ("TfL") approved funding for a number of Casualty Reduction Schemes as part of the 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan settlement. The 'Main Road Accident Reduction Programme' was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study has been carried out to identify potential casualty reduction measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing casualties and risk exposure (especially to vulnerable users) and a series of safety improvements were identified. Following completion of the study, the safety improvements, as set out in this report, were taken forward to a formal public consultation.
- 1.2 The Government and Transport for London have set targets for 2020 to reduce Killed or Serious Injury collisions (KSIs) 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.
- 1.3 The Mayor's Vision Zero Strategy aims to eliminate deaths and serious injuries on London's road and street network including **Haverling** roads in the light of previous incidents. The Mayor's aim is for no-one to be killed in or by a London Bus by 2030 and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's road and street by 2041. The main targets are as follows:

- (a) 65% reduction in KSIs by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average

- (b) 70% reduction in KSIs by buses by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average
- (c) 70% reduction in KSIs by 2030 against 2010-2014 baseline average
- (d) 0 KSIs by 2041
- (e) 0 KSIs by buses by 2030

The Main Road Casualty Reduction Scheme was developed to help to meet the above targets.

Traffic Survey Results Summary

- 1.4 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 2000 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Main Road west of Pettits Lane.

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

Location	85 th ile Speed (mph)		Highest Speed (mph)	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Main Road west of Pettits Lane (Off peak periods)	38	37	45	45
Main Road west of Pettits Lane (Peak periods)	34	33	40	40
Main Road east of Crossways (Off peak periods)	42	37	50	45
Main Road east of Crossways (Peak periods)	31	28	45	40

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

Injury Collision Data

- 1.4 In the five-year period to February 2017, **eighty** personal injury collisions (PICs) were recorded along Main Road. Of these eighty PICs, 1 was fatal, three were serious; six involved pedestrians and eighteen occurred during the hours of darkness.

A summary of the PICs are as follows:

Location	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total PICs
Main Road between St Edwards Way and Junction Road	0	0	6 (1-Dark)	6
Main Road / Junction Road Junction	0	0	6 (1-Ped) (4-Dark)	6
Main Road / Oaklands Avenue Junction	0	0	4	4
Main Road between Oaklands Avenue and Pettits Lane	0	0	1	1
Main Road / Pettits Lane	0	0	8 (1-Ped) (1-Dark)	8
Main Road between Pettits Lane and Kingston Road	0	0	2	2
Main Road / Kingston Road Junction	0	0	3 (1-Dark)	3
Main Road / Lake Rise Junction	0	0	2	2
Main Road between Lake Rise and Lodge Avenue	0	0	1	1
Main Road / Lodge Avenue Junction	0	0	9 (1-Dark)	9
Main Road between Lodge Avenue and Repton Avenue	0	0	4	4
Main Road / Repton Avenue / Gidea Avenue Junction	0	0	5 (1-Dark)	5

Main Road between Gidea Avenue and Heath Drive	0	0	1 (1-Ped) (1-Dark)	1
Main Road / Heath Drive Junction	0	0	2	2
Main Road / Balgores Lane Junction	0	2 (2-Ped) (2-Dark)	4	6
Main Road between Balgores Lane and Crossways	1 (1-Dark)	0	3	4
Main Road / Crossways Junction	0	1 (1-Ped)	0	1
Main Road /Links Avenue Junction	0	0	2	2
Main Road / Severn Avenue Junction	0	0	1 (1-Dark)	1
Main Road between Severn Avenue and Castellan Avenue	0	0	1	1
Main Road / Castellan Avenue Junction	0	0	1	1
Main Road between Hockley Drive and Upper Brentwood Road	0	0	2	2
Main Road / Upper Brentwood Road Junction	0	0	6 (4-Dark)	6
Main Road between Upper Brentwood Road and Gallows Corner	0	0	2	2
Total	1	3	76	80

Proposals

1.5 The following safety improvements were proposed along Main Road to reduce vehicle speeds and minimise collisions.

- (a) Main Road between St Edwards Way and Kingston Road
(Plan No:QR004/1)
 - Speed cushions outside Magistrates Court west of Junction Road
 - Speed cushions outside Texco Express and Petrol Station east of Junction Road
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property No. 29 and Hill Court west of Pettits Lane
 - Speed cushions west of Kingston Road
- (b) Main Road between Lodge Avenue and Repton Avenue
(Plan No.QR004/2)
 - Speed cushions outside Gidea Park Primary School and outside property No. 43 Main Road
 - Speed cushions outside Gidea Park Primary School and outside Royal Jubilee Court.
- (c) Main Road between Repton Avenue and Crossways
(Plan No:QR004/3)
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos. 69/156 Main Road
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos.206/208 and Gidea Park Hotel
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property Nos.109 to 113/234/236/238 Main Road
- (d) Main Road between Links Avenue and Castellán Avenue
(Plan No:QR004/4)
 - Pedestrian refuges with speed cushions outside property Nos. 260a-c/260 Main Road
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos. 129/260a/260 Main Road
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos. 157/161/163/280 Main Road

2.0 Outcome of public consultation

- 2.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 500 letters were delivered via post to the area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Forty three written responses from Local Members, the Metropolitan Police, Gidea Park School, community groups and residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix 1.
- 2.2 The views expressed by ward councillors were mixed with some in support of the scheme and some against, with the chief concern being that of road humps being installed on a road of this class and with some concern about

drivers switching to side streets to avoid the traffic calming. The MP for Romford also expressed objection to road humps.

- 2.3 The Metropolitan Police noted that the flat topped humps proposed at the zebra crossings would help bring the 85th percentile speeds within DfT guidance.
- 2.4 The Romford Civic Society objected to the proposals with concerns about drivers diverting to other streets, the lack of alternative proposals and pollution. The Gidea Park Civic Society objected to the proposals although saw value in adding the flat topped humps to the existing zebra crossings. They also thought speed cameras would be more effective.
- 2.5 Gidea Park School objected with concerns about air pollution and that the roadworks would lead to pupils and staff being late.
- 2.6 The majority of residents who responded objected to the scheme with concerns about road humps, drivers diverting to side streets and air pollution. Some indicated that speed cameras would be a better solution. Some residents requested measure unrelated to the scheme or measures that are not possible in the UK.
- 2.7 Details of some Havering Casualty Reduction schemes, TfL's targets, Mayor's vision zero Strategy and traffic calming techniques are summarised in the Appendix 2.

3.0 Staff comments and conclusions

- 3.1 The collision analysis indicated that **eighty** personal injury collisions (PICs) were recorded along Main Road. Of these eighty, 1 was fatal, three were serious; six involved pedestrians and eighteen occurred during the hours of darkness.
- 3.2 Appendix 2 provides some commentary on the effectiveness of history Casualty Reduction Schemes, traffic calming measures and other features used in the Council's Casualty Reduction Programme, TfL's targets and Mayor's Vision Zero Strategy.
- 3.3 Staff prepared set of proposals which they considered to be appropriate for the class of road that Main Road is, which would influence driver behaviour and to reduce the risk exposure of vulnerable road users. However, given the level of objection to aspects of the scheme, Staff recommends that the most controversial aspects of the scheme are rejected.
- 3.4 Staff recommends that the following three features from the original scheme should be implemented:
 - (a) Humped zebra crossing west of Pettits Lane, outside property No. 29 and Hill Court.
 - (b) Humped zebra crossing west of Crossways, outside property Nos. 109

- to 113/234/236/238 Main Road
(c) Pedestrian refuges east of Links Avenue, outside property Nos.
260a-c/260 Main Road

3.5 The proposed safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation would minimise collisions, particularly for vulnerable road users along Main Road.

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 original Transport for London allocation was £0.090m initial feasibility and consultation costs of £0.011m have reduced the available funding to c£0.079m.

The estimated cost of 0.090m for feasibility, consultation and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Main Road Accident Reduction Programme (A2910). The funding will need to be spent by 31st March 2019, 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 and maintain places of refuges for the protection of pedestrians in the maintained highway is set out in Part V of the Highways Act 1980 ('HA1980')

The Council's power to construct road humps in highway maintainable at public expense is set out in Part V of the 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 2016 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 2016 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:

The recommendations made in this report do not give rise to any identifiable HR risks or implications that would affect either the Council or its workforce.

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.

Havering has a diverse community made up of many different groups and individuals. The council values diversity and believes it essential to understand and include the different contributions, perspectives and experience that people from different backgrounds bring.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the council, when exercising its functions, to have due regard to:

- (i) the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- (ii) the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not, and;

- (iii) foster good relations between those who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

Note: 'Protected characteristics' are: age, sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnerships, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and gender reassignment.

The council demonstrates its commitment to the Equality Act in its decision-making processes, the provision, procurement and commissioning of its services, and employment practices concerning its workforce. In addition, the council is also committed to improving the quality of life and wellbeing of all Havering residents in respect of socio-economics and health determinants.

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

RESPONSE REF:	COMMENTS	STAFF COMMENTS
QR004/1 (Local Member 1)	If the proposed programme helps to reduce accidents in Main Road, I would support the improvements.	-
QR004/2 (Local Member 2)	This is okay with me	-
QR004/3 (Local Member 3)	This seems fine with me.	-
QR004/4 (Local Member 4)	If it helps to reduce accidents and saves lives, I will be in favour of the proposal.	-
QR004/5 (Local Member 5)	Just to confirm, I am against any speed cushions on Main Road, this is the first I have heard about this so think we need to relook at the proposal.	-
QR004/6 (Local Member 6)	<p>I must say I have reservations about the proposals for the following reasons.</p> <p>(1) Owing to Main Road being busy, the moves slowly, there are often queues and it can rarely speed, making speed humps unnecessary, I don't know where these speed of 50mph were recorded.</p> <p>(2) Speed humps on a road which slopes as Main Road does on either side of the bridge between Raphael and Lodge Farm Parks, make it dangerous, because one has to slow down going uphill.</p> <p>(3) Emergency vehicles lose time slowing down over humps, also the jolting can be detrimental to patients (and indeed to passengers in any vehicles). Ambulances and police cars regularly use Main Road.</p> <p>(4) Slowing down traffic on a Main Road inevitably causes vehicles to divert down side roads, leading to 'rat runs'. Indeed, I would suggest it is these roads, such as Glenwood Drive, Erroll Road and Castellan Avenue, which need speed humps rather than main roads.</p> <p>(5) Statistics rarely tell the full story; surely preventative measures, such as those outlined in point 4 would be better.</p>	<p>(1)Traffic surveys were carried out on two locations along Main Road for a week which showed the vehicles were travelling up to 50mph.</p> <p>(2) In the vicinity of these two parks, only one sets of speed cushions are proposed west of Kingston Road which would not cause significant problems.</p> <p>(3)Emergency service vehicles can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions.</p> <p>(4) Although the proposals may cause little rat-runs on the side roads, it is considered that the level of rat-runs would be minimum.</p>

		(5) The most accidents mainly occur on the main roads, not on the side roads. The funding from the TfL for accident reduction programmes need to be used where the most accidents occurred. We are unable to propose traffic calming measures on side roads. For this purpose, the Council need to find other source of funding.
QR007/7 (HAC Member)	I understand what you are trying to do but the proposals seem rather draconian and over the top. Something like the cycle lane at the top of Main Road by the traffic lights going west, upon which I have never seen any cycle and often vehicles who are not used to the area have to cut in when they are in the wrong left turn lanes and wish to proceed to Romford could we review it?	Staff considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would minimise accidents along Main Road as 80 PIAs occurred along this road. With reference to cyclists, site observation showed that there are number of cyclists use Main Road to access Romford Town Centre.
QR004/8 (Romford MP)	I would like to voice my strong objections to any road humps being installed in Main Road and hope you will record this formally as part of the consultation.	Staff believe that the proposals would improve safety along Main Road.
QR004/9 (Metropolitan Police)	The existing zebra I was not consulted on as it has probably been in place for a long time. I have to ensure that the 85%ile is within the DfT guidance which will be by combining the two figures and addition of your intended measures will further reduce this. Consequently I do not have any concerns regarding your safety scheme.	-
QR003/10 (Main Road – resident 1)	I am writing to register my support for the planned safety improvements.	-

<p>QR004/11 (Main Road - resident 2)</p>	<p>We have constant troubles with the hotel who's delivery vehicles HGVs park on the pavement outside our house with the wheels up on the kerbs, blocking pedestrians usage of the bus stop and the cycle lane. We welcome the speed humps being put down in the area. We would like to say that we wholeheartedly approve of the measures being put in place due to the amount of accidents that occur on Main Road.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>QR004/12 (Main Road – resident 3)</p>	<p>We are opposed to your proposals for Main Road as it is a trunk road into Romford and it would cause more congestion and we feel it should be rejected on the following grounds. (1) They are bad for the environment as traffic will be accelerating after each speed cushion which pollutes the atmosphere more and is detrimental to the health of residents. (2) Large vehicles going over the cushion will cause more vibrations to our properties. We get this now when pot holes or road repairs are not carried out. (3) It will cause more problems for the emergency services when trying to negotiate with other traffic, and the emergency vehicles are the main offenders for the speeding and rightly so. (4) How many of the 80 accident were completely due to speed I would suggest most caused by other problems. (5) There is no return on this expenditure would it be more practical to have speed cameras and get a return on the investment.</p>	<p>(1) With reference to pollution, no studies showed that `speed humps cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions pollution. (2) Large vehicles can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions. (3) See comments above. (4)Seven PICs are speed related. (5) The Council has no control over the installation of speed cameras.</p>
<p>QR004/13 (Main Road - Resident 4)</p>	<p>- I grant there are individuals who do ignore the speed limit, these are mostly motor cycles but the majority of speeding vehicles are emergency services namely Police, Ambulances and Para Medics who account for the 'regularly' speeds of 50mph or more. - What consideration has been given to the increased pollution caused by vehicles slowing down for the speed bumps and then accelerating afterwards. Vehicles would presumably be using lower gears to travel Main Road, again increasing pollution.</p>	<p>- With reference to pollution, no studies showed that `speed humps cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions pollution. - From the experience, it is considered that speed cushions would not cause significant problems in terms of noise and vibration as large vehicles</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What consideration has been given to the increased noise levels and vibration that will be caused by the use of speed bumps. - Speed camera or a reduced speed limit to say 25mph might be alternatives. 	<p>including buses can straddle the speed cushions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras
QR004/14 (Main Road – Resident 5)	<p>I fully agree with, could you at the same time reduce the speed limit in Crossways and surrounding roads to 20mph. Living at the Main Road end of Crossways, it is extremely dangerous at busy times of the day because of drivers using Balgore's Crescent and Crossways to avoid the traffic light at Balgore's and Main Road. I would like to see traffic calming in Crossways as those drivers avoiding the lights are always in a hurry. I have noticed in Upminster, they have reduced speeds and think this area should do the same.</p>	<p>Crossways and Balgore's Crescent area for traffic calming could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available..</p>
QR004/15 (Main Road – Resident 6)	<p>I believe that the scheme should be designed to take the following into account.</p> <p>(1) The proposed scheme has the last cushion adjacent to 280 Main Road. From personal experience there is an increased risk of road traffic accidents adjacent to 304 Main Road. It is essential that this area is included in the scheme with a speed table to slow the traffic and improve the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>(2) In Havering the only urban east to west main route not to have traffic calming measures is Main Road. All the others have speed tables to the full width of the road. This means that all traffic has to slow down to negotiate them. This method of traffic calming has been used because it is more effective than using road cushions and to ensure a uniform approach across the borough, Speed tables should be adopted throughout this scheme.</p> <p>(3) By using road cushions in Main Road, which has a high proportion of speeding HGVs, motor bikes and cars, they will be less effective in slowing large vehicles, as they will straddle them and motor cyclists will be tempted to weave around them reducing their effect. Car drivers will also</p>	<p>Due to limited funding, further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.</p> <p>See the comments above.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed speed cushions would not cause significant problems in terms of safety. Due to limited funding, the speed</p>

	<p>be tempted to drive around them into the oncoming traffic. The avoidance of the speed cushions by drivers of all types of road vehicles will increase the risk of accidents and deadly head on.</p> <p>(4) If budget constraints do not allow for road tables throughout the scheme then the design of the two sites which have road cushions and no pedestrian refuge should be reconsidered. If pedestrian refuges are provided between the east and west bound carriageways it will help to discourage drivers of large vehicles and cars from driving round the speed cushions. The two proposed sites are outside the Magistrates Court west of Junction Road and outside the Gidea Park Hotel and number 208 Main Road</p>	<p>cushions are proposed as opposed to speed tables.</p> <p>Due to level of objections and limited funding, staff would recommend few sites for implementation.</p>
QR004/16 (Main Road – Resident 7)	<p>I welcome the proposals but think they will not solve the problem for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) Cushions will not reduce the overall speed much. Many of the car drivers and motor cyclists are commuters and will be aware of the cushions and merely straddle or avoid them hardly reducing speed</p> <p>(2) Cushions are not effective against vans and HGV's with wide wheelbases who are common speed offenders</p> <p>(3) There is no proposal for cushions to be installed near the location of the pedestrian refuge immediately to the north of Castellan Avenue</p> <p>(4) Cushions are not the deterrent to speeding that the Council is looking for. Only a raised surface the full width of the carriageway will help solve the problem</p>	<p>Due to limited funding, cushions are proposed as opposed to speed tables. Although speed cushions are not effective than speed tables, the Council believe that speed cushions would reduce vehicle speeds to some extent and reduce accidents along Main Road.</p>
QR004/17 (Main Road – Resident 8)	<p>The proposal looks interesting, any measures to reduce the speed of the 'boy racers' would be appreciated by all using or living on or off of Main Road</p>	-
QR004/18 (Main Road – Resident 9)	<p>I am in favour of traffic calming and the proposals should be greatly beneficial. However I am concerned the programme omits any reference to aggressive cycling on footways. In recent years, this has become a major physical and emotional hazard for pedestrians in Romford, allegedly as part of an informal safe cycling initiative. It may be safer for</p>	-

	cyclists; it's certainly not safe for pedestrians	
QR004/19 (Main Road – Resident 9)	The premises annotated as Gidea Park Hotel is actually Harvester	Plan will be amended.
QR004/20 (Main Road – Resident 10)	Is it possible that the speed cushions outside property Nos:69/156 in Main Road could be upgraded to pedestrian refuges with speed cushions or even better a full blown zebra crossing?	Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.
QR004/21 (Main Road – Resident 11)	<p>I object to the proposed scheme for the following reasons.</p> <p>(1) The major traffic problem is congestion, not speed.</p> <p>(2) Cyclists regularly use the pavement to travel with little or no regard for pedestrians or residents.</p> <p>(3) The main offenders of speeding are motor cyclists and emergency services. We regularly hear the noise from speeding motor cycles and the sirens of the Police and Ambulances.</p> <p>(4) Pollution is already very high in Main Road and the proposed scheme would worsen the situation.</p> <p>(5) Police cars on emergency calls will be disadvantaged by slow speed or damaged by the cushions.</p> <p>(6) Chelsea tractors will treat the cushions with impunity, however smaller older cars will suffer damage and the drivers will suffer discomfort.</p> <p>(7) If the plan is to stop speeding, the fairest system is to have speed cameras.</p> <p>(8) Cushions penalise the good guys who are obeying the speed limit but still have to slow to avoid damage to the vehicles or themselves.</p> <p>(9) I realise the TfL have too much taxpayers money and dangle this in front of local councils to implement schemes targeted at horrible motorists and slewed towards 'angelic cyclists'.</p>	It is considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would reduce vehicles speeds and accidents. It would not cause significant problems for motorists and pedestrians. With reference to pollution, no studies showed that 'speed humps cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions.
QR004/22 (Main Road – Resident 12)	I agree with the intent but hate the speed humps. All I observe when I use them daily in London road are cars, braking hard and then accelerating hard between humps. You ignored the car parking by police across all the pavements and	It is considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would reduce vehicles speeds and accidents. It would not cause

		entrance to station and garage. This causes visual blocks the slopes for wheelchair, pram walking aid and electric cars. Personally I think the plans are not worth our money.	significant problems for motorists and pedestrians.
QR004/23 (Main Road resident 13)		I strongly object to this suggestion and the idea of humps down a Main Road. I believe speed cushions will only generate unacceptable noise levels to residents as lorries and vans bang over the raised surface. Emergency vehicles constantly travel at high speeds and should there be an obstruction, they may consider taking a different line to avoid the humps endangering oncoming vehicles and pedestrians. Any vehicles approaching speed cushions in the road have a tendency to brake and then accelerate as they pass over them, this however can only generate more unnecessary pollution. Putting humps on the main bus route will mean passengers will have to tolerate the discomfort. Speed cameras would be a more viable option impose no Impact on the environment or residents.	It is considered that speed cushions would not cause significant noise problems as large vehicles including emergency services and buses can straddle over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions.
QR004/24 (Havering resident 1)		I have few concerns around the proposals. Cars will use quiet residential roads. There are actually not enough zebra crossings on the lower end of Main Road and I feel this is the perfect opportunity to place one opposite the Tesco garage. I would also like to say why is Pettits Lane not being looked at that is the most dangerous road with I think one crossing point and cars easily go down at 60-70mph.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause problems in terms of rat-runs. Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary. Other area could be considered when funding being available.
QR004/25 (Brook Road resident)		I do not agree with the proposal for traffic calming in Main Road. If you have driven down London Road you will know what I mean. It shakes you up and your car, not a nice experience if you want to stop people going too fast, try going down Brook Road, Gidea Park, they drive like maniacs. You can't drive too fast down main road, because of the volume of traffic, better solution is traffic lights at Pettits Lane turning right into Main Road is a nightmare.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems. Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and funding being available.

QR004/26 (Erroll Road- Resident 1)	We wish to submit our objections to this scheme. We think this scheme will increase the amount of traffic using Kingston Road, Gilbert Road and the road we live in as motorists take evasive action from the speed cushions.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads.
QR004/27 (Erroll Road- Resident 2)	I would like to advise you of my strong objection. These speed cushions will cause more cars to use the residential streets, Kingston Road, Erroll and Gibert Roads as rat runs. We are already seeing more and more vehicles speeding down these roads when Main Road is jammed. I do agree that more consideration is needed to assist pedestrians crossing the road. Perhaps another crossing near the Tesco Garage and also between Pettits Lane and the existing Pelican crossing at Raphael Park	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.
QR004/28 (Erroll Road- Resident 3)	We strongly object to your proposal because this will cause great misery to the residents of Erroll Road, Gilbert Road and Kingston Road as most of the motorists will be using these roads and avoid Main Road due to humps. We request you not to proceed with proposal and instead install speed cameras on Main Road	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras.
QR004/29 (Erroll Road- Resident 4)	It has been brought to my attention that the Council are considering to install speed cushions along Main Road, Surely the number of speed cushions being proposed is an absolute farce for the local residents. The discomfort of using the number of cushions proposed could cause much wear and tear on owners of vehicles. A more sensible solution would be to install a number of pedestrian crossings along the length of Main Road or install speed cameras along the route. The speed cameras would also create revenue for other things, i.e potholes.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras. Further pedestrian crossing measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.
QR004/30 (Gidea Close - Resident)	We would like to make the following points regarding the proposals. (1) Most of the time in Main Road the ability to travel at more than 20mph is just a dream – the proposal would only be effective in the early morning and in the evening/night.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems. It would reduce vehicle speeds and accidents. If

	<p>(2) The number of cushions seems very excessive. We would have thought 4 plus the 2 zebra crossings would be more than adequate.</p> <p>(3) Putting that number of cushions down Main Road will encourage more westbound traffic to use the A12 and Heath Drive and Pettits Lane, exacerbating what is already becoming a problem with increasing traffic using Heath Drive.</p> <p>(4) It is becoming more apparent that humps/cushions are a source of damage to car suspension and it will probably not be long before there are cases of councils being sued for damages.+</p>	drivers drive at appropriate speeds, the cushions would not cause damage to the vehicles.
QR004/31 (Kingston Road - Resident)	I have just been informed of the proposed suggestion to place cushions on Main Road. First of all, we have not been notified of the proposed plan although this could impact on us when the traffic try to avoid the cushions and turn off Kingston Road. Secondly, when we suggested a few years ago about having a road hump just before the bend in Kingston Road we were informed that Havering do not intend to install any more road humps.	The Council normally consults the residents in the immediate vicinity of any proposals.
QR004/32 (Gilbert Road - Resident)	Whilst I accept that something needs to be done to slow the traffic down, as I have seen many near misses on this road, I do not think the solution being suggested is the one. The idea of ambulances having to bounce over speed humps with patients on board is unacceptable, The police station is also cited on the stretch of the road in question, again, the added issues of the police service seems to be an additional pressure on this already stretched service. My experience of speed humps is that drivers who want to go fast, simply slow down for the cushion and then race away. This does not slow the traffic down really. I would urge that consideration is given to average speed cameras which work very well in other locations.	Emergency service vehicles can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions. It is considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would reduce vehicles speeds and accidents. The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras.
QR004/33 (Sydenham Close - Resident)	<p>Myself and my wife wish to object to the above proposed scheme.</p> <p>(1) Over 5 years, only 1 fatality and 3 serious injuries suggest less than one serious accidents per year. The law of</p>	It is considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would reduce vehicles speeds and accidents.

		<p>averages is still likely to occur even after the new measures.</p> <p>(2) Putting in about 10 sets of humps and 2 humped crossings in such a small area is totally over the top.</p> <p>(3) Myself and my wife as well as many thousands of people who suffer from back and joint pain will only be made to suffer more damage to our joints every time we travel along main road.</p> <p>(4) Emergency vehicles will be delayed and patients in ambulances will suffer more discomfort and injuries.</p> <p>We would suggest if necessary erecting 2 speed cameras in strategic positions along that stretch of road would solve the issue with less disruption. Alternatively leave things as they are and save the money.</p>	<p>Emergency service vehicles can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions. The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras.</p>
QR004/34 (Havering Resident 2)	-	<p>This is a Main Road not some side road or rat run and it should remain a Major Road. Accidents will happen and they are exactly that 'accidents'. This is a Major Road already restricted with cycle lanes which if you study daily have very little use. Keep in mind the Police and Emergency Ambulance/Fire Engines are regularly speeding on a daily answering emergency calls. The flashing speed sign past Links Avenue works well and slows down traffic and perhaps Employing these with a 15/20 minute speed with camera may be a better idea to slow down traffic.</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed traffic calming measures would reduce vehicles speeds and accidents. Emergency service vehicles can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as their vehicles' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions. The existing 30mph vehicle activated sign alone would not reduce accidents along Main Road</p>
QR004/35 (Erroll Road Resident 5)	-	<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed improvements. Whilst it is commendable that you are wanting to reduce speeding on Main Road. The proposed measures will only put the problem elsewhere and I think that introducing traffic calming measures in Main Road alone would be short sighted approach from the Council which would move the problems of Main Road onto the side roads. May I add that one improvement on Main Road would be a mini roundabout at the top of Erroll Road</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. Mini roundabout proposal could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.</p>

	as it is extremely difficult to turn right from Main Road into Erroll Road, particularly if there is already a vehicle wanting to turn right from Main Road into Pettits Lane. It is also extremely difficult to go from Erroll Road directly onto Pettits Lane for the same reasons.	
QR004/36 (Havering Resident 3)	- I am concerned about the impact of traffic movements through the adjoining roads as a result of the changes. I have long been concerned about the use of Heath Drive and Parkway as cut through. I would ask the Committee to review the use of these 'side roads' after the changes to Main road have been made.	It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. Traffic calming measures for side roads could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available
QR004/37 (Havering Resident 4)	- We wish to object to the traffic calming proposals put forward for Main Road for the following reasons. (1) The simplest and the cheapest way to decrease driver speed in Main Road is to install speed cameras in line with the 30mph speed limit. (2) Placing additional pedestrian refuges at intervals along the road will help to calm traffic, reduce speeding, inappropriate overtaking and assist pedestrians. An additional crossing between Upper Brentwood Road and Balgore's would also be of benefit. (3) On such a major through route traffic humps will only be a nuisance to drivers and passengers. In particular they will be very uncomfortable for bus passengers. (4) There will be even more drivers using Erroll, Gilbert and Kingston Roads as cut through to avoid the bumps. These roads already suffer with drivers going too fast. Each of these roads should be changed to a 20mph zone. (5) I note the increased number of accidents at night and suggest that you increase the level of lighting along Main Road. (6) Installing such a high number of traffic humps and raised crossing areas will be costly.	The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras These measures would not reduce vehicle speeds and accidents but they will assist pedestrians. Buses can pass over the speed cushions without any discomfort as buses' wheel bases are wider than the width of the speed cushions. It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. Street lighting and further improvements could be considered at a later date when funding being available.

<p>QR004/38 (Chair of Romford Civic Society)</p>	<p>The society objects to this scheme on the following grounds. (1) It will increase air pollution in the area. (2) It will result in an increase in traffic diverting onto side roads, especially Kingston, Erroll and Gilbert Roads (3) There is no analysis of alternative options or of the efficacy of the proposed scheme as a means of achieving its stated goals (4) The scheme is not related to a transportation and traffic strategy for central Romford</p>	<p>With reference to pollution, no studies showed that `speed cushions cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions pollution. It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. The proposed traffic calming measures would be the best option in reducing vehicles speeds and accidents.</p>
<p>QR004/39 (Havering Resident 5)</p>	<p>- Yet another poor proposal by these agencies. Most of the time the average speed in this road is 15/20mph. These cushions may slow traffic, but would create even more pollution, Damage vehicles, create serious rat runs in neighbouring streets. You should consider speed cameras which would not only catch the speedsters but create revenue for the Council and consider extra pedestrian zebra type crossing.</p>	<p>With reference to pollution, no studies showed that `speed cushions cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions pollution. It is considered that the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads. The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.</p>
<p>QR004/40 (Havering Resident 6)</p>	<p>- I am writing to oppose the proposed plans for installation of speed cushions in Main Road. It will increase air pollution and encourage traffic to take short cuts along the side roads, such as Erroll Road, Gilbert Road and Kingston Road. The amount of traffic in these roads has already increased over the last few years</p>	<p>With reference to pollution, no studies showed that `speed cushions cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions pollution. It is considered that</p>

	<p>and this proposal will only make it worse. I am not opposed to slowing down or even reducing road traffic but feel the proposed plans may not be in the best interest of the local residents.</p> <p>As an alternative, the following options could be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Installation of a number of pelican crossings - Installation of speed cameras. 	<p>the proposed measures would not cause significant problems on the side roads.</p> <p>The Council is not responsible for the installation of speed cameras</p> <p>Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary and when funding being available.</p>
<p>QR004/41 (Mashiters resident)</p> <p>Walk</p>	<p>Thank you for opportunity to respond to this consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This consultation paper fails to demonstrate whether this particular piece of highway in Havering is the highest priority in terms of investment of this nature, nor whether this particular type of solution is the most effective at achieving the desired objectives. - There is no analysis to show the side effect of such a scheme in terms of the increase in pollution nor the impact on surrounding streets. - No evidence has been offered to demonstrate the efficacy and environmental impact of similar schemes - There is no evidence of a strategic approach to the future development of the road network within central Romford. - There is no evidence offered that would demonstrate this is good use the public purse. - Further work should be required by Members before considering any detailed proposal such as this. <p>No consideration is given to any other traffic calming measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of width restrictions and alternate flow measures - Use of average speed detection system - Use of speed sensitive traffic lights - Use of speed lights that encourage a lower traffic speed between traffic lights. 	<p>Not suitable for Main Road</p> <p>The council is not responsible for speed cameras. Speed sensitive light are not allowed. Speed lights</p>

		are not effective in reducing vehicle speeds.
QR004/42 (Gidea Park Primary School)	<p>Whilst I welcome any attempt to reduce the dangers to children and other road users, as a primary school that is situated on Main Road I am extremely concerned about the current levels of air pollution and the resulting increase in the levels due to the slower moving traffic should this scheme go ahead. The dangers of high air pollution are widely known and the potential for increased harm to the health of our children is significant. The Local Authority is currently monitoring the high levels of air pollution outside our school and we regularly receive air quality alerts from the GLA.</p> <p>The timing of any work that is due to be carried would also be a significant concern to the school as there is already ongoing roadworks on the A127 and this would impact on both pupils and staff arriving late for school.</p>	See Appendix 2 for detail comments regarding the pollution.
QR004/43 (Gidea Park and District Civic Society)	<p>It seems to us that many tables and cushions are wholly inappropriate on this road, where during the day the heavy traffic numbers make it largely impossible to travel at speed. As a safety measures for pedestrians, many of whom might be quite elderly, it might perhaps be helpful to have speed reducing tables on the existing zebra crossings. Otherwise we consider that much of the money would be better spent on other speed reducing measures; for example, in contributing to the funding of speed cameras which are by far the most effective way of getting motorists to drive more slowly.</p> <p>Presumably, the Ambulance Service has been consulted and also the Police and the London Fire Brigade, as they perhaps the most frequent users of this stretch of road. We suggest that the Ambulance Services would find the proposed measures a hindrance whenever they have a patient needing urgent hospital attention and/ or require a 'gentle' ride without encountering a concentrated series of road humps.</p>	Due to the level of objection, the humped zebra crossings and pedestrian refuge are recommended.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF CASUALTY TARGETS, CASUALTY REDUCTION, TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES AND THEIR EFFECT

1. PERCENTAGE OF CASUALTY REDUCTION

The following table shows the percentage of casualty reduction achieved on the implementation of Accident Reduction Programme schemes in recent years using vertical deflections such as humped crossings, speed tables and speed cushions.

SCHEME	IMPLEMENTATION DATE	PERCENTAGE CASUALTY REDUCTION
Mawney Road and White Hart Lane Between A12 and Collier Row Road	March 2012	77%
Hornchurch Town Centre (20mph zone)	June 2012	45%
Collier Row Lane Between Goring Road and Playfield Avenue	March 2014	60%
Crow Lane Whole length	March 2015	40%
Dagnam Park Drive Between Gooshays Drive and Chudleigh Road (20mph zone)	January 2016	100%
Rainham Road Between Ford Lane and Wood Lane	December 2016	50%

Please note that vertical deflections such as humped crossings, speed tables, speed cushions were used in all the above schemes to reduce accidents. The casualties are compared before and after implementation of the schemes.

2. TFL 2020 CASUALTY TARGETS

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 **Havering** Accident Reduction Programme, funded by Transport for London will help to meet these targets.

3. LONDON MAJOR'S VISION ZERO STRATEGY

The Major's Vision Zero Strategy aims to eliminate deaths and serious injuries on London's road and street network including **Havering** roads in the light of previous incidents. The Major's aim is for no-one to be killed in or by a London Bus by 2030 and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's road and street by 2041. The main targets are as follows:

- (a) 65% reduction in KSIs by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average
- (b) 70% reduction in KSIs by buses by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average
- (b) 70% reduction in KSIs by 2030 against 2010-2014 baseline average
- (d) 0 KSIs by 2041
- (e) 0 KSIs by buses by 2030

4. TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES IN UK AND THEIR EFFECT ON SPEED REDUCTION AND ACCIDENT REDUCTION

(a) TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES

The following 'Traffic calming techniques' are widely used in UK.

- (1) Vertical deflections include Road hump, speed table, speed cushions, rumble strips
- (2) Horizontal deflection include Chicanes
- (3) Road Narrowing
- (4) Central islands
- (5) Traffic calming at junctions includes changes in alignment, roundabout and mini roundabouts.
- (6) Gateway measures include different surface materials, traffic islands, 20/30mph road signs
- (7) Speed cameras and speed limit changes
- (8) Traffic management measures include road closures and one way streets

All the above traffic calming measures are not suitable for all the roads in **Havering**. The selected traffic calming measures are generally used depending on the road character and nature of achievement such as speed reduction and accident reduction.

(b) SPEED REDUCTION

Vertical deflections such as road humps, speed tables and speed cushions in the carriageway have a **greater impact on vehicle speeds** than any other measures. In order to achieve greater vehicle speeds reduction, the vertical deflections need to be placed close apart which may require greater funding.

(c) ACCIDENT REDUCTION

The impact of traffic calming schemes on accident levels is generally related to both the speed reducing effect of the scheme and any reduction in traffic levels as a consequence of it. Slower vehicle speeds in 20mph speed limit roads compared with 30mph or over speed limit roads, not only reduce the occurrence of the accidents, but also have a significant effect on their severity such as from fatal and serious injuries to slight injuries.