

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

| 7.30pm | Tuesday | Havering Town Hall |
|--------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | 19 October 2010 | Main Road, Romford |
| | | |

Members 9: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

| Conservative Group (5) | Residents' Group (2) | Labour Group (1) | Independent Residents' Group (1) |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Frederick Thompson (C) Billy Taylor (VC) Steven Kelly Lynden Thorpe Damian White | Linda Hawthorn John Mylod | Denis Breading | David Durant |

For information about the meeting please contact: Taiwo Adeoye (01708) 433079 e-mail taiwo.adeoye@havering.gov.uk

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF



AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (if any) - receive.

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to declare any interests in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting. Members may still declare an interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 September 2010, and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

- 5 **HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME** The Committee is requested to consider the 2 reports relating to work in progress and applications.
- 6 MEAD SCHOOL, AMERSHAM ROAD, HAROLD HILL Alterations to School Keep Clear Marking - Outcome of Public Consultation
- 7 **PARK LANE AREA PARKING REVIEW -** Outcome of questionnaire consultation
- 8 **HUBBARDS CLOSE Possible road closure or restriction -** Outcome of residents'/ statutory authorities consultation
- 9 **HILLFOOT ROAD Possible removal of width restriction** Outcome of residents'/ statutory authorities consultation
- 10 ST EDWARDS PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN AND PARKING REVIEW - Outcome of Public Consultation
- 11 SOUTH HORNCHURCH AND RAINHAM MINOR PARKING SCHEMES AND PARKING REVIEW - Outcome of Public Consultation

12 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ORDER – Amendment – Report attached

13 URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specified in the minutes, that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Philip Heady Democratic Services Manager

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Havering Town Hall 21 September 2010 (7.30pm – 11.00pm)

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

| Conservative Group | Frederick Thompson (in the Chair), Osman Dervish, Steven Kelly, Lynden Thorpe and Linda Trew |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Residents' Group | Linda Hawthorn and John Wood |
| Labour Group | Denis Breading (part of meeting) |
| Independent Local Residents' Group | David Durant |

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Billy Taylor (Osman Dervish substituted), Damian White (Linda Trew substituted) and John Mylod (John Wood substituted).

Councillors Mike Armstrong, Andrew Curtin, Brian Eagling, Linda Van den Hende, Wendy Brice-Thompson, Barry Tebbutt and Damian White were also present for part of the meeting.

There were about 40 members of the public present at the meeting.

All decisions were taken unanimously with no votes against unless shown otherwise.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

There were no declarations of interest.

20 MINUTES

The minutes of the Committee held on 17 August 2010 were voted on with no dissenting voices.

Following which Councillor Kelly was of the view that the minutes were incomplete as there was no detailed record of the decision relating to the Work Schedules.

The legal advisor explained several times that the schedules needed to come forward in report form with recommendations to that decision could be made on the report schedules. The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 August 2010 were then voted on again with the Chairman's agreement by a show of hands on this occasion and agreed as a correct record by four votes to two and signed by the Chairman, Councillors Breading and Kelly voting against with the following three Members abstaining from the vote Councillors Dervish, Trew and Wood.

21 HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee was advised by the legal advisor that because the decision making in respect of the schedules as already explained at the start of the meeting needed to be taken by reference to a report to the Committee that it would be preferable if the schedules were brought back in that form to the next available committee.

Councillor Steven Kelly was dissatisfied with this and said he did not accept the advice. The legal advisor said it was up to the committee to decide.

Councillor Kelly proposed a motion of no confidence on the Chairman on the basis that he proposed to accept the advice given.

There was no support for this motion.

Councillor withdrew this motion.

Councillor Kelly proposed a motion of no confidence in the legal advisor.

There was again no support for this motion.

The Committee **AGREED** to take this report at the next meeting.

22 HAVERING'S 2011/12 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP) FUNDING SUBMISSION

The Committee received a report that sought approval for the list of schemes proposed to be included in Havering's 2011/12 LIP Funding Submission.

Cabinet in July 2010 considered a report on this matter. The meeting approved the preparation of the LIP Submission for 2011 / 12. Cabinet also agreed to seek the advice of the Highways Advisory Committee before the submission was finalised. Cabinet delegated its approval to the Lead Members for Community Empowerment and Environment.

The report informed the Committee that the Council made an annual Local Implementation Plan Submission to Transport for London (TfL) for funding transportation initiatives across the Borough. It had to be consistent with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy aspirations and the Council's own Local Implementation Plan. TfL required all projects in LIP Submissions to conform to the Mayor of London's new Transport Strategy published in May 2010. They also had to accord with the Local Implementation Plans of boroughs which set out how they would address the Mayoral priorities at a local level and also set out longer term transportation strategies and policies.

Transport for London had awarded Havering an indicative LIP funding amount of £2.7m for 2011/12 for the 'Corridors and Neighbourhoods' and 'Smarter Travel' programme areas

During the debate, Members of the Committee were informed that there was no indication if the LIP funding amount would be reviewed due to the current economic situation.

The Committee were advised to approach the Lead Members for Community Empowerment and Environment to identify any scheme on the reserve list of Projects and Programmes outside those indicatively allocated 2011/12 LIP funding that they felt should be given a priority.

The Committee **NOTED** the draft 2011/12 LIP Funding Scheme submission as detailed in Appendices A and B of the report.

23 MERCURY HOUSE SHORT TERM PARKING FACILITIES

The Committee considered a report that outlined the results of the public consultation for the provision of short term parking facilities in the service road situated to the north-west of Mercury House and requested authorisation for implementation.

This followed complaints from traders, delivery drivers and visitors to Mercury House. Officers considered that a short term parking facility should be installed in the un-named service road situated to the north-west of Mercury House. This type of provision would help with the general servicing of Mercury House and would be of great benefit to staff, while dropping off or collecting items.

The Committee **AGREED** the following:

- 1. That having considered the representations made, the Committee recommended to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the short term parking bay detailed in the report be implemented
- 2. The Committee noted that the estimated cost of £1,500 for the scheme would be met from the 2009/10 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes

The voting for the item was 6 votes in favour to 1 absent. Councillor Trew was absent during the voting.

public consultation

The Committee received a report that set out work to review the parking regime in the Lake Rise and Rosemary Road area that had been ongoing since 2005.

Following the public consultation and statutory advertisement of a parking scheme in the Lake Rise and Rosemary Avenue area, the report set out background to the scheme, the responses to the consultation and gave options for further decision-making on the scheme.

The area was currently part of the Sector 5 review area of the Romford Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), which was in operation 8:30am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. The zone has no residents' permit bays, but did contain some free parking bays in Lake Rise/ Rosemary Avenue and some meter bays in Oaklands Avenue and the rear of the Town Hall.

The area currently restricted was the southern end of Lake Rise (Main Road end), the southern end of Pettits Lane South (Main Road end), the Western half of Wayside Close, Woodlands Road, the Western half of Rosemary Avenue, Sorrel Walk, Brockton Close and Sydenham Close. In addition, streets to the east of Pettits Lane south were within the scheme (Drawing QF210/RL/150).

The outcome of the consultation was reported to a joint meeting of the then Romford Area Committee and Gidea Park Area Committee in March 2009. The response by residents was that 86% of those responding were against the scheme. Several people gave suggestions as to how the scheme should be taken forward.

As a result, the joint Area Committee considered a number of options for taking the matter forward. The Committee agreed that a scheme should be taken forward to detailed design and consultation which was subject to the following constraints;

- A scheme to be in force from 10am to 11am, Monday to Friday,
- Residents' parking bays to be provided throughout the area where safe and practical to place, having regard for servicing and fire fighting,
- Junctions, bends etc would be restricted with double yellow lines,
- 14 to 42 Pettits Lane South (evens) would be included in the new area
- Wayside Close, Sorrell Walk and Sydenham Close would be excluded from the area based on a lack of concern expressed from these streets.
- Officers would draw up a scheme as set out above for the Head of StreetCare in consultation with the two Area Committee Chairmen and the Chairman of Regulatory Services to agree in principle for public consultation.
- The results of consultation would be brought back to another joint meeting of the Area Committees with any decision to be ratified by the Regulatory Services Committee.

• The scheme would operate in Brockton Close, Lake Rise, Parkland Avenue, Raphael Avenue, Rosemary Avenue and Woodlands Road.

The scheme was designed and approved for consultation by the two Area Committee Chairmen and the Chairman of the Regulatory Services Committee. The report outlined that about 400 letters and plans were hand-delivered to residents on or just after 15 December 2009 with the proposals also being advertised. The closing date for responses was 8 January 2010.

The report detailed that by the close of public consultation, 39 responses had been received. (10% response rate). Of those responding, 12 supported the scheme (31%), 15 objected to the scheme (38%, but some given anonymously) and 12 did not give a view, made non-related comments or requested a different scheme (31%).

There were some people who do not think enough bays were proposed and others of the view that there were too many (in terms of preventing two-way traffic flow). Some wanted a scheme to operate all day, some were content with the advertised times and some wanted different times (citing shift workers as being the issue).

There were some comments that the original scheme had pushed commuters into the unrestricted areas, although some others disagreed with this point. There was some indication that people were concerned that if a simple restriction was introduced, they would have no facility to park. Some concerns had been raised that the scheme would lead to an increase in dropped kerb applications which would remove further on-street provision.

In the officers' view a consensus within the area was difficult to achieve and any decision made would not be supported universally.

The principle of the original CPZ was to restrict an area around Romford town centre to prevent long-term non-residential parking. The inclusion of the free parking bays would have been to assist residents and visitors to find occasional parking from time to time.

The addresses of those responding to the current consultation did not give conclusive information of views being concentrated in a particular area.

That the physical layout of the current proposal does restrict two-way traffic flow over short sections with the parking bay layouts, but there was sufficient opportunity for traffic to pass each other and there are no locations where emergency and servicing vehicles would be unduly hindered. The design provided for the maximum amount of parking bays for the area.

Officers agreed that it was difficult to give the Committee clear advice on what recommendations should be made to take the scheme forward. It seemed that the Council would not be able to make a decision which satisfied all interested parties.

The report from officers proposed the following options for the Committee to consider:

- (i) Reject the current proposals, but introduce the double yellow lines on junctions and bends or
- (ii) Reject the scheme as advertised in the current proposals completely; or
- (iii) Implement the scheme as advertised in the current proposals or
- (iv) Implement the scheme as advertised in the current proposals within the area currently not restricted as set out on drawings
- (v) Propose a different scheme from that advertised in the current proposals.

Officers suggested that if one of the first two options was taken forward, then the Committee may recommend that the matter would not be reviewed for a particular length of time, such as 5 years. This would give certainty of decision to residents that the matter has been dealt with and would not be discussed again within a medium-term timeframe. Additionally, it would not require further costs (mainly staff time) in dealing with further consultations and debate in the medium term.

Staff recommended that restrictions at the junctions and the bends within the estate would be useful in assisting with traffic/pedestrians seeing and being seen when emerging from junctions and travelling around bends.

The implementation of the scheme as advertised would deal with the general weekday concerns of overspill parking, but would allow general parking to take place out of the restricted times and at weekends. There were concerns raised previously about the impact all day restrictions would have on park users wishing to park on-street.

Implementing the scheme as advertised, but only within the current unrestricted area, would deal with some of the overspill parking, not affect the operation of the current CPZ and be a self-contained scheme in terms of administration and enforcement.

In proposing a different scheme, officers outlined to the Committee that a scheme extending the current operation with residents' permit parking bays was not favoured by residents and a part time scheme had produced split views – a different option was likely to lead to similar split views or rejection.

Officers also suggested that despite some residents not being in favour of residents' permit parking bays (not feeling they were required or not accepting other people parking in front of their premises), if none are included within a scheme, then many residents would be disadvantaged as were unable to provide any more off-street parking.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by two residents who expressed their view in support of a scheme but with some alterations. With its agreement, Councillor Curtin addressed the Committee stating that he was only responding to feedback he had received from residents of Rosemary Avenue that there was a problem whilst resident at the other end at Lake Rise (Main Road end) felt that any proposal would make them worse off.

With its agreement, Councillor Tebbutt addressed the Committee stating that any parking restriction in the area would only push the problem to the Lodge Farm car park.

During the debate, Members of the Committee discussed issues relating to the proposed scheme and agreed to recommend the implementation of the yellow lines and that the matter would not be reviewed for 4 years.

The Committee also suggested that officers consider proposals to restrict the outside of the bend at Woodlands Road and consult on Brockton Close on being brought into the existing scheme at the southern end of Lake Rise.

The Committee having considered the representations, made the following **RECOMMENDATIONS** to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that both the following decisions be taken :

- 1. Introduce the double yellow lines on junctions and bends as set out on drawings QF210/RL/101 to QF210/RL/109;
- Implement the scheme as advertised in the current proposals within the area currently not restricted as set out on drawings QF210/RL/101 to QF210/RL/109 (current extents shown on Drawing QF210/RL/150);
- 3. That no review of the scheme be consider for a period of four years.

In addition, the Committee considered that the Head of Street Care should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement of the following:

- 1. Double yellow line restrictions of the outside of the bend at Woodlands Road for a distance of 15 metres.
- 2. Brockton Close on being brought into the existing scheme at the southern end of Lake Rise.

25 ELM PARK WALKABILITY – ROSEWOOD AVENUE AND CORONATION DRIVE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee received a report that recommended that a new uncontrolled pedestrian crossing be provided and five existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossings be upgraded in the Elm Park local centre.

The report outlined that in encouraging people to walk more, Transport for London had funded a 'Walkability' scheme for Elm Park with the intention of making pedestrian access improvements and removing barriers to walking within 500 metres/10 minutes walk from Elm Park Centre.

The reported indicated that pedestrian crossings of side roads were improved in St Nicholas Avenue and Maylands Avenue in 2009/10.

The existing pedestrian crossings would be improved and provided with tactile paving and kerbs to flush with the carriageway, realigned where necessary. The existing locations were at:

- Rosewood Avenue junction with St Andrews Avenue.
- Carnforth Gardens junction with St Andrews Avenue.
- Rosewood Avenue junction with Ambleside Avenue.
- Rosewood Avenue and Coronation Drive at roundabout.

The proposed location was at:

Rosewood Avenue outside no.1 Station Parade and children's nursery.

The existing crossing of Coronation Drive would require the removal of two mature lime trees. The removal of a mature highway tree required replacement with five new trees. The proposed locations for these were yet to be decided. Residents in the vicinity who had previously requested a tree would be offered one and further consultation with residents would take place in September. The planting season commenced in November.

In reply to a Members' concern on the removal of the lime tree, the Committee was informed that in its current position the tree was a hindrance.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** the following:

- 1. That the pedestrian crossing improvements, including the removal of two mature trees, as detailed in the report be implemented.
- That it be noted that the estimated cost of £15,000 including fees and tree replacement would be met from the 2010/11 allocation for Walking Improvements funded by Transport for London.

The voting for the report was 6 votes in favour to 1 against, Councillor Trew was absent during the voting. Councillor Hawthorn voted against the recommendation.

26 HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH – PARKING REVIEW - Results of public consultation

The Committee received a report that presented the views of those responding to a parking survey in the area to the south of Hornchurch Town Centre. It proposed an area and principles for a controlled parking zone and sought authority to design and advertise a detailed scheme.

The report stated that residents in streets to the south of Hornchurch Town Centre had raised concerns with officers and at Hornchurch Area Committee meetings about the level of long-term non residential parking and its effect on access and highway safety in the area.

It had been suggested that the parking was a combination of commuters parking to work in the town centre and shoppers visiting the area. In addition, some residents had also reported parking problems occurring in the evening where visitors to the Town Centre caused similar problems.

On 21 September 2009 the Chairman of the Hornchurch Area Committee signed Chairman's Decision Ref 09/159 giving staff authority to undertake a parking review in the area generally bounded by High Street, Abbs Cross Lane, Mill Park Avenue, Ravenscourt Grove (as far as its western junction with Ravenscourt Drive) and Devonshire Road. Approximately 1800 letters were hand delivered within the area on or just after 7 October 2009, with a questionnaire with a closing date of 11 December 2009 for completion.

By the close of consultation, 351 responses had been received (20% response rate). The responses were split for and against a scheme across the review area, residents closer to the Town Centre showed support for something to be done.

Officers noted that there were wide-support for double yellow lines on junctions, bends and where servicing was difficult. If restrictions were installed at these sites, then further pressure would be brought onto the areas closest to the Town Centre.

Those responding against a scheme had expressed the minimum intervention as opposed to those supporting a scheme who would like to see residents' bays, restrictions in force all day/ evening and Monday to Saturday.

The report informed the Committee that if a scheme was required closer to the Town Centre and assuming car park charges are to remain, staff suggested that the area shown would be most appropriate for a scheme. It would include the eastern end of Bruce Avenue and The Avenue, where views for a scheme were strongest.

Officers suggested that such a scheme would be in operation from 8am to 8pm, Monday to Saturday, with residents' bays. In addition, there were areas not impacting directly on residents where business permit bays and some onstreet pay-and-display bays could be provided to balance some of the problems businesses had highlighted.

The Committee was informed that if in agreement with officers' advice, then a detailed design would have to be prepared and residents/businesses

consulted along with public advertisement with a decision being made through the Highways Advisory Committee/Cabinet Member process.

During the debate, Members of the Committee discussed issues relating to the parking survey in the area. They considered that any parking restriction would have an effect on trade in Hornchurch. A member was of the opinion that the majority of residents were not in support of a scheme.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme.

The voting for the recommendation was 7 votes to 1 abstention. Councillor Thompson abstaining from the vote.

27 SUSPENSION OF COMMITTEE MEETING PROCEDURE RULES

During the discussion of items on the agenda, the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Committee Meeting Procedure Rule 8(b) to allow the conclusion of consideration of the remaining items on the agenda.

The voting for the suspension was 7 votes to 1. Councillor Steven Kelly voted against the motion.

Chairman 19 October 2010



5 REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

HIGHWAY SCHEMES Schemes Progress and Applications October 2010

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Principal Engineer 01708 433751 mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough[X]Excellence in education and learning[]Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity[X]Value and enhance the life of every individual[]High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax[]

SUMMARY

This report provides an update on highway schemes currently in progress. It also presents applications for new highway schemes for which the Committee will make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to either progress or the Committee will reject.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee notes the contents of Schedule 1 Highways Schemes Progress.
- 2. That the Committee considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement (where required) of the highway schemes applications set out in Schedule 2, Section A Scheme Proposals with Funding in Place.
- 3. That the Committee considers the highway schemes applications set out in Schedule 2, Section B General parking requests for prioritisation (LBH Revenue Budget) and for each application the Committee either;
 - (a) Considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement (where required) of the parking scheme; or
 - (b) Considers that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the parking scheme.
- 4. That the Committee considers the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the highway schemes applications set out in Schedule 2, Section C Scheme proposals without funding available.
- 5. That the Committee notes the contents of Schedule 2, Section D Scheme proposals on hold for future discussion.
- That the Committee reviews Schedule 3 Highway Schemes Applications (July and August 2010) and agrees that the schedule is a correct record of decisions, giving the following outcomes;
 - (a) AGREED the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement (where required) of the scheme; or
 - (b) REJECTED the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme; or
 - (c) DEFERRED the Head of StreetCare is requested to provide further information to the Committee.
- 7. That it be noted that any schemes taken forward to public consultation and advertisement (where required) will be subject to a further report to the

Committee and a decision by the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment if a recommendation for implementation is made.

- That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing each scheme is set out in the Schedules along with the funding source. In the case of Schedule 2, Section C - Scheme proposals without funding available, that it be noted that there is no funding available to progress the schemes.
- 9. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing each scheme set out in Schedule 3 is shown on the original application sheets for July 2010 and August 2010 which have been reproduced in Appendix I to this report.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Highways Advisory Committee receives all highway scheme requests, so that a decision will be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources are expended on detailed design and consultation.
- 1.2 Several schemes are funded through the Transport for London Local Implementation Programme and generally the full list of schemes will be presented to the Committee at the first meeting after Annual Council, although some items will be presented during the year as programmes develop.
- 1.3 There is also a Council revenue budget for Parking Schemes and so requests which can be funded in this way will be submitted to the Committee on a regular basis.
- 1.4 There is also a need for schemes funded by other parties or programmes (developments with planning consent for example) to be captured through this process.
- 1.5 Where any scheme is to be progressed, then the Head of StreetCare will proceed with the detailed design, consultation and public advertisement (where required). The outcome of consultations will then be reported to the Committee which will make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment. Where a scheme is not to be progressed, then the Head of StreetCare will not undertake further work.
- 1.6 In order to manage the workload, two schedules have been prepared. Schedule 1 will generally provide a monthly update to the HAC of schemes in progress, which will have had prior agreement from the Committee for the Head of StreetCare to proceed with detailed design and consultation. The Committee is not required to review this schedule line by line, although Staff

may point out matters which it is felt may be useful for Members to have highlighted.

- 1.7 Schedule 2 sets out applications for new schemes and is split as follows;
 - (i) Section A Scheme Proposals with Funding in Place. These are projects which are fully funded and it is recommended that the Head of StreetCare proceeds with detailed design and consultation.
 - (ii) Section B General parking requests for prioritisation (LBH Revenue Budget). These are requests which could be funded through the Council's revenue budget for Parking Schemes and the Committee is requested to recommend to the Head of StreetCare whether each request is taken forward to detailed design and consultation or not.
 - (iii) Section C Scheme proposals without funding available. These are requests for works to be undertaken where no funding from any source is identified. The recommendation of Staff to the Committee can only be one of rejection in the absence of funding. The Committee can ask that the request be held for future discussion should funding become available in the future.
 - (iv) Section D Scheme proposals on hold for future discussion. These are projects or requests where a decision is not yet required (because of timing issues) or the matter is being held pending further discussion should funding become available in the future.
- 1.8 Schedule 2 contains information on funding source, likely budget (as a selfcontained scheme), the request originator, date placed on the schedule and a contact point so that Staff may inform the person requesting the scheme the outcome of the Committee decision.
- 1.9 If a scheme from Schedule 2 is agreed for the Head of StreetCare to take forward, then it will be moved to Schedule 1 and updates given until the scheme is either completed on site or rejected following the detailed report to the Committee.
- 1.10 For this report only, Schedule 3 has been included which deals with the Committee views for requests submitted in July 2010 and August 2010. For this Schedule, the Committee is simply requested to agree that it represents a true record of the decisions previously agreed. The full request lists for both months is reproduced in Appendix I of this report, which contains the other details set out above.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of each request or project is set out in Schedule 2 for the Committee to note.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs to implement a scheme should it be ultimately implemented. It should be noted that further decisions are to be made following a full report to the Committee and with the Cabinet Member approval process being completed where a scheme is recommended for implementation.

Legal implications and risks:

Many aspects of highway schemes require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Where a scheme is selected to proceed, then such advertisement would take place and then be reported in detail to the Committee so that a recommendation may be made to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

With all requests considered through Schedule 2, a formal set of Recommendations and a record of the Committee decisions is required so that they stand up to scrutiny.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Decisions need to be made which are in accordance with various equalities considerations, the details of which will be reported in detail to the Committee so that a recommendation may be made to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Appendix I July 2010 and August 2010 Scheme Applications

London Borough of Havering

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

Highway Schemes Applications

Scheme Date CRM / Item Potential Likely Origin/ Requested/ Scheme Description Officer Advice Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on Contact from List Scheme proposals with funding in place for HAC approval in principle Unlawful rubber strip humps placed when development took place which Provision of 3 speed humps Developer need removal. Humps required to Mark S278 associated with original **Exchange Street** ensure traffic remains at low speed Philpotts 20.000 21/06/2010 1 Development Romford Brewery Highways approaching uncontrolled pedestrian StreetCare development Act 1980 crossing points at Brewery Walk and ArcadePlace Union Road Developer Proposals associated with new S38 (former Double Yellow Line David Ballm development require public/ statutory 2 2,500 Development 21/06/2010 StreetCare Oldchurch restrictions and 20mph Zone Highways advertisement Hospital) Act 1980 Local parking review for iunction restrictions, bend Review would support discharge of Mark LBH Gidea Park 3 restrictions and updating of Planning Consent for school Philpotts 2,500 Development 21/06/2010 School Education School Keep Clear development site StreetCare restrictions Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend Review would support discharge of Mark LBH Hylands School Planning Consent for school 4 restrictions and updating of 2,500 Development 21/06/2010 Philpotts Education School Keep Clear development site StreetCare restrictions

Highways Advisory Committee

July 2010

| 5 | Ayloff School | Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions | Review would support discharge of Planning Consent for school development site | LBH Education | 2,500 | Development | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
|-----|--|--|---|------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|------------|---|
| 6 | Clydesdale Road, additional parking places | Provision of net increase of 4 parking places in street and improvements to cycle route dropped kerbs | Proposals would remove area of underused open paved area to the advantage of additional parking spaces and a better cycle route access from Park Lane. | LBH Revenue/ TfL LIP | 20,000 | Residents | 24/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 7 | Hillfoot Road Width Restriction | Resident Questionnaire to determine whether or not to physical width restriction keep restriction | Can fund questionaire through general staff time costs, no funding identified for works. Followed report to North Romford AC of 31st March 2009 which advised against removal. AC wanted review and Head of StreetCare agreed to fund review. | LBH Head of StreetCare | 1,000 | North Romford AC | 31/03/2009 | Chairman North Romford Area Committee |
| 8 | Upper Rainham Road/ Elm Park Avenue | Yellow Box on Upper Rainham Road - Rainham- bound side | Will assist with right turning at peak times where junction locks up with traffic queues | LBH Revenue | 1,200 | Cllr Morgon | 29/06/2010 | Cllr Morgon |
| 9 | Suttons Lane | Pedestrian refuge to access shops, near Randall Drive | Scheme feasible and funded | LBH Area Committee | 8,000 | Hornchurch AC | 29/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 10 | Suttons Lane | Minor kerb and parking bay adjustments at junction with Standen Avenue | Required to improve visibility at junction following scheme review | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Hornchurch AC | 29/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| Gen | eral parking req | uests for HAC prioritisat | ion (LBH Revenue Budget) | | | | | |
| 11 | Hornchurch Town Centre | Review of parking by Station and P&D by shops building on Town Centre South scheme. | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnaire to local area with results reported back to future HAC | LBH Revenue | 4,000 | Hornchurch Area Committee | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |

| 12 | Victoria Road, Romford | Review Parking within Ring Road to provide Pay-and- Display parking. | HAC requested for approval in principal for public consultation/ statutory advert with results reported back to future HAC | LBH Revenue | 3,500 | Victoria Road Businesses | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
|----|--|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|------------|---------------------------------|
| 13 | Coach drop off facilities, Romford | Review to find locations at low cost suitable for coach drop off. | Sites identified, to be consulted with results reported to HAC for decisions | LBH Revenue/ S106 Liberty | 8,000 (plus £50k) | Coach operators and trade body | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 14 | Goodrington School, Walden Road | School Keep Clear restrictions by school gate and "banjo" area | Will assist in keeping area clear where vehicles and pedestrians are moving | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | School | 23/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 15 | Bower Park School, Havering Road | Review extent and times of operation of School Keep Clear zig-zags | School opening times have changed and so restrictions need updating. | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | School | 23/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 16 | Pinewood Road, Collier Row | Review parking restrictions at junction of Clockhouse Lane/ St John's Road and new school pedestrian access - double yellow lines and School Keep Clears | Will support recent School Travel Plan improvement of new pedestrian gate. | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | School | 25/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 17 | Marshalls Park Area | Review and introduce double yellow lines at junctions and bends within estate area; New and updated School Keep Clear restrictions outside St Edward's Primary School; review and convert meter bays to bay and display bays in Park End Road and Havering Drive | Will support other improvements planned for School Travel Scheme, keep junctions and bends clear for pedestrian and vehicle visibility; and increase and simplify on-street paid parking bays. | LBH Revenue | 8,000 | School and Residents | 24/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |

| 18 | Rainham Village Parking Review | Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well - commence work with local parking questionnaire. Review likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme. | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnaire to local area with results reported back to future HAC | LBH Revenue | 8,000 | Viking Way Extension | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|--|----------------|-------|--|------------|---------------------------------|
| 19 | Motorcycle Parking | Request for "hoops" to be placed within M/C bays to assist with M/C security and more on-street provision in town centres. | Would certainly help M/C users secure their M/Cs - costs to be researched. M/C use is growing in London and Havering has not provided new parking places for some time. | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 25/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 20 | Park Lane area | Various requests for residents' parking in streets without, school crossing patrol being blocked, parking on junctions and approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road. | Various issues in the area, would be useful to undertake a parking review questionnaire and look at the issues as a whole before any schemes are taken forward. | LBH Revenue | 2,000 | Residents, local councillors, Road Safety Unit | 29/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 21 | Roneo Corner Shops | Parking bay for shops in lay- by 10 to 18 | Part of the lay-by is used for buses, but the rest is restricted. Potential scope for short term parking and loading bay, would need discussion with shop keepers | LBH Revenue | 4,000 | Shop Keepers | 29/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 22 | Osborne Road | Review parking controls for afternoon operation at Brentwood Road end because of obstructive parent parking | Will help keep area clear at school times | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Residents, Cllr Galpin | 29/06/2010 | Cllr Galpin |
| 23 | Albany Road | Parking both sides of the road is restricting approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road | Single line working only currently available and some restrictions may help | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Cllr Galpin | 29/06/2010 | Cllr Galpin |

| 24 | Airfield Way/ Northolt Way | Double yellow lines at junction extending into Northolt Way to keep entrance to area and Tesco service yard accessible | Will help keep access clear | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 29/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
|------|---|---|--|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 25 | Hartland Road and Broadstone Road | Footway parking scheme, where footways have been reconstructed | Subject to being assessed and designed, a scheme will help with access through area | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Cllr Galpin | 01/07/2010 | Cllr Galpin |
| 26 | Rainham Interchange & Library Development | Loading bays, disabled persons bays, bus stop clearways/ buses only route and general waiting restrictions to support Rainham Interchange project | Changes required in order to make operation of Interchange and Library work in the context of bus routeing and servicing. Work needs to be underway around April 2012 | TfL LIP/ LBH | 5,000 | LBH Regen. | 17/03/2010 | Regeneration |
| Sche | eme proposals | without funding available | for HAC to consider and decide | e a course | of action | | | |
| 27 | Hubbards Close prevention of through traffic from A127 | Restriction to prevent traffic driving through Hubbards Close from Hubbards Chase which is often an issue when A127 is busy | Options appraisal and feasibility study. Discussions would be required with residents of Hubbards Close and Hubbards Chase as well as Transport for London and emergency services about what is felt to be the best solution as A127 will be impacted. | TBC | 5,000 | Cllr Ramsey | 21/06/2010 | Cllr Ramsey |
| 28 | Marshalls Park Area | Additional speed humps or speed cushions plus a speed table in Parkside Avenue, Seymer Road, Dorset Avenue, Marshalls Drive and Park Drive roads to improve speed reduction within existing 20mph Zone | Scheme generally already successful in reducing casualties and traffic speeds, but speeds may be further reduced. | TBC | £75,000 to £125,000 | Gidea Park Area Committee | 30/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |

| 29 | Wincanton Road, Harold Hill - Road widening | Request from care home that road be widened to better accommodate traffic. Concern about emergency access for residents of home and that large vehicles have to drive on verge. | Road is less than 4 metres where nos 44 to 48 are served, ending in turning head. Road widening generally feasible, but care home is also next to Tees Drive which is wide enough for emergency use. No budget available for new build. | TBC | 30,000 | Clover Cottage Care Home | 08/06/2010 | 952644 |
|----|---|---|---|-----|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| 30 | Frederick Road, Rainham - Further speed humps | Additional speed humps in street with suggestion that this would have bus route removed from street | Speed tables installed in 2009/10 as part of a wider 20mph scheme. Tables selected to be compatible with buses, but further humps or tables would impact on bus operations. | TBC | ТВС | Resident | 15/06/2010 | 949656 |
| 31 | Shephards Hill - Signal-controlled pedestrian crossing | Provision of signal-controlled crossing outside 79 - 83 | Would serve 11 properties and bus stop if relocated. No reported pedestrian casualty issues. Potential for a pedestrian refuge looked at previously - would need road widening and budget of around £19k. | TBC | 70,000 | Cllr Eagling | 28/06/2010 | Cllr Eagling |
| 32 | Harold Court Road and Church Road | 20mph signs | 20mph signs not permitted unless with a traffic order. 20mph limit requires actual speeds of 24mph or below. 20mph zones requires self- enforcing traffic calming. Unusual to look at single roads less than 500m, normally applied to areas with casualty problems and none in the area. | TBC | 50,000 to 120,000 | Cllr Eagling | 28/06/2010 | Cllr Eagling |
| 33 | Swindon Lane, Harold Hill | Road humps | Not a concern from a casualty- reduction point of view and any scheme would have to include Redruth Road and Redcar Road | TBC | 60,000 | Resident | 30/06/2010 | 957084 |
| | | | | | | | | |

London Borough of Havering

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

Highway Schemes Applications

Scheme Date CRM/ Item Potential Likelv Origin/ Requested/ Description Officer Advice Scheme Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on Contact from List Scheme proposals with funding in place for HAC approval in principle Right turn lane on advance to Oldchurch Rise and bus stop Will assist with lane discipline and bus LBH 1 Oldcurch Road 1,000 **Cllr** Osborne 12/07/2010 Cllr Osborne clearway to replace stop accessibility Revenue redundant bus lane Concerns with traffic speed on and leaving roundabout towards Rainham Dagenham Road approach Road/ Castle Avenue junction. to roundabout - mask Review has shown that there is too South LBH Area Nicola Childs visibility to the right for up much visibility for traffic approaching Hornchurch Committee 2,000 04/08/2010 LBH 2 Newton's Corner until the last 15 metres to from Dagenham Road and so entry & Rainham Capital StreetCare reduce speed of traffic speeds to roundabout are high. AC Visibility can be reduced up until the entering roundabout final 15 metres in accordance with roundabout design standards Proposals associated with new David Ballm 20mph Zone as a result of 3 **Riverside Close** development require public/ statutory Developer 1,000 David Ballm 03/08/2010 LBH the new development advertisement StreetCare Proposals associated with new David Ballm 20mph Zone as a result of Kidman Close LBH 4 development require public/ statutory Developer 1,000 David Ballm 03/08/2010 the new development advertisement StreetCare

Highways Advisory Committee

August 2010

| Gen | eral parking req | uests for HAC prioritisat | ion (LBH Revenue Budget) | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|----------------|-------|------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| 5 | Harkness Close | Restrict turning head and bin store | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on- street parking | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Management Company/ Resident | 12/07/2010 | File |
| 6 | Heaton Close | Restrict parking to one side for access | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on- street parking | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 12/07/2010 | 769864 |
| 7 | Petersfield Avenue/ Redruth Road | Extended junction protection and bend protection to assist London Buses | Would help bus access, but remove on-street parking | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | London Buses | 12/07/2010 | File |
| 8 | Wrexham Road/ Woodbridge Lane | Extended junction protection and removal of footway parking opposite junction to assist with servicing | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on- street parking, would reduce damage to verge. | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 27/07/2010 | File |
| 9 | North Hill Drive | Remove part time restrictions associated with former school crossing patrol | Should be removed, subject to no objections being raised | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 27/07/2010 | File |
| 10 | Tees Drive | Remove footway bay and restrict junction with Priory Road | Would help with emergent visibility from Priory Road | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 11 | Hilldene Avenue | Remove footway bay within 10m of junction with Newbury Road | Would help with emergent visibility from Newbury Road | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 12 | Castle Close | Turning head restrictions | Would help servicing and reduce obstructive parking on shared surface | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 13 | Straight Road/ Heaton Avenue | Review parking restrictions at junction to keep visibility clear | Would help with visibility and access to Heaton Avenue, would need to link up with Bus Stop which needs Clearway | LBH Revenue | TBC | Surgery | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 14 | Fairford Way | Request for residents' parking scheme to stop commuters | Near 174, 496 and 498 bus routes - perhaps a local parking survey is required first to gauge extent of problem | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | 744008 |

| 15 | Petersfield Avenue/ Dagnam Park Drive | Extended junction protection | Emergent visibility poor to the right (from DPD) and restrictions will improve situation, but may cause pressure on parking for nearby maisonettes | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
|----|--|--|---|----------------|-------|----------|------------|--------|
| 16 | Ashton Road estate | Various issues with access through estate, parking near junctions etc | Possible parking questionnaire with businesses before any proposals are designed | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Business | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 17 | St Neots Road area | Commuter parking causing access and parking problems | Near 256 bus route and walking distance to Harold Wood - perhaps a local parking survey is required first to gauge extent of problem | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 18 | Saddleworth Road | Residents of new houses and flats blocking servicing access | Could restrict one side of street, but would reduce available parking spaces | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 19 | Chippenham Road | Residents' parking scheme | Hilldene Regeneration scheme is increasing parking in area which may help | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 20 | Taunton Road (stub) | Restrict turning head | Will help servicing access and access to dropped kerbs | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 21 | Chestnut Glen | Concern about emergency access | Many residents have dropped kerbs so footway parking not feasible and so restrictions on one side of the street would be required and in our view would not be popular, issue not raised by emergency services | LBH Revenue | твс | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 22 | Osborne Road/ Lynhurst Drive | Extended junction protection to stop parking on both sides by shops | Will assist with access at junction | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | 890436 |
| 23 | Rockingham Avenue | Extended junction protection opposite Osborne Road end of street to stop people parking in Rockingham Avenue | Junction and bend would be justified for restrictions, but restrictions opposite first few houses may push problem elsewhere | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |

| 24 | Grenfell Avenue and estate | Residents' parking survey | Questionnaire will see the extent of any parking issues | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Cllr Galpin | 13/07/2010 | Cllr Galpin |
|----|---|---|---|----------------|-------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 25 | Eyhurst Avenue/ Ambleside Avenue etc and area | Residents' parking survey following complaints of people not wishing to pay for car park | Questionnaire will see the extent of any parking issues | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 26 | Elm Park Avenue, Suttons Lane end | Extended junction protection | Will help bus access, may displace residents parking | LBH Revenue | 500 | Street Leader | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 27 | The Broadway | Drop off bay for disabled people | Will help interchange with station | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 28 | Service Road to Towers School (off Osborne Road) | Junction protection and day- time restriction assist school access | Will keep access to school clear | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | School | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 29 | Ravensborne Crescent/ Coombe Road | Request for additional residents' parking bays within existing CPZ | Where there is space, bays can be provided | LBH Revenue | TBC | Residents | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 30 | Athelstan Road | Request for additional residents' parking bays within existing CPZ | Where there is space, bays can be provided | LBH Revenue | TBC | Residents | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 31 | Faringdon Avenue/ Ashton Road | Extended junction protection into Faringdon Avenue | Will help with visibility at junction | LBH Revenue | 500 | Cllr Light | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 32 | Parkstone Avenue | Extend restrictions back from Butts Green Road as resident does not like parking in front of house | Would push problem further into Parkstone Avenue | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | 911524 |
| 33 | Wingletye Lane at A127 | Complaints about parking associated with Campion Road, Grassmere Road, Wilstshire Avenue up to Essex Road etc | Controls may displace parking into wider area, but access to and from A127 difficult at peak school times - possibly undertake questionnaire first | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 34 | Cornflower Way | Restrictions required at Fire Gate at Sackville Crescent | Would keep area clear for emergency access and cyclists | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |

| | | end | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----------------|-------|----------|------------|------|
| 35 | Woodhall Crescent/ Halcyon Way/ Wingletye Lane | Extend part time restrictions further into street where commuters are parking/ people avoiding car park charges. Chip shop attracting parking on junctions | May displace problems | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 36 | Bryant Avenue/ Ewan Road | Extended junction protection to help with visibility from Ewan Road. Complaints between businesses causing each other obstruction | Recommend review Bryant Avenue as one scheme, especially as Tesco is to building a new access to Bryant Avenue and other problems are noted with access to premises and visibility. | LBH Revenue | ТВС | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 37 | Birch Crescent | Complaints about obstructive parking and emergency access | Restrictions would deal with issue but remove a great deal of parking capacity. Emergency Services have not raised as an urgent issue but do have access problems from time to time | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 38 | Butts Green Road | Request for Bus Stop Clearway just north of Burntwood Avenue (Hornchurch-bound) to deal with obstructive parking | Flats in the area can cause problems for bus access at stop, would be worth adjusting kerb to 140mm at same time | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 39 | Sussex Avenue | Footway Parking | Many dropped kerbs, but some limited provision will be possible, subject to ensuring appropriate emergency vehicle/ servicing access is maintained. Area within CPZ, so Parking bays residents' bays may assist | LBH Revenue | 4,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |

| 40 | Butts Green Road | Parking review between Slewins Lane and Burntwood Road | Flats in area may be causing access issues to dropped kerbs etc | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Cllr Rochford | 13/07/2010 | Cllr Rochford |
|----|--|--|--|----------------|-------|---------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 41 | Market Link and The Mews area | Review parking restrictions and parking bays for access into Market Place and The Mews etc | Great deal of history with unauthorised occupation of Public Highway, but review required for servicing and emergency access | LBH Revenue | 6,000 | Businesses | 27/07/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 42 | Brentwood Road/ Hazelmere Gardens | Junction protection extending into Hazelmere Gardens. Parking problems associated with businesses | Will keep access clear, but may displace parking further into Hazelmere Gardens | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 43 | Phillida Road | Footway Parking | Some can be provided | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | File |
| 44 | Bridge Close | Upgrade the parking controls from 8am to 8pm, to at any time (double yellow lines) to deal with parking problems alleged to be attributable to the Islamic Centre | Blue badge holders may park on single and double yellow lines for up to 3 hours as long as there is no loading ban in force. | LBH Revenue | 1,200 | Resident | 19/07/2010 | Cllr Thompson |
| 45 | Brooklands Road | More residents' parking bays | Subject to review of HGV access to Medora Road, request is feasible | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 14/07/2010 | 961334 |
| 46 | Abbs Cross Lane | Double yellow line parking restrictions through recently constructed pedestrian refuge by school where vans and parking causing an obstruction | Refuge installed with "T-bar" markings indicating area to keep clear so vehicles can pass refuge, but approach has failed as markings are being ignored. Therefore double yellow lines are only solution. | LBH Revenue | 600 | Cllr Morgon | 21/07/2010 | Cllr Morgon |
| 47 | Hacton Primary School | Request for School Keep Clear restrictions at schools accesses (Goodwood Avenue, Plumpton Avenue and Central Drive) | If locations meet criteria then request feasible. | LBH Revenue | 2,000 | School | 27/07/2010 | 967268 |

| Sche | eme proposals | without funding available | e for HAC to consider and decide | e a course | of action | | | |
|------|---|---|--|------------|--------------------------|----------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 48 | Firbank Road | Request to control traffic speeds, citing humps elsewhere | Street is a bus route and humps would not be suitable (speed cushions or tables more appropriate) - does not consider Cornell Way and St John's Road which are on same straight route. | | £25,000 to £75,000 | Resident | 02/07/2010 | 957052 |
| 49 | Brentwood Road (Lawrence Road to Lytton road) | Drivers speeding, schools close by - traffic calming should be provided | Casualty-reduction scheme undertaken in 2008-09. Works included a pedestrian refuge on this section of road and full upgrade of the zebra crossing outside the school. Other measures not considered necessary, but next step would be speed cushions (as is a bus route), but not on forward plan. Would not necessarily traffic calm such a short section. | | 30,000 | Resident | 08/07/2010 | 960894 |
| 50 | Whitchurch Road Shops - Parking Lay by | Request to widen lay-by to allow proper parking of vehicles "nose in" rather than the current overhanging as is now the case. | Current use of lay by presents safety risk to highway users. Nose in would require land take from Homes in Havering for conversion to carriageway, but would still have vehicles reversing from between other parked vehicles. Restricted time parallel parking would be safer and provide turn-over of spaces. | | TBC | Resident | 12/07/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
| 51 | Hyland Way | Request for traffic calming | may have impact on other un- calmed streets in area | | 35,000 | Resident | 12/07/2010 | 960872 |

| 52 | Kettering Road | Convert highway verge to parking bays (12 nr) nose in | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | 60,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | HH File |
|----|---------------------|--|--|--------|----------|------------|-------------|
| 53 | Newbury Walk | Convert highway verge to parking bays (5 nr) nose in | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | 16,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | HH File |
| 54 | Charlbury Close | Convert highway verge to parking bays (4 nr) parallel | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | 15,000 | Resident | 13/07/2010 | HH File |
| 55 | Belgrave Avenue | Request to deal with speed and amount of traffic using street | One slight injury at Montrose Avenue junction, right turning goods vehicle. | 30,000 | Resident | 16/07/2010 | 964434 |
| 56 | Glanville Drive | Request for a review and analysis of traffic "rat running" through street to avoid Hornchurch and Doggets Corner | No casualty problem in street. No data available for extent of any problems in street. Any scheme would need to include Maywin Drive | 20,000 | Resident | 26/07/2010 | Cllr Mylod |
| 57 | Kingsley Gardens | Concerns with rat-running and traffic congestion | No casualty problem in street, works may put further pressure on Squirrels Heath Lane/ Ardleigh Green Road | 20,000 | Resident | 22/07/2010 | Cllr Thorpe |
| 58 | Ardleigh Close | Provision of pedestrian refuge near Ardleigh Green Road junction | Junction used by commercial traffic, so refuge would have to be set back into junction. Would help pedestrians willing to divert from desire line. | 8,000 | Resident | 22/07/2010 | 964306 |

| 59 | Bevan Way | Lane end to bus stop, including measures to keep route clear from parked vehicles and dropped kerbs | Officers have look to see if any StreetCare budgets are available, but there are none. Scheme would be helpful to bus users. | 8,0 | 00 | Resident | 22/07/2010 | Cllr Dodin |
|----|-----------------|---|---|-----|----|-------------|------------|--------------|
| 60 | Suttons Gardens | Speed Hump halfway down street to reduce speeding | No casualty problem in street although junctions have has some issues (not speed related). | 3,0 | 00 | Cllr Morgon | 26/07/2010 | Cllr Morgon |
| 61 | Cedar Road | Complaints from residents about vans rat-running between Mawney Road and North Street. | Considered weight limit, but would not prevent vans (too light). Width restriction would be possible at Cedar Close and may be more effective. In both options, changes would be needed at the junction of North Street/ Cedar Road to allow HGVs to turn to access industrial area at Chesham Close. Parking controls would also be needed to assist HGVs. North Street/ Main Road corridor scheme will look at more detail of costs. | ТВ | вС | Residents | 04/08/2010 | Cllr Tebbutt |
| 62 | Park Drive | Request to remove refuge to east of Brackendale Gardens and place to west. Resident does not feel is serves pedestrians well. | Would require speed cushions to be relocated as well. Scheme installed following public consultation and felt useful to the community as a whole. Casualty rate has improved in street following wider scheme. Resident objected to original scheme from 2007/08. | 9,0 | 00 | Resident | 27/07/2010 | 972190 |

| 63 | Rainham Village Parking Review | Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well - commence work with local parking questionnaire. Review likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme. | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnaire to local area with results reported back to future HAC | LBH Revenue | 8,000 | Viking Way Extension | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts StreetCare |
|----|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 64 | Rainham Interchange & Library Development | Loading bays, disabled persons bays, bus stop clearways/ buses only route and general waiting restrictions to support Rainham Interchange project | Changes required in order to make operation of Interchange and Library work in the context of bus routeing and servicing. Work needs to be underway around April 2012 | TfL LIP/ LBH | 5,000 | LBH Regen. | 17/03/2010 | Regeneration |
Scheme

Item

Ref

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 1 - Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

Objective/ Theme

Funding Ends Budget Notes

| | Bus Stop Acessibility. Route 248 Corridor | Bus Stop Accessibilty | Design work in progress | RP | TfL LIP | Mar-11 | 50,000 | Upgrades to existing bus stops and relocating to better places where possible |
|---------|--|--|---|----|-------------------------|--------|--------|--|
| QG068 | Station Road, Upminster - Puffin to Toucan Crossing conversion | | Previously approved via Upminster Area Committee | RP | S106 | TBC | 40,000 | Scheme with Transport for London Signals, awaiting feedback and signals slot confirmation |
| твс | Homenuren Town Centre | Review of parking by Station and P&D by shops building on Town Centre South scheme. | Questionnaire consultation imminent | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | твс | |
| QJ067 | Victoria Road, Romford | Review Parking within Ring Road to provide Pay- and-Display parking. | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | 9,000 | Cost includes 2 pay-and-display machines (report to HAC November 2010) |
| QJ068 | Coach drop off facilities, Romford | Review to find locations at low cost suitable for coach drop off. | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue/ S106 | N/A | 58,000 | Costs include £50k S106 from Swan Walk development |
| (J.IUb9 | Bower Park School, Havering | Review extent and times of operation of School Keep Clear zig-zags | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | Report to HAC November 2010 |
| | | | | - | - ' | | | |

Staff Lead Funder

Current Status

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 1 - Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\1 - Highway Schemes Progress.xlsOctober2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Objective/ Theme | Current Status | Staff Lead | Funder | Funding Ends | Budget | Notes |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|
| QJ070 | Pinewood Road, Collier Row | Review parking restrictions at junction of Clockhouse Lane/ St John's Road and new school pedestrian access - double yellow lines and School Keep Clears | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | October HAC report |
| TBC | Roneo Corner Shops | Parking bay for shops in lay-by 10 to 18 | Review in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| TBC | Osborne Road | Review parking controls for afternoon operation at Brentwood Road end because of obstructive parent parking | Consultation | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ071 | Albany Road | Parking both sides of the road is restricting approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road | Consultation | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ072 | Hartland Road and Broadstone Road | Footway parking scheme, where footways have been reconstructed | Consulation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ073 | Fairford Way | parking issues | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ074 | Grenfell Avenue and estate | Residents' survey into parking issues | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 1 - Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

| Item Ref | Scheme | Objective/ Theme | Current Status | Staff Lead | Funder | Funding Ends | Budget | Notes |
|-------------|---|---|--|------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------|---|
| QJ075 | Eyhurst Avenue/ Ambleside Avenue and area | Residents' survey into parking issues | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ076 | Ravensborne Crescent/ Coombe Road | Additional residents' parking bays | Design work in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | | |
| QJ077 | Bridge Close, Romford | Upgrade existing part time restrictions to double yellow lines for the whole street | Consultation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | 1,200 | |
| QJ078 | Brooklands Road | Additional residents' parking bays | Design work in progress | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | 1,500 | Subject to HGV access to Medora Road |
| QJ033 | Clydesdale Road, additional parking places | Provision of net increase of 4 parking places in street and improvements to cycle route dropped kerbs | Consulation in progress | RP | LBH Revenue/ TfL LIP | Mar-11 | 20,000 | Maximum costs, subject to refinement. October HAC |
| QJ050 | Upper Rainham Road/ Elm Park Avenue | Yellow Box on Upper Rainham Road - Rainham- bound side | Report planned to HAC in October 2010 | RP | LBH Revenue | N/A | 1,500 | Met. Police have no issues with scheme. |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

Scheme Date Likely Origin/ Item Potential Requested/ Description Scheme Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List SECTION A - Scheme proposals with funding in place Lister Avenue (part) 20mph Zone as a result of the Proposals associated with new David Ballm LBH and Nightingale development require public/ statutory 06/08/2010 1 Developer 1.000 David Ballm new development StreetCare Crescent advertisement Would require consultation with London Buses, but feasible. New site would LBH remove footway parking and require a bus Revenue Relocate first Elm Park-bus stop Bus Stop, Elm Park stop clearway to be fully accessible. [for 2 2,000 45m west to allow resident to 942454 Resident 06/08/2010 Avenue Current site not accessible and so a move Clearway at apply for a dropped kerb would assist bus passengers. Lamp alternative column would have to be moved and so location] would be at resident's cost. Proposals for upgrade of existing pedestrian refuge near Queen's Crossing improvements identified as part Theatre Car Park, new Billet Lane & North LBH Head of Mark Philpotts 27/09/2010 3 pedestrian refuge outside of wider study for Hornchurch Cultural TfL LIP 40,000 Regeneration LBH StreetCare Street, Hornchurch Fairkytes (both Billet Lane) and a Quarter. new zebra crossing on North Street near Queen's Theatre.

Highways Advisory Committee

October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|--|--|---|--|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | Squirrels Heath Road, Gidea Park | Mini-roundabout at junction with Northumberland Avenue to slow traffic in advance of humped zebra crossing which resident is unhappy with in terms of causing disturbance following earlier scheme | Officers do not feel a mini-roundabout would be appropriate in design terms. This case relates back to previous scheme and to reduce speed on this section of road, additional speed tables could be provided (one each side of crossing location) through TfL Minor Improvements funding. | TfL LIP | 15,000 | Resident | 13/09/2010 | 965850 |
| 5 | Pettits Lane North - opposite Fire Station | Relocate first Chase Cross bound bus stop approximately 70 metres north. | Current bus stop is just before approach zig-zags to zebra crossing and not considered desirable by Officers in terms of traffic overtaking a stationary bus and pedestrians being masked on crossing. Alternative location would require removal of footway parking bays and a bus stop clearway, but supported on safety grounds by Officers. | LBH Revenue [for footway bay removal and Clearway provision] | | Met. Police Traffic Unit and London Buses | 03/09/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| SECT | ION B - General | parking requests for prior | itisation (LBH Revenue Budget) | | | | | |
| 6 | Little Gaynes Lane | Request for parking controls to deal with on-street parking related to doctor's surgery and access being blocked. | Feasible, but may move problem elsewhere. Might be useful to undertake localised residents' parking survey to gauge extent of problem | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 27/09/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

Highways Advisory Committee

October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | Central Drive, Hornchurch | bays following resurfacing. | Bays were in place before surfacing. Some residents have campaigned for bays not to be replaced via Cllr Morgon and Cllr M White. Other residents wish them to be reinstated. Local consultation could find strength of feeling either way. | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Residents | 20/09/2010 | Head of StreetCare |
| | Dolphin Approach, Romford | parking controls to deal with obstructive parking by blue badge holders | | | | | | |
| 9 | Butts Green Road | Restrictions outside, opposite and adjacent to Emerson House | Several flatted developments along this section of street with basement parking. On-street parking causing visibility issues at vehicle access points and restrictions will assist, but will remove heavily-used on- street parking. Servicing appears difficult and so local review may be useful with a loading bay provided on each side of the street to serve the various flats. | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Resident | 03/08/2010 | 975084 |
| 10 | Church Road, Harold Wood | Move 2-wheel footway residents' parking bays back into carriageway near Harold Court School | Other bays in area fully on carriageway. This location causes access and safety issues for pupils walking to school. | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 11 | Hamilton Drive, Harold Wood | Request for more residents' permit bays, especially near 69- 109 | Feasible where road space is available | LBH Revenue | 3,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 12 | Athelstan Road, Harold Wood | Request for more residents' permit bays | Feasible where road space is available | LBH Revenue | 3,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 13 | Firham Park Avenue, Harold Wood | Request for restrictions to help with access to residents' driveway | Estate has a history of parking issues, but when the Council last reviewed around 5 years ago, no scheme took place because residents could not agree on way forward. This localised issue had the resident advised to apply for a wider dropped kerb which would deal with his own problem. | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 14 | Carlton Road, Romford | Change 8:30am to 10:00am restriction to 8am to 6:30pm | Two different CPZs. Romford end is all day with residents' bays, Gidea Park part time with no bays. May be worth a questionnaire for the street first. | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 15 | Hearn Road, Romford | Remove parking bay to help access to commercial site. | Will reduce amount of available bays, but help with access | LBH Revenue | 750 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Brice Thompson |
| 16 | Wayside Close, Romford | Access concerns for deliveries/ emergency services etc | Recent parking consultation have shown that Wayside Close residents generally do not want any more changes. To make access easier, either double yellow lines are needed on one side or verges paved for footway parking (funding not available) | LBH Revenue | TBC | Resident | 6/8/210 | 922384 |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

| SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes A | pplications |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
|--------------------------------|-------------|

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 17 | Como Street, Romford | 2 more residents' bays adjacent to 54 Linden Street | Feasible | LBH Revenue | 750 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 18 | Londsdale Road, Romford | Request for residents' bays | Road narrow with many dropped kerbs, so bays would have to be staggered. Scheme would bring street into local CPZ - may be worth a questionnaire first | LBH Revenue | твс | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Tebbutt |
| 19 | Wheatsheaf Road, Romford | Request for more residents' permit bays | Feasible where road space is available | LBH Revenue | 3,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 20 | Beaufort Close, Romford | Request for footway parking to help servicing access, but does not want yellow lines | No space available at all in street, request should be rejected. | LBH Revenue | N/A | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 21 | Jutsums Avenue | Narrow road with parking causes larger vehicles to drive over verges | One verge could be paved for footway parking, but funding not available (£15k required). Double yellow lines on both sides would remove problem | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Osborne |
| 22 | Jubilee Avenue estate | Request for residents' permit bays as people from Mark's Road park in street | Would extend existing CPZ into area and so all could park within zone. Questionnaire first might be useful to gauge local views | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 23 | Links Avenue | CPZ/ Residents' parking | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful - several requests for this | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Armstrong |
| 24 | Hockley Drive | CPZ/ Residents' parking | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 25 | Edward Close, Gidea Park | 2 hour parking restriction to stop commuters | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 26 | Chalforde Gardens, Gidea Park | Request for parking review in terms of restriction times and need for permit bays | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 27 | Oxley Close, Gidea Park | Double yellow lines throughout street | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 28 | Hill Grove, Gidea Park | Restrictions to assist deliveries and emergency access (several requests) | Feasible, but would mean double yellow lines, perhaps staggered throughout street. Perhaps a questionnaire would be useful. Footway parking not feasible as footways are flags. | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 29 | Marshalls Drive, Gidea Park | Request to be included in CPZ | Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful - refer to Hill Grove which is next street | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 30 | Birch Crescent/ Macdonald Avenue | Access concerns for deliveries/ emergency services, vans parking in area etc (several requests) | Area has many dropped kerbs. Restrictions for access will remove on- street parking provision. perhaps a questionnaire to gauge views would be useful | LBH Revenue | 750 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 31 | Fairfield Avenue, Upminster | Restricted parking request to deal with commuters | Several requests for this and with 1 resident not supporting. Enough interest to go straight to public advert. Suggest bring street into line with adjacent roads (8am to 9:30pm, Monday to Friday) | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 32 | Dunster Crescent, Hornchurch | Introduce residents' permit bays into CPZ and extend CPZ hours | Feasible, no permit bays within the area around Upminster Bridge Station - may need wider review and questionnaire first | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | 946038 |
| 33 | Moor Lane, Cranham | Parking on both sides of street causing problems for buses | Restrictions would be required on one side of street. | LBH Revenue | 1,000 | Cllr Ford | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Ford |
| 34 | Hall Lane, Upminster, by park | Parking on Sundays causing traffic flow issues and blocking buses. Request to extend existing Monday to Saturday restriction to 7 days a week. Restrictions at junction with Masefield Drive. | Feasible. | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | London Buses and Cllr Barrett | 10/09/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 35 | Pond Walk, Cranham | Inconsiderate parking in narrow road | Suggest a questionnaire to find out what residents would like to see first | LBH Revenue | 500 | Cllr Van den Hende | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Van den Hende |
| 36 | Swan Avenue, Cranham | Footway parking bays near each other on opposite sides of street causing obstruction | Many bays do not meet current dimension standards or leave 1.5m for pedestrians. Footway parking should be reviewed, redesigned and consulted | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Cllr Ford | 06/08/2010 | Cllr Ford |

Item Ref

37

38

39

40

Langley Close

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

Clears

Extend double yellow line restrictions from junction with

Faringdon Avenue to cover

adjacent and opposite gates for St. Ives House for HGV access

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| •• | | ay concines Applications | | | | | | - |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| n f | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
| | Gaynes Road Service Road, Upminster | Obstructive parking preventing deliver access to shops | Blue badge holders causing some of the issue and so it would be worth redesigning the layout to provide some disabled persons bays, with other areas restricted for waiting and loading | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Business | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| | Highview Gardens, Upminster | Request for parking bays or permit bays | Feasible, no permit bays within the area - may need wider review and questionnaire first | LBH Revenue | 500 | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| | Marlborough Gardens, Cranham | Extended restrictions at bend outside Hall Mead School and review existing School Keep | Unlawful "no parking" markings removed some months ago following a resident enquiry. Officers agree that permanent "no waiting" restrictions are required and | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident/ Cllr Barrett | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

LBH

Revenue

500

Business

09/08/2010

976542

"no waiting" restrictions are required and

Feasible - would provide HGV access, but

SKC should be reviewed.

reduce on-street parking

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 41 | Balgores Lane | Change parking restrictions to favour parking by parents dropping off children at Gidea Park College | Existing restrictions 8am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. Changes feasible, but if the HAC are amenable to the idea, the area would have to be set further away from Main Road because of traffic flow issues. Residents may not appreciate dropping off near their premises. | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Andrew Rosindell MP | 17/08/2010 | 978862 |
| 42 | Upminster Road | Review of footway parking and restrictions at service road from Hacton Lane where vehicle damage and access problems have been experienced | Some locations on service road prevent access for service vehicles, but review may require removal of some parking space | LBH Revenue | 2,500 | Resident | 05/08/2010 | 977046 |
| 43 | Junction Road, Romford | Request for additional residents' permit bays | Feasible where road space is available | LBH Revenue | 3,000 | Resident | 02/09/2010 | lain Hardy, LBH StreetCare |
| 44 | Princes Road, Romford | Removal of residents' permit bay in front of vehicle crossover as it keeps getting blocked | Residents' bays installed across vehicle crossovers as was the design at the time, but enforcement difficult and so bay should be removed. | LBH Revenue | 1,500 | Resident | 02/09/2010 | 989128 |
| 45 | 59-75 Ongar Way | Double yellow lines across dropped kerb within parking bay outside block 59-75 Ongar Way where disabled resident is having difficult access. | The Council has powers to enforce against parking in front of dropped kerbs, but restrictions would make it clear to motorists. | LBH Revenue | 500 | Cllr Burton | 13/09/2010 | Cllr Burton |

Highways Advisory Committee

October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 46 | Spey Way, Romford | Request for footway parking bays. | Request pre-HAC with residents now consulted. 35 residents consulted. 27 residents objected and 1 supported. Recommend that scheme does not proceed. | N/A | N/A | Resident | 02/09/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| SECT | ION C - Scheme | proposals without funding | g available | | | | | |
| 47 | Saffron Road, Collier Row | | No injury collisions recorded in street in 3 years to May 2010 | | 9,000 | Residents | 20/09/2010 | Cllr Armstrong |
| 48 | Butts Green Road | approaching Slewins Lane | No history of collisions at this location. The type of road does not lend itself to heavy engineering measures | | TBC | Resident | 03/08/2010 | 975084 |
| 49 | Petersfield Avenue | | No pedestrian facilities within 300 metres, but no recent, recorded injury problems. | | 7,000 | Resident | 04/08/2010 | 976212 |
| 50 | Suttons Avenue, Hornchurch | Request for speed reduction measures | In 4 years to May 2010, 2 slight injuries recorded, 1 with vehicle travelling too fast for conditions | | 35,000 | Cllr Wood | 13/09/2010 | Cllr Wood |
| 51 | Anson Close | | Large verges in area could be converted to parking spaces, but at a cost of around $\pounds2,500$ per space. | | TBC | Resident | 06/08/2010 | 919854 |
| 52 | Plover Gardens, Cranham | Request for parking area to be constructed or road extended for | Large verges in area could be converted to parking spaces, but at a cost of around $\pounds2,500$ per space. | | TBC | Resident | 06/08/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| 53 | Squirrels Heath Road, Gidea Park | Mini-roundabout at junction with Northumberland Avenue to slow traffic in advance of humped zebra crossing which resident is | Officers do not feel a mini-roundabout would be appropriate in design terms. This case relates back to previous scheme and to reduce speed on this section of road, additional speed tables could be provided (one each side of crossing location) through TfL funding, but Gidea Park AC rejected proposal. | | 15,000 | Resident | 27/09/2010 | 965850 |
| 54 | Albert Road Romford | Speeding traffic, request for traffic calming | Road hump scheme would reduce speeds. One injury collision (in 3 years to April 2010) at Moss Lane junction, not speed related. | | 25,000 | Andrew Rosindell MP | 17/08/2010 | 978864 |
| 55 | Nag's Head Lane | Reduce speed limit to 40mph | Would provide consistency with Brentwood's section and end of Warley Road which are 40mph. No recent injuries on road, but 4 on junction with Shepherd's Hill | | 8,000 | Cllr Eagling | 01/09/2010 | Cllr Eagling |
| 56 | | access by large vehicles ignoring 7.5 tonne weight limit | Width restriction would need to prevent anything larger than a transit type van. A larger vehicle would have to turn round if advance signage were ignored. Matter has been raised for some years and police do undertake enforcement action from time to time. | | 15,000 | Angela Watkinson MP | 01/09/2010 | 982158 |

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| North Hill Drive | Request for speed restrictions | Street was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casualty- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses. | | 25,000 | Resident | 13/09/2010 | 985546 |
| Junction Road | Request for traffic calming | Street not subject to significant casualty problem. Road hump scheme would slow traffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds. | | 25,000 | Andrew Rosindell MP | 13/09/2010 | 982160 |
| Melksham Drive, Harold Hill | Linto green to create more parking | • | | £400 per sq.m | Angela Watkinson MP | 28/09/2010 | 1000782 |
| Birkbeck Road | Request for speed humps | No casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not funded as there are no casualties. | | 25,000 | Resident | 13/09/2010 | 982048 |
| Hyland Way | Request for traffic calming - Item 51 from August HAC | May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jcn with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 8/06 - jcn with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 7/06 - jcn Hyland Close, parking blocked visibility; 12/09 - | | 35,000 | Resident | 12/07/2010 | 960872 |
| | North Hill Drive Junction Road Melksham Drive, Harold Hill Birkbeck Road Hyland Way | North Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsJunction RoadRequest for traffic calmingMelksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parkingBirkbeck RoadRequest for speed humpsHyland WayRequest for traffic calming - Item 51 from August HAC | North Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsStreet was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casualty- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses.Junction RoadRequest for traffic calmingStreet not subject to significant casualty problem. Road hump scheme would slow traffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds.Melksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parkingFeasible, but would cost around £400 per square metre for road construction and therefore not affordable.Birkbeck RoadRequest for speed humpsNo casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not funded as there are no casualties.Hyland WayRequest for traffic calming - ItemHAC requested casualty data - 4 years to May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jcn with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 8/06 - jcn with | SchemeDescriptionOfficer AdviceFunderNorth Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsStreet was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casualty- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses.Junction RoadRequest for traffic calmingStreet not subject to significant casualty problem. Road hump scheme would slow traffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds.Melksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parkingFeasible, but would cost around £400 per square metre for road construction and therefore not affordable.Birkbeck RoadRequest for traffic calming - Item 51 from August HACNo casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not funded as there are no casualties.Hyland WayRequest for traffic calming - Item 51 from August HACHAC requested casualty data - 4 years to May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jon with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 7/06 - jon Hyland Close, parking blocked visibility; 12/09 - snow/ reckless. | SchemeDescriptionOtticer AdviceFunderBudgetNorth Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsStreet was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casualty- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses.25,000Junction RoadRequest for traffic calmingStreet not subject to significant casualty problem. Road hump scheme would slow traffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds.25,000Melksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parkingFeasible, but would cost around £400 per square metre for road construction and therefore not alfordable.£400 per sq.mBirkbeck RoadRequest for speed humpsNo casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not funded as there are no casualtes.25,000Hyland WayRequest for traffic calming - Item 51 from August HACHAC requested casualty data - 4 years to May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jen with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 8/06 - jen | SchemeDescriptionOfficer AdvicePotential FunderLikely BudgetOrigin/ Request fromNorth Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsStreet was last review for casually reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casually- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street25,000ResidentJunction RoadRequest for traffic calmingStreet not subject to significant casually problem. Road hump scheme would slow taffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds.25,000Andrew Resident MPMelksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parking here for end a construction and terefore not affordable.Feasible, but would cost around £400 per square metre for road construction and terefore and a streer are no casualties.\$400 per sq.mAndrew ReguestBirkbeck RoadRequest for traffic calming - Item St from August HACNo casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not funded as there are no casualties.25,000ResidentHyland WayRequest for traffic calming - Item St from August HACHAC requested casualty data - 4 years to May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jcn with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 7/06 - | SchemeDescriptionOfficer AdvicePotential FunderLikely BudgetOrigin/ Request Placed on ListNorth Hill DriveRequest for speed restrictionsStreet was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that turther work required for casualty- reduction. Only other works could be speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses.25,000ResidentResidentJunction RoadRequest for traffic calmingStreet not subject to significant casualty- problem. Road hump scheme would slow traffic down, but Officers do not have funding to check current speeds.25,000Andrew Rosindel MP31/09/2010Melksham Drive, Harold HillRequest for road to be extended into green to create more parkingFeasible, but would cost around £400 per square metre for road construction and therefore not atfordable.\$400 per sq.mAngela Watkinson MP28/09/2010Birkbeck RoadRequest for traffic calming - Item St from August HACNo casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 8/06 - jen with Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 7/06 |

12 of 13

Library

Development

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 2 - Highway Schemes Applications

restrictions to support Rainham

Interchange project

S:\T&T\Committees & Liaison\Highways Advisory Committee\Highway Schemes Progress & Applications Reports\2 - Highway Schemes Applications.xlsOct2010HAC

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | Potential Funder | Likely Budget | Scheme Origin/ Request from | Date Requested/ Placed on List | CRM / Contact |
|-------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 62 | Parking Review | commence work with local | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnairre to local area with results reported back to future HAC | LBH Revenue | 8,000 | Viking Way Extension | 21/06/2010 | Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare |
| 63 | linterchange & | bays, bus stop clearways/ buses | Changes required in order to make operation of Interchange and Library work in the context of bus routeing and | TfL LIP/ | 5,000 | LBH Regen. | 17/03/2010 | Regeneration |

servicing. Work needs to be underway

around April 2012

LBH

Highways Advisory Committee

13 of 13

October 2010

Highways Advisory Committee

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 3 - Highway Schemes Applications (July and August 2010)

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision | | | | |
|-------------|--|---|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 2010 APPLICA | TIONS | I | Decision | | | | |
| | Scheme proposals with funding in place for HAC approval in principle | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Exchange Street | Provision of 3 speed humps associated with original Romford Brewery development | Unlawful rubber strip humps placed when development took place which need removal. Humps required to ensure traffic remains at low speed approaching uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points at Brewery Walk and ArcadePlace | AGREED | | | | |
| 2 | Union Road (former Oldchurch Hospital) | Double Yellow Line restrictions and 20mph Zone | Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement | AGREED | | | | |
| 3 | Gidea Park School | Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions | Review would support discharge of Planning Consent for school development site | AGREED | | | | |
| 4 | Hylands School | Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions | Review would support discharge of Planning Consent for school development site | AGREED | | | | |
| 5 | Ayloff School | Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions | Review would support discharge of Planning Consent for school development site | AGREED | | | | |
| 6 | Clydesdale Road, additional parking places | Provision of net increase of 4 parking places in street and improvements to cycle route dropped kerbs | Proposals would remove area of underused open paved area to the advantage of additional parking spaces and a better cycle route access from Park Lane. | AGREED | | | | |
| 7 | Hillfoot Road Width Restriction | Resident Questionnaire to determine whether or not to physical width restriction keep restriction | Can fund questionaire through general staff time costs, no funding identified for works. Followed report to North Romford AC of 31st March 2009 wich advised against removal. AC wanted review and Head of StreetCare agreed to fund review. | AGREED | | | | |
| 8 | Upper Rainham Road/ Elm Park Avenue | Yellow Box on Upper Rainham Road - Rainham-bound side | Will assist with right turning at peak times where junction locks up with traffic queues | AGREED | | | | |
| 9 | Suttons Lane | Pedestrian refuge to access shops, near Randall Drive | Scheme feasible and funded | AGREED | | | | |
| 10 | Suttons Lane | Minor kerb and parking bay adjustments at junction with Standen Avenue | Required to improve visibility at junction following scheme review | AGREED | | | | |
| Gene | ral parking requ | ests for HAC prioritisation | (LBH Revenue Budget) | | | | | |

19th October 2010

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 11 | Hornchurch Town Centre | Review of parking by Station and P&D by shops building on Town Centre South scheme. | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnairre to local area with results reported back to future HAC | AGREED |
| 12 | Victoria Road, Romford | Review Parking within Ring Road to provide Pay-and-Display parking. | HAC requested for approval in principal for public consultation/ statutory advert with results reported back to future HAC | AGREED |
| 13 | Coach drop off facilities, Romford | Review to find locations at low cost suitable for coach drop off. | Sites identified, to be consulted with results reported to HAC for decisions | AGREED |
| 14 | Goodrington School, Walden Road | School Keep Clear restrictions by school gate and "banjo" area | Will assist in keeping area clear where vehicles and pedestrians are moving | AGREED |
| 15 | Bower Park School, Havering Road | Review extent and times of operation of School Keep Clear zig-zags | School opening times have changed and so restrictions need updating. | AGREED |
| 16 | Pinewood Road, Collier Row | Review parking restrictions at junction of Clockhouse Lane/ St John's Road and new school pedestrian access - double yellow lines and School Keep Clears | Will support recent School Travel Plan improvement of new pedestrian gate. | AGREED |
| 17 | Marshalls Park Area | Review and introduce double yellow lines at junctions and bends within estate area; New and updated School Keep Clear restrictions outside St Edward's Primary School; review and convert meter bays to bay and display bays in Park End Road and Havering Drive | Will support other improvements planned for School Travel Scheme, keep junctions and bends clear for pedestrian and vehicle visibility; and increase and simplify on-street paid parking bays. | AGREED |
| 18 | Rainham Village Parking Review | Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well - commence work with local parking questionnaire. Review likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme. | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnairre to local area with results reported back to future HAC | AGREED |
| 19 | Motorcycle Parking | Request for "hoops" to be placed within M/C bays to assist with M/C security and more on-street provision in town centres. | Would certainly help M/C users secure their M/Cs - costs to be researched. M/C use is growing in London and Havering has not provided new parking places for some time. | AGREED |

Highways Advisory Committee

19th October 2010

| Item | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC |
|---------------|---|--|---|----------|
| Ref | | - | | Decision |
| 20 | Park Lane area | Various requests for residents' parking in streets without, school crossing patrol being blocked, parking on junctions and approach to traffic signals at Horncurch Road. | Various issues in the area, would be useful to undertake a parking review questionnaire and look at the issues as a whole before any schemes are taken forward. | AGREED |
| 21 | Roneo Corner Shops | Parking bay for shops in lay-by 10 to 18 | Part of the lay-by is used for buses, but the rest is restricted. Potential scope for short term parking and loading bay, would need discussion with shop keepers | AGREED |
| 22 | Osborne Road | Review parking controls for afternoon operation at Brentwood Road end because of obstructive parent parking | Will help keep area clear at school times | AGREED |
| 23 | Albany Road | Parking both sides of the road is restricting approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road | Single line working only currently available and some restrictions may help | AGREED |
| 24 | Airfield Way/ Northolt Way | Double yellow lines at juncion extending into Northolt Way to keep entrance to area and Tesco service yard accessible | | REJECTED |
| 25 | Hartland Road and Broadstone Road | Footway parking scheme, where footways have been reconstructed | Subject to being assessed and designed, a scheme will help with access through area | AGREED |
| 26 | Rainham Interchange & Library Development | Loading bays, disabled persons bays, bus stop clearways/ buses only route and general waiting restrictions to support Rainham Interchange project | Changes required in order to make operation of Interchange and Library work in the context of bus routeing and servicing. Work needs to be underway around April 2012 | AGREED |
| Sche actio | | ithout funding available for | r HAC to consider and decide a co | ourse of |
| 27 | Hubbards Close prevention of through traffic from A127 | Restriction to prevent traffic driving through Hubbards Close from Hubbards Chase which is often an issue when A127 is busy | Options appraisal and feasibility study. Residents and statutory authority consultation only. | AGREED |
| 28 | Marshalls Park Area | - | Scheme generally already successful in reducing casualties and traffic speeds, but speeds may be further reduced. | REJECTED |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision |
|-------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 29 | Wincanton Road, Harold Hill - Road widening | Request from care home that road be widened to better accommodate traffic. Concern about emergency access for residents of home and that large vehicles have to drive on verge. | Road is less than 4 metres where nos 44 to 48 are served, ending in turning head. Road widening generally feasible, but care home is also next to Tees Drive which is wide enough for emergency use. No budget available for new build. | REJECTED |
| 30 | Frederick Road, Rainham - Further speed humps | Additional speed humps in street with suggestion that this would have bus route removed from street | Speed tables installed in 2009/10 as part of a wider 20mph scheme. Tables selected to be compatible with buses, but further humps or tables would impact on bus operations. | REJECTED |
| 31 | Shephards Hill - Signal-controlled pedestrian crossing | Provision of signal-controlled crossing outside 79 - 83 | Would serve 11 properties and bus stop if relocated. No reported pedestrian casualty issues. Potential for a pedestrian refuge looked at previously - would need road widening and budget of around £19k. | REJECTED |
| 32 | Harold Court Road and Church Road | 20mph signs | 20mph signs not permitted unless with a traffic order. 20mph limit requires actual speeds of 24mph or below. 20mph zones requires self-enforcing traffic calming. Unusual to look at single roads less than 500m, normally applied to areas with casualty problems and none in the area. | REJECTED |
| 33 | Swindon Lane, Harold Hill | Road humps | Not a concern from a casualty-reduction point of view and any scheme would have to include Redruth Road and Redcar Road | REJECTED |

Highways Advisory Committee

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

SCHEDULE 3 - Highway Schemes Applications (July and August 2010)

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | UST 2010 APPLI | CATIONS | | Booloion |
| | | ith funding in place for HA | Capproval in principle | |
| 1 | Oldcurch Road | Right turn lane on advance to Oldchurch Rise and bus stop clearway to replace redundant bus lane | Will assist with lane discipline and bus stop accessibility | AGREED |
| 2 | Newton's Corner | Dagenham Road approach to roundabout - mask visibility to the right for up until the last 15 metres to reduce speed of traffic entering roundabout | Concerns with traffic speed on and leaving roundabout towards Rainham Road/ Castle Avenue junction. Review has shown that there is too much visibility for traffic approaching from Dagenham Road and so entry speeds to roundabout are high. Visibility can be reduced up until the final 15 metres in accordance with roundabout design standards | REJECTED |
| 3 | Riverside Close | 20mph Zone as a result of the new development | Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement | AGREED |
| 4 | Kidman Close | 20mph Zone as a result of the new development | Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement | AGREED |
| Gene | eral parking requ | ests for HAC prioritisation | (LBH Revenue Budget) | |
| 5 | Harkness Close | Restrict turning head and bin store | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on-street parking | REJECTED |
| 6 | Heaton Close | Restrict parking to one side for access | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on-street parking | REJECTED |
| 7 | Petersfield Avenue/ Redruth Road | Extended junction protection and bend protecton to assist London Buses | Would help bus access, but remove on- street parking | REJECTED |
| 8 | Wrexham Road/ Woodbridge Lane | Extended junction protection and removal of footway parking opposite junction to assist with servicing | Would assist with servicing and emergency access, may reduce on-street parking, would reduce damage to verge. | REJECTED |
| 9 | North Hill Drive | Remove part time restrictions associted with former school crossing patrol | Should be removed, subject to no objections being raised | AGREED |
| 10 | Tees Drive | Remove footway bay and restrict junction with Priory Road | Would help with emergent visibility from Priory Road | REJECTED |
| 11 | Hilldene Avenue | Remove footway bay within 10m of junction with Newbury Road | Would help with emergent visibility from Newbury Road | REJECTED |

19th October 2010

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision |
|-------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 12 | Castle Close | Turning head restrictions | Would help servicing and reduce obstructive parking on shared surface | REJECTED |
| 13 | Straight Road/ Heaton Avenue | Review parking restrictions at junction to keep visibility clear | Would help with visibility and access to Heaton Avenue, would need to link up with Bus Stop which needs Clearway | REJECTED |
| 14 | Fairford Way | Request for residents' parking scheme to stop commuters | Near 174, 496 and 498 bus routes - perhaps a local parking survey is required first to gauge extent of problem | AGREED |
| 15 | Petersfield Avenue/ Dagnam Park Drive | Extended junction protection | Emergent visibility poor to the right (from DPD) and restrictions will improve situation, but may cause pressure on parking for nearby maisonettes | REJECTED |
| 16 | Ashton Road estate | Various issues with access through estate, parkingnear junctions etc | Possible parking questionnaire with businesses before any proposals are designed | REJECTED |
| 17 | St Neots Road area | Commuter parking causing access and parking problems | Near 256 bus route and wlaking distance to Harold Wood - perhaps a local parking survey is required first to gauge extent of problem | REJECTED |
| 18 | Saddleworth Road | Residents of new houses and flats blocking servicing access | Could restrict one side of street, but would reduce available parking spaces | REJECTED |
| 19 | Chippenham Road | Residents' parking scheme | Hilldene Regeneration scheme is increasing parking in area which may help | REJECTED |
| 20 | Taunton Road (stub) | Restrict turning head | Will help servicing access and access to dropped kerbs | REJECTED |
| 21 | Chestnut Glen | Concern about emergency access | Many residents have dropped kerbs so footway parking not feasible and so restrictions on one side of the street would be required and in our view would not be popular, issue not raised by emergency services | REJECTED |
| 22 | Osborne Road/ Lynhurst Drive | Extended junction protection to stop parking on both sides by shops | Will assist with access at junction | REJECTED |
| 23 | Rockingham Avenue | Extended junction protection opposite Osborne Road end of street to stop people parking in Rockingham Avenue | Junction and bend would be justified for restrictions, but restricitions opposite first few houses may push problem elsewhere | REJECTED |
| 24 | Grenfell Avenue and estate | Residents' parking survey | Questionnaire will see the extent of any parking issues | AGREED |
| 25 | etc and area | Residents' parking survey following complaints of people not wishing to pay for car park | Questionnaire will see the extent of any parking issues | AGREED |
| 26 | Elm Park Avenue, Suttons Lane end | Extended junction protection | Will help bus access, may displace residents parking | REJECTED |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

| ltem Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision |
|-------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 27 | The Broadway | Drop off bay for disabled people | Will help interchange with station | REJECTED |
| 28 | Service Road to Towers School (off Osborne Road) | Junction protection and day-time restions to assist school access | Will keep access to school clear | AGREED |
| 29 | Ravensborne Crescent/ Coombe Road | Request for additional residents' parking bays within existing CPZ | Where there is space, bays can be provided | AGREED |
| 30 | Athelstan Road | Request for additional residents' parking bays within existing CPZ | Where there is space, bays can be provided | AGREED |
| 31 | Faringdon Avenue/ Ashton Road | Extended junction protection into Faringdon Avenue | Will help with visibility at junction | REJECTED |
| 32 | Parkstone Avenue | Extend restricitons back from Butts Green Road as resident does not like parking in front of house | Would push problem further into Parkstone Avenue | REJECTED |
| 33 | Wingletye Lane at A127 | Complaints about parking associated with Campion Road, Grassmere Road, Wilstshire Avenue up to Essex Road etc | Controls may displace parking into woder area, but access to and from A127 difficult at peak school times - possibly undertake questionaire first | REJECTED |
| 34 | Cornflower Way | Restrictions required at Fire Gate at Sackville Crescent end | Would keep area clear for emergency access and cyclists | REJECTED |
| 35 | Woodhall Crescent/ Halcyon Way/ Wingletye Lane | Extend part time restrictions further into street where commuters are parking/ people avoiding car park charges. Chip shop attracting parking on junctions | May displace problems | REJECTED |
| 36 | Bryant Avenue/ Ewan Road | Extended junction protection to help with visibility from Ewan Road. Complaints between businesses causing each other obstruction | Recommend review Bryant Avenue as one scheme, especially as Tesco is to building a new access to Bryant Avenue and other problems are noted with access to premises and visibility. | REJECTED |
| 37 | Birch Crescent | Complaints about obstructive parking and emergency access | Restrictions would deal with issue but remove a great deal of parking capacity. Emergency Services have not raised as an urgent issue but do have access problems from time to time | REJECTED |
| 38 | Butts Green Road | Request for Bus Stop Clearway just north of Burntwood Avenue (Hornchurch-bound) to deal eith obstructive parking | Flats in the area can cause problems for bus access at stop, would be worth adjusting kerb to 140mm at same time | REJECTED |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision | | |
|-------------|--|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 39 | Sussex Avenue | Footway Parking | Many dropped kerbs, but some limited provision will be possible, subject to ensuring appropriate emergency vehicle/ servicing access is maintained. Area within CPZ, so kaming bays residents' bays may assist | REJECTED | | |
| 40 | Butts Green Road | Parking review between Slewins Lane and Burntwood Road | Flats in area may be causing access issues to dropped kerbs etc [HAC requested further information] | DEFERRED | | |
| 41 | Market Link and The Mews area | Review parking restrictions and parking bays for access into Market Place and The Mews etc | Great deal of history with unauthorised occupation of Public Highway, but review required for servicing and emergency access | AGREED | | |
| 42 | Brentwood Road/ Hazelmere Gardens | Junction protection extending into Hazelmere Gardens. Parking problems associated with businesses | Will keep access clear, but may displace parking further into Hazelmere Gardens | REJECTED | | |
| 43 | Phillida Road | Footway Parking | Some can be provided | REJECTED | | |
| 44 | Bridge Close | Upgrade the parking controls from 8am to 8pm, to at any time (double yellow lines) to deal with parking problems alleged to be attributable to the Islamic Centre | Blue badge holders may park on single and double yellow lines for up to 3 hours as long as there is no loading ban in force. | AGREED | | |
| 45 | Brooklands Road | More residents' parking bays | Subject to review of HGV access to Medora Road, request is feasible | AGREED | | |
| 46 | Abbs Cross Lane | Double yellow line parking restrictions through recently constructed pedestrian refuge by school where vans ar parking causing an obstruction | Refuge installed with "T-bar" markings indicating area to keep clear so vehicles can pass refuge, but approach has failed as markings are being ignored. Therefore double yellow lines are only solution. | AGREED | | |
| 47 | Hacton Primary School | Request for School Keep Clear restrictions at schools accesses (Goodwood Avenue, Plumpton Avenue and Central Drive) | If locations meet criteria then request feasible. | AGREED | | |
| | Scheme proposals without funding available for HAC to consider and decide a course of action | | | | | |
| 48 | Firbank Road | Request to control traffic speeds, citing humps elsewhere | Street is a bus route and humps would not be suitable (speed cuhsions or tables more appropriate) - does not consider Cornell Way and St John's Road which are on same straight route. | REJECTED | | |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision | |
|-------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--|
| 49 | Brentwood Road (Lawrence Road to Lytton road) | Drivers speeding, schools close by - traffic calming should be provided | Casualty-reduction scheme undertaken in 2008-09. Works included a pedestrian refuge on this section of road and full upgrade of the zebra crossing outside the school. Other measures not considered necessary, but next step would be speed cushions (as is a bus route), but not on forward plan. Would not necessarily traffic calm such a short section. | REJECTED | |
| 50 | Whitchurch Road Shops - Parking Layby | Request to widen lay-by to allow proper parking of vehicles "nose in" rather than the current overhanging as is now the case. | Current use of layby presents safety risk to highway users. Nose in would require land take from Homes in Havering for conversion to carriageway, but would still have vehicles reversing from between other parked vehicles. Restricted time parallel parking would be safer and provide turn-over of spaces. [Parallel parking/ echelon to be reviewed elsewhere]. | REJECTED | |
| 51 | Hyland Way | Request for traffic calming | May have impact on other un-calmed streets in area [HAC requested further information] | DEFERRED | |
| 52 | Kettering Road | Convert highway verge to parking bays (12 nr) nose in | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | REJECTED | |
| 53 | Newbury Walk | Convert highway verge to parking bays (5 nr) nose in | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | REJECTED | |
| 54 | Charlbury Close | Convert highway verge to parking bays (4 nr) parallel | Costs based on £250 per sq.m for lightly constructed carriageway standard. Does not include utility diversions or increase in surface water runoff | REJECTED | |
| 55 | Belgrave Avenue | Request to deal with speed and amount of traffic using street | One slight injury at Montrose Avenue junction, right turning goods vehicle. | REJECTED | |
| 56 | Glanville Drive | Request for a review and analysis of traffic "rat running" through street to avoid Hornchurch and Doggets Corner | No casualty problem in street. No data available for extent of any problems in street. Any scheme would need to include Maywin Drive | REJECTED | |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision | |
|-------------|--|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 57 | Kingsley Gardens | Concerns with rat-running and traffic congestion | REJECTED | | |
| 58 | Ardleigh Close | Provision of pedestrian refuge near Ardleigh Green Road junction | Junction used by commercial traffic, so refuge would have to be set back into junction. Would help pedestrians willing to divert from desire line. | REJECTED | |
| 59 | Bevan Way | New footway from Hacton Lane end to bus stop, including measures to keep route clear from parked vehicles and dropped kerbs | Officers have look to see if any StreetCare budgets are available, but there are none. Scheme would be helpful to bus users. | REJECTED | |
| 60 | Suttons Gardens | Speed Hump halfway down street to reduce speeding | No casualty problem in street although junctions have has some issues (not speed related). | REJECTED | |
| 61 | Cedar Road | Compliants from residents about vans rat-running between Mawney Road and North Street. | Considered weight limit, but would not prevent vans (too light). Width restriction would be possible at Cedar Close and may be more effective. In both options, changes would be needed at the junction of North Street/ Cedar Road to allow HGVs to turn to access industrial area at Chesham Close. Parking controls would also be needed to assist HGVs. North Street/ Main Road corridor scheme will look at more detail of costs. | REJECTED | |
| 62 | Park Drive | Request to remove refuge to east of Brackendale Gardens and place to west. Resident does not feel is serves pedestrians well. | Would require speed cushions to be relocated as well. Scheme installed following publc consultation and felt useful to the community as a whole. Casualty rate has improved in street following wider scheme. Resident objected to original scheme from 2007/08. | REJECTED | |
| Sche | me proposals o | n hold for future discussio | n when required to be taken forwa | ard | |
| 63 | Rainham Village Parking Review Parking Review Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well - commence work with local parking questionnaire. Review likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme. | | HAC requested for approval in principal for questionnairre to local area with results reported back to future HAC | DEFERRED | |

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

| Item Ref | Scheme | Description | Officer Advice | HAC Decision | |
|-------------|--|--|---|-----------------|--|
| 64 | Rainham Interchange & Library Development | bays, bus stop clearways/ buses only route and general waiting restrictions to support Rainham | Changes required in order to make operation of Interchange and Library work in the context of bus routeing and servicing. Work needs to be underway around April 2012 | DEFERRED | |

This page is deliberately left blank



6 REPORT

[X]

[]

[]

[]

[X]

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

Report Author and contact details:

MEAD SCHOOL, AMERSHAM ROAD, HAROLD HILL Alterations to School Keep Clear Markings Outcome of Public Consultation Nicola Childs Incorporated Engineer 01708 433103 Nicola.childs@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough Excellence in education and learning Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity Value and enhance the life of every individual High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax

SUMMARY

Following the public consultation and statutory advertisement, this report recommends that the existing School Keep Clear Road marking is extended and one footway parking bay is removed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee, having considered the representations made, recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the School Keep Clear road marking be extended and a footway parking bay removed as detailed in this report and shown on Drawing S0024/OV/01 be implemented.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £1000 can be met from the 2010/11 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Mead Primary School contacted the Council earlier in 2010 regarding a near-miss incident involving a vehicle exiting the vehicular entrance of the school and a child pedestrian. As a result, the pedestrian exit which was close to the vehicular exit was relocated.
- 1.2 The vehicular entrance has now been upgraded and tactile paving provided.
- 1.3 The school requested that the School Keep Clear road marking be extended around the full extent of bend by this entrance. This proposal will also require the removal of a 17 metre long footway parking bay.
- 1.4 Keep clear markings are accompanied by a sign plate which used to refer to the restriction applying during term time only. This has now changed and the School Keep Clear marking will be enforceable Monday to Friday 8.00am to 5.00pm

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of public consultation, two responses had been received (16% response rate). Results are summarised below:
- 2.2 Numbers 121 to 143 Amersham Road and Mead Primary School were consulted between 20th August 2010 and 13th September 2010.

| Ref: | Address | Comment |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 137 | Both replies comment on the indiscriminate parking of |
| | Amersham | parents dropping-off and picking-up children, who blatantly |
| | Road | park where it suits, taking a risk on whether they are caught |
| 2 | 139 | by Parking Enforcement. |
| | Amersham | 139 also comments on excessive speed being an issue. |
| | Road | |

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 Once the School Keep Clear markings are installed with the revised operating times, they become easier to enforce and fall within the Council's parking enforcement regime. However the extent of parking enforcement is governed by resources which is shared amongst the borough's schools.
- 3.2 The issue of speed was beyond the remit of this report.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

That it be noted that the estimated cost of £1000 can be met from the 2010/11 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes.

Legal implications and risks:

Parking management schemes (including restrictions and bays) required consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

The provision of School Keep Clear road marking should provide a safer extent of road over which pedestrians can cross.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Design Drawings

Drawing No.

S0024/OV/01 Mead Primary School, Amersham Road, Harold Hill Proposed Improvements to Vehicular Entrance



| | s loon | - | / | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|--|----------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 10/80/ | JOB TITLE Mead Primary School Amersham Road, Harold Hill DRAWING TITLE Proposed Improvements to Vehicular Entrance | B Detailed design 08/06/10 REVISION AMENDMENT DATE | MAX footway gradient at drop kerb 1:12 or 83mm in 1m. | Kerbs 125 x 255 HB2 radius kerbs with 125 x 150 BN dropped kerbs laid upside down and flush. | Edging 50mm x 150mm. | Kerbs and edgings to be laid on C20 ST4 dry mix concrete bed and haunch. | <u>Carriageway construction:</u> C16/20 ST4 dry mix concrete 200mm thick overlaid with 40mm thick close graded surface course 10mm nominal size. | Tactile paving 50mm thick laid directly on the ST4 concrete 1.2m wide, 1.2m deep. | <u>OR</u> If flagstones are available from another site, extend flagstones upto the radius portion of the footway then as above. | <u>Footway construction:</u> C16/20 ST4 dry mix concrete 150mm thick overlaid with 20mm thick medium graded surface course 6mm nominal size. | Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majetty's Studionery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction intringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Hovering 1000/24327 NOTES | PURPOSE construction ecopyRIGHT Recommunity, Traffic & Engineering This drawing belongs to StreetCore Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering Section. Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior |

This page is deliberately left blank



7 REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

PARK LANE AREA PARKING REVIEW Outcome of questionnaire consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Principal Engineer 01708 433751 mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough[X]Excellence in education and learning[]Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity[]Value and enhance the life of every individual[X]High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax[]

SUMMARY

This report presents the views of those responding to a parking survey in Park Lane area of Romford and proposes further action based on the volume of responses across the area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the responses and information set out in this report either;

- (a) Considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement of proposals, subject to comments put forward by the Committee, to bring Clifton Road and Park Lane (between Malvern Road and Brentwood Road) into Sector 3 of the Romford Controlled Parking Zone, subject to the following design constraints;
 - The scheme shall operate between 8:30am and 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday as the existing scheme;
 - Residents' parking bays shall be provided where possible having regard for access and servicing;
 - That it be noted that parking bays cannot be provided in front of dropped kerbs;
 - That parking bays for businesses be provided where not directly affecting residents (for the businesses at the northern end of Park Lane);
 - That the dual-use bay outside Seafields Fostering be converted to a business permit bay;
 - That short term parking bays for shoppers be provided where not directly affecting residents (for the businesses at the northern end of Park Lane), with the Committee giving an indication of either limited stay bays or pay-and-display parking.
 - Restrictions be provided to assist the School Crossing Patrol operating in Park Lane, at the junction with Malvern Road.
 - Double yellow lines be provided on all junctions, bends, through pedestrian refuges within the review area and the Park Lane approach to Hornchurch Road shown on Drawing QJ054/101; or
- (b) The Committee considers that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme
- 3. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing the scheme is £5,000 which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor Parking Schemes.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

1.1 At its meeting of 13th July 2010, the Committee considered a Highways Scheme Application (Item 20) for various parking-related matters in the Park Lane Area, raised variously by residents, Councillors and the Council's Road Safety Unit;
"Various requests for residents' parking in streets without, school crossing patrol being blocked, parking on junctions and approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road."

- 1.2 Staff advised the Committee that before any detailed work took place, it would be useful to undertake a parking review questionnaire of the area to gauge the extent of any local issues.
- 1.3 The Committee agreed that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with such a questionnaire and so approximately 1400 letters with a questionnaire were hand-delivered to residents and businesses in the area on or just after 16th August 2010, the letter and questionnaires are in Appendix I to this report. The area involved is shown on Drawing QJ054/101. Of the letters, around 50 were delivered to businesses.

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 255 responses were received from residents and 13 from Businesses. The responses are summarised in Appendix II of this report.
- 2.2 In terms of residents currently within the Romford Controlled Zone (Sector 3, with residents' permit parking), of those responding, the majority wish to remain in the scheme. Malvern Road and Claremont Road was closer in terms of those wishing to remain in the scheme or come out, but the response rate from each street was around 30% and 20% respectively.
- 2.3 For residents wishing to join the existing scheme, few streets expressed a strong desire to join with the exception of Clifton Road. Of the 28 responses from the street, 22 expressed a desire to join.
- 2.4 Park Lane has been analysed to see if the responses vary with proximity to streets in the existing scheme. Between Brentwood Road and Malvern Road, of the 10 responses, 9 wished to join the existing scheme and 1 did not wish to join.
- 2.5 With businesses, of the 13 which replied, 12 were from Park Lane. The other response was from a business in Malvern Road.
- 2.6 Amongst the Park Lane businesses which responded, 4 agreed with business permits, but 8 did not. 3 agreed with controlled parking spaces near their premises, but 9 did not. 3 agreed with loading bays, but 9 did not
- 2.7 Seafields Fostering within Malvern Road requested that the dual-use bay outside their premises be converted to a business bay and extended to provide parking for 2 to 4 business vehicles.

- 2.8 In terms of double yellow lines being placed at junctions, on bends, past pedestrian refuges and where servicing/ fire fighting access is difficult, 218 of all respondents agreed (81%).
- 2.9 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit would be keen to see traffic flow through Park Lane improved with some parking restrictions. Although it is an unclassified road, they view it as a useful route for use by the emergency services. They had no view on the rest of the area.
- 2.10 The London Fire Brigade expressed agreement with the Met. Police. The London Ambulance Service did not respond to the consultation.
- 2.11 The Council's Road Safety Manager commented that Park Lane does require some form of restriction particularly between Malvern Rd and Hillcrest Rd where the parking is bad with the road seeming to be particularly narrow. However it does have the effect of keeping traffic speeds down. In addition, restrictions would be welcomed on Park Lane, at the junction with Malvern Road to assist the School Crossing Patrol.
- 2.12 Many respondents made comments in response to the consultation, which are summarised below;
 - Concerns about amount and speed of traffic in Park Lane,
 - Complaints about parking associated with the shops towards the midpoint of Park Lane,
 - Comments that the proposals are a money-making scheme/ tax,
 - Complaints about people parking all day in Park Lane,
 - Inconsiderate parking in front of dropped kerbs,
 - Too much parking enforcement,
 - Not enough parking enforcement,
 - General comments supporting objection or support for inclusion within existing scheme,
 - General comments supporting remaining in or leaving current scheme,
 - Comments relating to developments in the area putting pressure on parking,
 - Complaints that school and business staff are allowed to park in the area,
 - Complaints about the amount of commercial vehicles owned by residents being parked in the area,
 - Complaints about parents dropping off children for schools,
 - Complaints about parking associated with churches,
 - Support for restrictions on junctions,
 - Current restrictions not far enough,
 - Current restrictions too much,

- Concern about emergency and service access,
- Comments that existing scheme does not have enough spaces,

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 The consultation took place as a result of various parking issues being raised from a variety of sources. There is a clear indication that the respondents from Clifton Road would like to join the existing scheme. There is also a clear indication that respondents from Park Lane north of Malvern Road would also like to join the existing scheme.
- 3.2 Should the committee agree that a Clifton Road be formally proposed for inclusion, then residents of Park Lane currently parking in the street could be disadvantaged and therefore it would be reasonable to include Park Lane between Brentwood Road and Malvern Road within a formal scheme. However, it would mean that new permit-holders in Park Lane and Clifton Road could park within the zone which may put pressure on other streets.
- 3.3 There are some businesses at the northern end of Park Lane and so some provision may be required for business and shopper parking, although much of this area is currently covered with all-day restrictions.
- 3.4 There is support for double yellow line restrictions on junctions bends, etc and staff suggest that restrictions are designed in such locations.
- 3.5 Many of the comments made demonstrate the problems with many different people trying to access the road network and the difficulty there is in trying to balance parking, servicing and access. Some streets did not have high levels of response and so not all comments are widely agreed with.
- 3.6 Residents' parking permits are available on an unlimited basis (subject to vehicles being registered at the permit address) and so there is a risk that parking demand exceeds capacity. Businesses are restricted to two-permits however.
- 3.7 The Committee will be mindful of the competing demands and views, but in terms of areas to be included in the existing scheme, only Clifton Road and the northern end of Park Lane supports the proposal.
- 3.8 The Met. Police, London fire Brigade and the Council's Road Safety Manager would like to see some restrictions to aid emergency services and the crossing patrol at, although there is a balance between access, parking provision and calming effect on speeds available from the presence of onstreet parking. Staff consider that if a combination of controls are provided at junctions, through refuges and on the approach to Hornchurch Road, this will go some way to improve the situation.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of £5,000 can be met from the Council's 2010/11 revenue budget for Parking Schemes.

Legal implications and risks:

Parking management schemes (including restrictions and bays) require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Parking management schemes in residential areas are often installed to improve road safety and accessibility for residents who may be affected by long-term nonresidential parking.

Parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may be detrimental to others.

Blue-badge holders are able to park with an unlimited time in resident permit bays and up to three hours on restricted areas (unless a loading ban is in force).

There will be some visual impact, due to the required signing and road markings.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project File: QJ 054 Park Lane Area Parking Review

APPENDIX I LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE



Bob Wenman Head of StreetCare

Culture & Community London Borough of Havering 10th Floor, Mercury House Mercury Gardens Romford, RM1 3DW

Resident/ Occupier Statutory/ Other Consultees Park Lane Parking Review Area Please call:Traffic & EngineeringTelephone:01708 433704Fax:01708 433721Email:highways@havering.gov.uk

QJ054

My Ref: Your Ref:

16th August 2010

Dear Sir or Madam,

PARK LANE AREA – PARKING REVIEW

The Council has received various parking-related complaints and concerns from the Park Lane area. In order to decide if any controls are required, the Council's Highways Advisory Committee has agreed that I should write to you with a questionnaire to gauge your view.

I should be grateful if you would complete the questionnaire enclosed with this letter and if needed, provide some brief comments relating to any on-street parking issues you encounter in the area. We are not able to deal with non-parking related problems through this exercise.

We are seeking the following views;

- Whether residents within the current residents' parking scheme in operation in the area would like to remain in the scheme or come out of it;
- Whether residents not within the current residents' parking scheme would like to joint the scheme or not;
- Whether or not businesses in the area would like to be able to have some business parking permit bays in the area; short term parking near their premises; and loading facilities near their premises.
- Whether people in the area generally feel there is a need to restrict junctions bends and other locations from parking.

The Council does not have any views on what is required (if anything) and so this is your chance to make your views known, as the Highways Advisory Committee can only make recommendations based on the replies we receive.

If you require further information, please contact my team on **01708 433704**.

You should return your completed questionnaires to;

Traffic & Engineering

StreetCare 10th Floor London Borough of Havering Mercury House Mercury Gardens Romford RM1 3DW

You may also send responses either in text form or a scanned document electronically to: highways@havering.gov.uk

Questionnaires should be returned by **FRIDAY 17**th **SEPTEMBER 2010**. Should the outcome of this process lead to detailed proposals, then those potentially affected will be consulted.

In order to assist you with making your views known, current costs for parking permits are set out below with some other information which may be of use.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Philpotts CEng MICE MCIHT AIEMA Principal Engineer Traffic & Engineering

CURRENT PARKING PERMIT COSTS

| Resident (annual) | | Business (annual) | | |
|--|--------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| First permit | £13.20 | | | |
| Second permit | £17.25 | £71.05 | | |
| Third and subsequent permits £76.15 | | Maximum of 2 permits per business | | |
| Permits for visitors are available at £5.10 for 10 scratch cards | | | | |

NOTE

Please note that the Council cannot designate individual streets for permits without providing bays, allocate bays for individual people or premises or provide bays across dropped kerbs for new schemes (driveway accesses).

The use of any bay is on a first come first served basis. If the numbers of permits in circulation exceed the available number of bays on-street, then some users may have difficulty in finding a parking space.

Blue Badge holders may park for up to 3 hours on a single or double yellow line unless a loading restriction is in operation.



Traffic & Engineering, StreetCare 01708 433704

PARK LANE AREA PARKING REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Please enter your name and address and answer each question so that we can accurately assess local views on parking issues in the area.

| Name: | Date: |
|----------|----------|
| Address: | RESIDENT |

PART A – Residents views on the existing Controlled Parking Zone

1. If you are currently within the existing Controlled Parking Zone, please confirm if you would prefer your street to stay within the scheme or come out of the scheme.

| Stay in |
|----------|
| Come out |

2. If you are currently not within the existing Controlled Parking Zone, please confirm if you would like your street to join the scheme or remain out of the scheme.

| Join |
|------|
| |

|--|

PART B – Junctions, bends, crossings and access issues

3. Do you support double yellow lines being placed at junctions, on bends, past pedestrian refuges and where servicing/ fire fighting access is difficult

| Yes |
|-----|
| No |



Traffic & Engineering, StreetCare 01708 433704

PARK LANE AREA PARKING REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Please enter your name and address and answer each question so that we can accurately assess local views on parking issues in the area.

| Name: | Date: |
|----------|----------|
| Address: | BUSINESS |

PART A – Views of businesses within the parking review area

1. Do you consider it necessary for the Council to provide business parking permits within the area, which would operate during the same period as the Controlled Parking Zone?

Please note that highway space is limited and so only limited bays would be physically possible, should a scheme take place.

| 2. | Do you consider it necessary for the Council to provide time- |
|----|--|
| | limited or controlled parking outside or near your premises (where |
| | physically possible)? |

Options would be;

- short term parking (for example Parking for 1 or 2 hours, no return within 2 hours)
- or pay-and-display parking
- 3. Do you consider it necessary for the Council to provide loading bays near to your premises (where physically possible)?

A loading bay would allow loading for 20 minutes and operate either during the same period as the Controlled Parking Zone or 24 hours a day.

PART B – Junctions, bends, crossings and access issues

4. Do you support double yellow lines being placed at junctions, on bends, past pedestrian refuges and where servicing/ fire fighting access is difficult.

| Limited |
|-------------|
| Pay&Display |
| No |

🗋 Yes

No



| Yes |
|-----|
| No |

NOTE:

A Controlled Parking Zone is where residents' parking bays are provided in each road where they can be safely installed, with a yellow line restriction placed between bays.

Yellow line restrictions are placed within an area, preventing both residents and non residents from parking (other than blue badge holders who can park for up to 3 hours).

Provision is often made for local businesses with business parking bays operating within the same times as for residents' bays.

The current scheme is the RO3 part of the Romford Controlled Parking Zone which operates between 8:30am and 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. It is not currently proposed to change the times of operation.

COMMENTS

Please include any brief comments you may have directly relevant to on-street parking problems in your area.

QUESTIONAIRES SHOULD BE RETURNED BY FRIDAY 17th SEPTEMBER 2010

Please note that all questionnaires and comments received by the Council are open to public inspection and any scheme taken forward will be based on responses to this questionnaire.

Please make sure you include your address so that we can accurately analyse responses across the area so that any scheme taken forward is based on accurate information.

If a scheme is to be taken forward, then you will be consulted on detailed proposals and will have a further opportunity to comment before any decisions are taken.

Questionnaires should be sent to:

Traffic & Engineering

StreetCare 10th Floor London Borough of Havering Mercury House Mercury Gardens Romford RM1 3DW

You may also send responses either in text form or a scanned document to electronically to: highways@havering.gov.uk

APPENDIX II CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| RESIDENTS |
|-----------|
|-----------|

| | Part A - Question 1 | | | Part B Question 3 - DYLs | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|----|----------------------|
| Street | Stay in | Come out | No/Other View | Yes | No | No/ Other view |
| Benjamin Close | 2 | | | 2 | | |
| Brentwood Road | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Malvern Road | 9 | 8 | 1 | 17 | 2 | |
| Claremont Road | 5 | 7 | | 10 | 2 | |
| Globe Road (in CPZ) | 11 | 5 | | 13 | 1 | 2 |
| Anonymous | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 | | |

| | Part A - Question 2 | | | Part A - Question 3 | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------|----|----------------------|
| Street | Join | Not join | No/ Other View | Yes | No | No/ Other view |
| Norman Road | | 5 | | 4 | 1 | |
| Park Crescent | | 12 | | 10 | 2 | |
| Mendip Road | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 1 | |
| Maygreen Crescent | | 5 | | 1 | 4 | |
| Cheviot Road | | 6 | | 5 | 1 | |
| Bush Elms Road | | 20 | 1 | 17 | 4 | |
| Hillcrest Road | 5 | 32 | | 32 | 4 | 1 |
| Rossall Close | 4 | 6 | | 10 | | |
| Trustons Gardens | 1 | 4 | | 3 | 2 | |
| Globe Road (out CPZ) | | 10 | | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Clifton Road | 22 | 6 | | 24 | 4 | |
| Park Lane | 15 | 24 | 1 | 30 | 6 | 4 |
| Anonymous | 4 | 4 | | 8 | | |

BUSINESSES

| | Part A - Q1 Business Permits | | Part | A - Q2 Cor | trols |
|--------------|--|----|---------|------------|-------|
| Street | Yes | No | Limited | P&D | No |
| Park Lane | 4 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Malvern Road | 1 Response giving other parking issues | | | | |

| | Part A - Q3 Loading Bays | | | Part B Question 3 - DYLs | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|----|--------------------------|----|---------|
| Street | CPZ | 24 Hours | No | Yes | No | No view |
| Park Lane | 3 | | 9 | 7 | 5 | |





8 REPORT

[X]

[]

[]

[X]

[]

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

HUBBARDS CLOSE Possible road closure or restriction Outcome of residents'/ statutory authorities consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Principal Engineer 01708 433751 mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough Excellence in education and learning Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity Value and enhance the life of every individual High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax

SUMMARY

This report sets out the various comments received in response to a consultation with residents and statutory authorities on a request to close or restrict traffic using Hubbards Close in Emerson Park.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the responses and information set out in this report either;
 - (a) Agrees that a formal consultation and public advertisement for the closure of Hubbards Close at the limit of adoption is desirable, but the lack of funding available to the Head of StreetCare requires the deferral of the matter unless funding can identified in the future and the land ownership issue successfully resolved, with the land confirmed as public highway.
 - (b) Considers that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme as a closure is not appropriate.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £5,000 cannot currently be met from any Council budget.
- 3. That it be noted that until the specific land ownership issue has been resolved, the Council could not make a decision on the matter.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Council has been received complaints from residents of Hubbards Close and an Emerson Park ward councillor that traffic as been using Hubbards Close to bypass London-bound traffic queues on the A127 Southend Arterial Road to (it is assumed) access Wingletye Lane and beyond.
- 1.2 At its meeting of 13th July 2010, the Highways Advisory Committee noted that although funding for physical works was not current available, Staff should proceed with contacting residents within the area and statutory authorities for their views.
- 1.3 Drawing QJ053/102 sets out the various highway status issues. Hubbards Close is split into two sections; the western end fronting nos. 1 to 8 is adopted public highway. The eastern section from Rose Cottage to

Grasslands is unadopted carriageway. The section between Grasslands and the A127 Southend Arterial Road does not appear to have any particular designation, but it is considered to be public highway, being unadopted.

- 1.4 Staff have reviewed injury collision data for Hubbards Close (from the A127) and Hubbards Chase (to Wingletye Lane) and in the 3 years to May 2010, no injury collisions have been reported.
- 1.5 51 letters were hand-delivered to residents of Hubbards Close, Hubbards Chase and Southend Arterial Road and a letter was sent to each of the emergency services and Transport for London on 2nd August 2010, with a closing date for comments of 10th September. Drawing QJ053/101 gives an indication of the street addresses of respondents.

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 15 responses were received and are summarised in Appendix I of this report.
- 2.2 Transport for London confirmed no objection to the proposals.
- 2.3 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit confirmed that it had no preference either way, but did not see rat-running as a reason to close or restrict a road unless there are other safety issues associated with it. They confirmed they would not generally use the A127 end unless accessing a property as part of a call due to the unmade nature of the road.
- 2.4 The London Fire Brigade considers the condition of the road deterrent for rat-running, although the route could provide a closer access should there be an incident on A127; or if split attendance to an incident in the close itself, so continued access could prove beneficial.
- 2.5 Of the residents and businesses in the area, 9 supported a closure or restriction, one objected to a closure, one preferred a restriction rather than a closure (with a gate for residents) and one disputed the status of part of the land.

3.0 Staff Comments

3.1 The Council has powers to close or restrict a public highway, which does not necessarily have to be adopted by the Council. In terms of a closure in response to the current issues, it is often the practice to close a road with a gate with a fire brigade padlock, maintaining access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Council cannot provide individuals with authority for use of such a gate – this is reserved for the emergency services and the Council as highway authority.

- 3.2 In terms of restrictions, the Council has powers to restrict or prohibit types of traffic (such as weight limits, pedestrian areas, width restrictions etc). From experience, Staff would suggest that physical measures tend only to be features which are self-enforcing and therefore worth considering. In the case of a width restriction, there would always be a class of vehicle which can pass and therefore does not deal with the rat-running issues.
- 3.3 Notwithstanding the issues raised by the police and fire brigade, Staff suggest that the only practical and realistic proposal is to close the road (with access maintained for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles). The question is then one of location.
- 3.4 There is no clear consensus from residents on where the road could be closed. One option is at the end of the adopted section of Hubbards Close, one at the A127 end and one somewhere in the middle.
- 3.5 Operationally, the option at the end of the adopted section would make most sense as it would be within existing adopted highway and therefore easily checked by highways staff as part of routine maintenance inspections. Additionally it would be obvious to road users that it was a feature installed by the Council. Of course, the Council has powers to place features on any highway, adopted or not.
- 3.7 The Committee should be aware that funding is not identified for a closure scheme, but may wish to consider either a preferred treatment in case funding can be obtained in the future. The Committee will also note that there is no evidence of an injury collision problem in the street. Any scheme would require formal consultation and statutory advertisement.
- 3.8 The Committee should also be aware that a resident consultee has raised a matter relating to land-ownership at the A127 end of the road which would have to be resolved before any decisions could be taken.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

A road closure scheme would cost approximately £5,000, for which funding is not identified.

Legal implications and risks:

Road closures or traffic restrictions require a traffic order, consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

A specific issue of land ownership has been raised and therefore no decision can be taken by the Council until the matter is resolved.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

Road closures and restrictions can reduce the amount of traffic through a particular point or area to the benefit of residents and vulnerable road users, but as a consequence divert such traffic to other routes.

In this case, the A127 Southend Arterial Road is more appropriate and capable of taking through traffic than Hubbard Close.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project Scheme File Ref: QJ053 Hubbards Close Traffic

Drawings

QJ053/101 Hubbards Close Possible Closure – Street Layout Plan

QJ053/102 Hubbards Close Possible Closure – Adoption Status

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| Respondent | Comments |
|---|--|
| Thasan Muru Transport for London London Routes & Places Better Routes & Places | No objection to proposals. |
| PC Graham Harris Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit North East Sector | Police has no preference either way, but do not see rat-running as a reason to close or restrict a road unless there are other safety issues associated with it. |
| | Police would not generally use A127 end unless accessing a property as part of a call due to the unmade nature of the road. |
| Steve Smith London Fire Brigade Hornchurch Fire Station | Considers the condition of the road deterrent for rat-running, although route could provide a closer access for the LFB should there be an incident on A127; or if split attendance to an incident in the close itself, so continued access could prove beneficial. |
| | If a gate with a standard FB lock were provided, then LFB is not concerned either way. |
| Mrs Claxton Grasslands 306 Southend Arterial Road | At peak times lane is used by hundreds of vehicles to avoid congestion on A127. |
| | No objection to restricted access, feels that total closure is not a viable solution. |
| | Access to premises is via A127, so the restriction would need to be south of property so emergency vehicles would automatically come via A127 (cites personal circumstance). |
| Mr Pearson Rosary Southend Road | Comments disputing status of land. |
| Tracy Mackness Hubbards Chase Piggery | Would like the street restricted or closed because of fast and aggressive public. Concern that livestock is at risk. |

| Paul Tinslay Fortune Farm Southend Arterial Road | Does not consider traffic is any different than 25 years ago and strongly objects to closure. Feels a gate closed at busy periods could help, residents would not agree where to position gate. Would not want a gate at property as drive would be used to turn round. There is a history of violence in past when residents have tried to close the road. | |
|--|--|--|
| 2 Hubbards Close | Concerned about amount of traffic running through area from A127 starting early in the morning. Cites damage to vehicles and receiving parking tickets by parking out of the way. | |
| Paul Cantle 3 Hubbards Close | Agrees with closure and considers it should be placed at the end of the adopted section (first 8 houses). Comments on large vehicles and activities of other parts of the street. | |
| Derek Long 5 Hubbards Close | Agree with closure as road is used when A127 is congested and is concerned that an accident will occur. Suggests road is closed at A127 end. | |
| Margaret Laken 6 Hubbards Close | Does want Hubbards Close closed to prevent traffic using it as a cut through from A127. Does not mind where restriction is placed. | |
| Mr & Mrs Gibson 7 Hubbards Close | Agree with a decision to close the cut though from the A127.Concerns about road safety. | |
| Ms Botto 8 Hubbards Close | Agrees that there should be restricted access to Hubbards Close. (cites personal circumstance). | |

| Mark Smith No address given | Agree that road should be closed or at least physically restricted. | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | When there is a build up of traffic on A127, the Country Park Estate becomes a cut through. | |
| | Concerns about traffic speed and behaviour. | |
| T Calder No address given | In favour of scheme to stop hundreds of cars coming through the road, especially in the mornings (i.e. school run). | |

APPENDIX II

CONSULTATION LETTER



Bob Wenman Head of StreetCare

Culture & Community

London Borough of Havering 10th Floor, Mercury House Mercury Gardens Romford, RM1 3DW

Please call:Traffic & EngineeringTelephone:01708 433704Fax:01708 433721Email:highways@havering.gov.uk

My Ref: Your Ref:

2nd August 2010

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Resident/ Occupier

Hubbards Chase (part)

Emergency Services Transport for London

Hubbards Close

TRAFFIC IN HUBBARDS CLOSE

Some residents have requested that Hubbards Close be physically restricted or closed to prevent traffic using the street as a cut-through when the A127 Southend Arterial Road is congested.

In order to inform future decisions, the Council's Highways Advisory Committee has asked me to write to residents and businesses potentially affected any scheme in the future.

I should therefore be grateful if you would respond to this letter indicating whether or not you feel the street should be physically restricted or closed.

If you do feel restriction or closure is appropriate, please indicate where in the street you feel to be appropriate. The views of residents and businesses will then be reported to the committee at its meeting on 19th October (details of the meeting are on the reverse of this letter).

Any changes to the current regime will require the involvement and approval of the emergency services and Transport for London and their respective views are being sought.

You comments should be in writing to the address above or by email to highways@havering.gov.uk and be received by us no later than Friday 10th September 2010

Please note that all comments we receive are open to public inspection.

Yours faithfully,



Mark Philpotts CEng MICE MCIHT AIEMA Principal Engineer Traffic & Engineering

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010, 7:30pm Council Chamber Havering Town Hall Main Road, Romford, RM1 3BD







9 REPORT

[X]

[]

[]

[X]

[]

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

HILLFOOT ROAD Possible removal of width restriction Outcome of residents'/ statutory authorities consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Principal Engineer 01708 433751 mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough Excellence in education and learning Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity Value and enhance the life of every individual High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax

SUMMARY

This report sets out the various comments received in response to a consultation with residents and statutory authorities on a proposal to remove the existing width restriction at Hillfoot Road.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the responses and information set out in this report either;
 - (a) Agrees that the removal of the width restriction is desirable, but the lack of funding available to the Head of StreetCare requires the deferral of the matter unless and until funding can identified in the future.
 - (b) Considers that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme as the removal of the width restriction is not appropriate.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £6,000 for the removal of the scheme cannot currently be met from any Council budget.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The former North Romford Area Committee received a report at its meeting of 31st March 2009 setting out the background to the installation of a 7 feet (2.15 metre) width restriction in Hillfoot Road, near the junction with Collier Row Lane.
- 1.2 The report set out the background to the scheme with a conclusion that the feature had been in place for some time and notwithstanding a lack of funding for removal, has become part of the local highway network.
- 1.3 Further representations were made in objection to the scheme and the Committee agreed to consult views of residents and interested parties at its meeting of 13th July 2010 (Item 7, of the Scheme Applications Schedule).
- 1.4 On this basis, a consultation letter with background information was handdelivered to 201 residents and sent to interested parties on 2nd August 2010, with a closing date for comments of 10th September 2010. A copy of the letter is provided at the end of this report.

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 86 replies had been received by residents. In addition, a petition of 130 signatures was received objecting to the removal of the restriction. Responses were received from the Met. Police Traffic Unit, Met. Police SNT and the London Fire Brigade.
- 2.2 The comments from residents were generally divided amongst those who felt the scheme should remain because it had reduced the amount of larger vehicles driving through the area and those who felt it had created problems elsewhere. Views are summarised numerically as follows;

| Street | Keep Restriction | Remove Restriction |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Collier Row Lane | 1 | 0 |
| Hillfoot Avenue | 0 | 37 |
| Hillfoot Road | 33 | 1 |
| Hornden Road | 1 | 0 |
| No address given | 4 | 1 |
| Playfield Avenue | 0 | 8 |
| Totals | 39 (45%) | 47 (55%) |

- 2.3 The response from the Met. Police Traffic Unit that they were not aware of any issues with the restriction in relation to the police, but would seek organisation the views of the Safer Neighbourhood Team. If the restriction were removed, there would eventually be complaints about rat running. If there is a real safety issue where the Fire Brigade and Ambulance Service are concerned, the Police would not object to removal, but if not could not see a reason to remove it.
- 2.4 The Met. Police SNT reported that their staff had spoken to residents in the area (mainly Hillfoot Road) and the majority felt the restriction should remain.
- 2.5 The London Fire Brigade commented that if the restriction were to be removed, it would assist with access and possibly response times as the restriction would have an affect.
- 2.6 The London Ambulance Services did not respond to the consultation, despite Staff sending a further request for a response.

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 The original scheme prompted some controversy, but a decision was taken at the time on the advice given. The Committee may wish to consider that the width restriction is now an established and permanent part of the local highway network and the matter should be brought to a conclusion.
- 3.2 Conversely, if the Committee considers local demand to be so compelling as to require changes, it would be entirely dependent on funding becoming available and there is none currently identified.
- 3.3 The London Fire Brigade and London Ambulance Service are physically affected by the restriction. The LFB has indicated potential issues whereby the restriction would add to response times. The Police will support the other two services, but suggest removal will likely lead to complaints about rat running.
- 3.4 Staff would further comment that if the restriction were removed, then it is entirely possible that more, larger vehicles may start to drive through the area.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost for the removal of the width restriction associated lit traffic signs and reinstatements is £6,000, for which funding is not identified.

Legal implications and risks:

The removal of the width restriction would require the advertisement of the restriction Traffic Order being rescinded.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

The width restriction was designed as part of a package of measures designed to improve road safety in the local area and to discourage through traffic.

Notwithstanding the concerns of objectors to the restriction, its removal is likely to affect people benefiting directly from the presence of the restriction and the wider area should larger vehicles return.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project Scheme File Ref: QJ052 Hillfoot Road Width Restriction



Bob Wenman Head of StreetCare

Culture & Community London Borough of Havering 10th Floor, Mercury House Mercury Gardens Romford, RM1 3DW

Please call:Traffic & EngineeringTelephone:01708 433704Fax:01708 433721Email:highways@havering.gov.uk

My Ref: Your Ref:

2nd August 2010

Dear Sir or Madam,

Emergency Services

The Resident/ Occupier

Playfield Avenue (part) Collier Row Lane (part)

Hillfoot Avenue

Hillfoot Road

HILLFOOT ROAD WIDTH RESTRICTION - POSSIBLE REMOVAL

Some residents have requested that the width restriction on Hillfoot Road, near the junction with Collier Row Lane be removed and therefore the junction would be open to all traffic.

In order to inform future decisions, the Council's Highways Advisory Committee has asked me to write to residents potentially affected by the removal of the restriction.

I should therefore be grateful if you would respond to this letter indicating where you would like the restriction to remain or not and with brief reasons either way. The views of residents will then be reported to the committee at its meeting on 19th October.

Some background to the original scheme is on the reverse of this letter, along with details of the meeting of the committee where the outcome of this consultation will be discussed.

You comments should be in writing to the address above or by email to highways@havering.gov.uk and be received by us no later than Friday 10th September 2010

Please note that all comments we receive are open to public inspection.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Philpotts CEng MICE MCIHT AIEMA Principal Engineer Traffic & Engineering

Original Scheme Background

The North Romford Community Area Forum (CAF) considered a report at its meeting of 22nd March 2001 relating to traffic calming in the Hillfoot Road and Lawns Way areas.

The report included proposals for; a 7 feet (2.15 metre) width restriction in Hillfoot Road near its junction with Collier Row Lane; a mini-roundabout at the junction of Hillfoot Road and Mashiters Hill; bollards at various locations in Lawns Way to prevent vehicle over-run of footways; signs on Lawns Way warning of children crossing on both approaches to the junction with The Drive.

The proposal for the width restriction was subject to statutory advertisement and this took place on 11th May 2001 along with letters being delivered to residents in the area as well as the emergency services and other statutory consultees.

The matter of the width restriction was referred back to the North Romford CAF at its meeting of 13th September 2001 to deal with the outcome of the public consultation and advertisement of the proposal. Six replies were received from local residents, all objecting to the scheme as follows;

- There was concern that vehicles which could not pass through the width restriction would divert to Hillfoot Avenue.
- Concern about congestion in Hillfoot Road in peak periods due to parked vehicles.
- Delivery vehicles would have to turn round in Hillfoot Road after visiting premises.
- Ambulances and fire engines would be prevented from gaining access.
- Certain residents had vehicles larger than the width restriction so they would be inconvenienced.

Staff advice at the time was as follows;

- Larger vehicles may divert but the diversion route would be longer and would help to reduce through trips made by larger vehicles.
- The width restriction would be set back from the junction and deter obstructive parking.
- Any deliveries affected had other junctions where they could turn around.
- Emergency services would be able to access the restriction using lockable bollards.
- There would be inconvenience to some local residents with vehicles of a width greater than the restriction.

Based on the above, the Area Forum was invited through the formal Recommendations to decide whether or not the width restriction should be implemented and to this end, it resolved to proceed with installation.

Highways Advisory Committee 19th October 2010, 7:30pm Council Chamber Havering Town Hall Main Road, Romford, RM1 3BD This page is deliberately left blank


10 REPORT

[X]

[]

[]

[X]

[]

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

ST. EDWARD'S PRIMARY SCHOOL SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN & PARKING REVIEW Outcome of Public Consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Nicola Childs Engineer 01708 433704 Nicola.childs@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough Excellence in education and learning Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity Value and enhance the life of every individual High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax

SUMMARY

This report presents the views of those responding to the statutory advertisement and public consultation of various minor junction improvements and minor parking schemes in the area around St. Edwards Primary School, Romford.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the various schemes detailed in this report, Appendix I and shown on Drawings QF210/OA/101 to 134 be implemented, with the following exceptions;
 - QF210/OA/128-29 The proposed double yellow lines on the southwestern side of The Chase at its junction with Dorset Avenue be reduced in length to 10 metres.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing all of the schemes is £45,000, £10,000 of which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor Parking Schemes and £35,000 of which can be met from the 2010/11 Transport for London Local Implementation Plan allocation for School Travel Plans (St. Edward's Primary School).
- 3. The Committee considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement of the requests arising from the public consultation as set out in Appendix III, subject to comments put forward by the Committee.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Work began in 2009/2010 to review the St Edward's Primary School Travel Plan to improve pedestrian routes to school. Also, comments had been made by residents at a Gidea Park area Committee about problems caused by parking at junctions and so the opportunity was taken for a review.
- 1.2 It was also an opportunity to review the amount of on-street parking facilities in the area, which would benefit parents whose children attend St Edwards School and users of the Central Library.
- 1.3 The area in question is bounded by North Street, Parkside Avenue and Pettits Lane, down to Central Library, with St. Edward Primary School located on Havering Drive. The area is also subject to a 20mph Zone.

- 1.4 In terms of parking controls, the area is part of Sector 5 area of the Romford Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), operational 8:30am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. The zone has no residents' permit bays, but does contain some free parking bays scattered throughout the restricted area and some meter bays in roads closer to the town centre and the Court.
- 1.5 The School Travel Plan originally requested a zebra crossing on Pettits Lane, near Havering Drive. Unfortunately, a combination of vehicle speed and visibility meant the location was not suitable and other locations were away from the pedestrian desire line.
- 1.6 Therefore, walking routes from the main roads to the school were then reviewed for accessibility and pedestrian visibility, along with the various parking issues previously highlighted.
- 1.7 Proposals were developed which included a speed table at the junction of Mashiters Walk and Havering Drive; reduction of the size of the wide bellmouths at the junctions of Havering Drive with The Chase and McIntosh Road.
- 1.8 In addition, proposals were developed for restricting the junctions in the area with double yellow lines (generally for 10 metres on all arms, but some longer) and changes to the on-street paid parking bays near Central Library and the school.
- 1.9 A full list of the schemes and drawing references is contained within Appendix I.
- 1.10 The various proposals were advertised on 6th September 2010 with a closing date for comments being 27th September 2010. In addition some 600 letters were hand delivered to residents (with plans appropriate to their location) and the school (to hand to parents).

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of public consultation, 30 responses had been received (5% response rate).
- 2.2 Of those responding, 15 supported the scheme (many of these did not think the proposals went far enough to stop indiscriminate parking and made further suggestions), 11 objected to individual parts the scheme (related to parking) and 4 did not give a view but made further suggestions.

3.0 Staff Comments

3.1 Staff have commented on each response in Appendix II. Parking requests made by residents during the consultation are contained in Appendix III.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of implementing all of the schemes is £45,000, £10,000 of which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor Parking Schemes and £35,000 of which can be met from the 2010/11 Transport for London Local Implementation Plan allocation for School Travel Plans (St. Edward's Primary School).

Legal implications and risks:

Parking management schemes (including restrictions and bays) required consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Speed tables required consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

Parking restrictions at junctions and outside schools improves visibility for all road users and particularly assists vulnerable pedestrians. Pay & display and parking meter parking provides for short term parking.

Blue-badge holders are generally able to park for up to three hours on restricted areas (unless a loading ban is in force).

Loading can take place on restrictions (unless there is a loading ban in force), so long as there is evidence of the vehicle being loaded or unloaded.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project Scheme File Ref: QJ025 School Travel Plan St Edwards Primary.

APPENDIX I ST. EDWARD'S SCHOOL SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN & PARKING REVIEW MINOR JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS AND MINOR PARKING SCHEMES

For the purpose of this Appendix: the drawing number is **QF210.OA** followed by the scheme number shown in the table; Double Yellow Line is abbreviated to DYL and School Keep Clear is abbreviated to SKC.

| Existing road markings are not shown on drawings. | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Scheme number | Location | Description | |
| 101 | Parkside Ave nos. 1-5 | DYL on apex of bend across frontages | |
| 102-3 | Parkside Ave j/w | DYL for 15m on each arm of junction | |
| | Fontayne Ave | | |
| | Fontayne Ave no. 1 | DYL for 20m on apex of bend | |
| 104-5 | Fontayne Ave nos 53-55 | DYL for 20m on apex of bend | |
| | Parkside Ave j/w Fontayne Ave | DYL for 15m around junction | |
| 106-7 | Pettits Ln j/w Pettits Cl | DYL for 15m on each arm of junction | |
| | Pettits Ln j/w Parkside Ave | DYL for 15m on each arm of junction | |
| | Pettits Ln nos. 187 - 165 | DYL on both sides around pedestrian refuge | |
| 108-9 | Pettits Ln j/w Marshalls Dr | DYL for at least 15m on each arm of junction | |
| | Pettits Ln j/w Havering Dr | DYL for 15m on each arm of junction | |
| 110-11 | Park End Rd j/w Church Ln & Council car park | DYL for at least 8m on each arm of junction. 4 parking meter bays replaced with 5 pay & display bays. 2 new parking meter bays. | |
| | Park End Rd nos. 51- 53 | DYL for 20m on apex of bend | |
| 112-14 | Havering Dr j/w Park End Rd | DYL around junction & up to Roedean Dr. 4 parking meter bays replaced with 5 pay & display bays. | |
| | Havering Dr j/w Roedean Dr | DYL for 10m around junction and up to highway boundary | |
| | Havering Dr j/w Mashiters Walk | DYL for at least 15m around junction and 25.56m of SKC | |
| 115 | Havering Dr j/w The Chase | Reduce radius of southern kerb to 6.0m. Provide tactile paving. DYL for 15m around junction. | |
| | | | |

| Scheme | Location | Description |
|---------|------------------------|---|
| number | | |
| 116-17 | Havering Dr j/w | Reduce radius of southern kerb to 6.0m. |
| | McIntosh Rd | Provide tactile paving. |
| | | DYL for 15m around junction. |
| | Havering Dr j/w | Provide table across 4 arms of junction. |
| | Mashiters Walk | Provide tactile paving. |
| | | DYL for 15m around junction. |
| 118&121 | Oaklands Ave j/w | DYL for 15m around junction |
| | Mashiters Walk | |
| | Oaklands Ave j/w | DYL around junction and up to highway |
| | Dickens Way | boundary |
| 119-20 | Mashiters Walk | DYL for 20m on apex of bend |
| | nos. 21 & 23 | |
| | Mashiters Walk | DYL for 20m on apex of bend |
| | nos. 9 & 11 | |
| 122-23 | Park Dr j/w North St | DYL around junction for at least 15m, |
| | | extending to 2/4 Park Drive |
| | Park Dr j/w Dorset Ave | DYL for 20m on apex of bend |
| 124-25 | The Avenue j/w | DYL for 15m around junction |
| | North St | |
| | The Avenue j/w | DYL for 15m around junction |
| | Park Dr | |
| 126-27 | Seymer Road j/w | DYL for 15m (or to adjacent restriction) around |
| | North St | junction |
| | Seymer Rd j/w Fir | DYL for at least 10 around junction |
| | Tree CI & McIntosh Rd | |
| 128-29 | Dorset Ave j/w St | Single yellow lines return to back of highway |
| | Peter's Primary School | rather than across bell mouth |
| | Dorset Ave j/w the | DYL for 10m around junction and up to |
| | Chase | existing parking bay. *Advertised on southern |
| | | kerb of The Chase up to no. 2 The Chase* |
| 130-31 | McIntosh Rd j/w | DYL for 10m around junction |
| | Hill Grove | |
| | McIntosh Rd j/w | DYL for 10m around junction |
| | McIntosh Cl | |
| 132-33 | Mashiters Walk j/w | DYL for 10m around junction |
| | Marshalls Dri | |
| | Mashiters Walk j/w | DYL for 10m around junction |
| | Hill Grove | |
| 134 | McIntosh Rd j/w | DYL on southern kerb of McIntosh Rd from |
| | Dorset Ave & | existing DLY at Dorset Rd extending to south- |
| | Marshalls Dr | east kerb of Marshalls Dr |

APPENDIX II SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Letters along with plans of the proposals were hand delivered to all of the properties in the immediate area of the proposals.

For the purpose of this Appendix: the drawing number is **QF210.OA** followed by the scheme number shown in the table; Double Yellow Line is abbreviated to DYL and School Keep Clear is abbreviated to SKC.

Support for Scheme

| Scheme number | Address | Residents' Comments | Staff comments |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 101 | Parkside Avenue | Thinks it would be beneficial to have DYL on both sides of the road at the apex of the bend to add further deterrent to the existing single yellow line restriction. | The proposed DYL improves visibility around the bend. With DYL on both sides of the road, this may adversely affect drivers' speeds and further displace parking in a road in an area of the road where parking is at a premium. |
| 106-7 | 189 Pettits Lane | Thinks the restrictions at Pettits Lane/Parkside Avenue should be extended another 20m from the junction due to excessive vehicle speeds (traffic calming ineffective). | Further restrictions could be considered but will displace more parking. |
| 106-07 | 169 Pettits Lane | Wants DYL extended to cover property frontage. | Extending the restriction is possible however no other resident in this unrestricted area has made any comments on the proposals. Further restriction will displace more parking. See Appendix III |

| Scheme number | Address | Residents' Comments | Staff comments |
|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 110-11 | 49 Park End Road | Supports proposals but thinks they will only work with adequate enforcement. Does not believe the pay and display bays in Park End Road will work due to the amount of disabled parking. Considers making Park End Road one-way from Church Lane to Havering Drive to reduce traffic flow. | The proposal for a one-way Park End Road would potentially increase traffic speeds and increase traffic on adjoining roads. |
| 112-14 | St Edward's School | Would like a further restriction or road markings at end of proposed pay and display bays to maintain clear access to service entrance. | Area already covered by single yellow line operational 8.30am to 6.30pm. No other restriction is necessary. |
| 112-14 | 6 Havering Drive | Wants SKC (not DYL) extended to cover property frontage. Wants SKC road markings highlighted with red surfacing. | The area is already covered by a single yellow line. The purpose of SKC markings is not to keep properties clear of parked cars. This is an enforcement issue. Red surfacing is not appropriate. |
| 116-17 | 63 Havering Drive | Supports the proposals. As 61 Havering Drive, he would like to see the parking bay outside his house removed as vans continually park there, obscuring visibility when exiting their drive. If it cannot be removed, can it become a parking meter? | 61 and 63 Havering Drive outline the same parking problem due to the parking of light commercial vehicles. The bays could become parking meter bays operational 8.30am-6.30pm, however the purpose of free bays is to provide free daily parking for residents. |
| 128-29 | 89 Dorset Avenue | Supports scheme but concerned at loss of parking in The Chase and Dorset Avenue, especially due | Further parking provisions could be considered for the area. |

| | | to bus drivers who allegedly save spaces for each other. | |
|------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Scheme number | Address | Residents' Comments | Staff comments |
| 130-31 | 28 Hill Grove | Wants DYL at both junctions extended into Hill Grove along flank walls on one side to maintain access for larger vehicles. Concerns over emergency access. | Request can be accommodated but will displace more parking and the proposal will need further consideration and advertisement. |
| 130-31 | Address not supplied | Wants scheme to go further and address the problem of vehicles parking both sides of Hill Grove preventing large vehicles travelling along without damaging cars. Quoted Cedric Avenue where this problem had been resolved by staggered parking restrictions. | Such a scheme as in Cedric Avenue could be considered. |
| 134 | Address not supplied | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Avenue & Marshalls Drive as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive or Dorset Avenue. Feels it is dangerous exiting Marshalls Drive on McIntosh Road. Recent problems for Fire Engine accessing Marshalls Drive, and suggests that the existing restrictions be extended on one side of Marshalls Drive up to the sub station. | The current proposal is a balance between providing some parking for light commercial vehicles along a flank wall and maintaining visibility as much as possible. However to improve visibility for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive onto McIntosh Road, the existing DYL in McIntosh Road can be extended by 5m to include to include the speed cushions. Request can be accommodated but will displace more parking. |
| n/a | Address not supplied | Delighted with proposal: how quickly can it be carried out? | |
| n/a | 70 Dorset Avenue | Believes scheme will alleviate dangerous conditions for all. Has spoken to many other residents, the majority of who agree. | |

| n/a | 34 Oaklands Avenue | Thinks proposals should go further with DYL provided opposite all 'T' junctions. | Generally parking opposite junctions does not affect visibility for drivers and pedestrians negotiating the junction. |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|---|
| n/a | Address not supplied - email | In full agreement. | |

Objections to scheme

| Drawing | Address | Residents' Comment | |
|---------|------------------------|--|---|
| 104-05 | 192 Parkside Avenue | Objects to the scheme as it will cause difficulty when getting his disabled son in and out of a minibus. | Drivers are able to stop on restrictions to pick up and set down. Disable transport vehicles are legitimately allowed to load passengers. |
| 104-05 | 193 Parkside Avenue | Objects to loss of parking opposite his house. | Resident has off-street parking. |
| 106-7 | 1 Pettits Close | Does not believe there is a problem. Proposals will lead to more congestion in Pettits Lane. | Proposals will prevent congestion as the junction will be safer if no vehicles are parked close to it. |
| 119-20 | 23 Mashiters Walk | Proposed DYL on the apex outside her property would cause inconvenience. The apex is slight. | The resident already has off-street parking with space for more. There is also a tree on the apex which obscures visibility. |
| 124-25 | 15 The Avenue | Believes the proposals will force 'school run' parking into unrestricted areas increasing blocking of residents' private driveways. Thinks the Town Hall car park should be opened to those on the 'school run'. | This is an enforcement issue and will need to be monitored. |

| Drawing | Address | Residents' Comment | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|
| 128-29 | 64 Dorset Avenue | Proposal could increase vehicles trying to park between private drives in gaps too small for the vehicle. Comments that Council money could be better spent on road maintenance. | This is an enforcement issue and will need to be monitored. |
| 128-29 | 64 Dorset Avenue | Has objected to parking alterations in the past. This road is subjected to indiscriminate parking by parents and workers at the bus garage: her challenges to this have allegedly resulted in criminal damage to her car. Wants a tree across her drive to be relocated (at her expense) to be able to extend her drive. Objects to any further loss of parking around the junction of Dorset Avenue and The Chase. Suggests where parking bays could be installed throughout the existing SYL in Dorset Avenue (between 1-65 & 2-60). Also suggests where parking bays could be installed in The Chase. | Indiscriminate parking across driveways is a borough wide issue particularly around primary school sites. However enforcement is targeted at these locations to the best that resources permit. Further parking provisions could be considered for the area. |
| 128-29 | 82 Dorset Avenue | Fails to see the benefit of proposals as parents will continue park hoping parking enforcement do not appear. Wants resident parking permit scheme in Dorset Avenue enforced between 9.30 – 2.30 stopping commuters and bus drivers but allow school parking. | Enforcement is targeted at school sites to the best that resources permit. Further restrictions could be considered for the area. |
| 134 | 19 Marshalls Drive | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Avenue & Marshalls Drive as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive or Dorset Avenue. The | The current proposal is a balance between providing some parking for light commercial vehicles along a flank wall and maintaining visibility as much as possible. However to improve visibility for drivers exiting Marshalls |

| Drawing | Address | speed cushions are ineffective at slowing vehicles. Residents' Comments | Drive onto McIntosh Road, the existing DYL in McIntosh Road can be extended by 10m to include to include the speed cushions. Staff comments |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|
| 134 | 4 Marshalls Drive | Wants to see McIntosh restricted on both sides between Marshalls Drive and Dorset Avenue. Thinks the scheme is a waste of time as it does nothing to address issue of excessive speed which a problem in the area. | The current proposal is a balance between providing some parking for light commercial vehicles along a flank wall and maintaining visibility as much as possible. However to improve visibility for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive onto McIntosh Road, the existing DYL in McIntosh Road can be extended by 10m to include to include the speed cushions. Speed was not the subject of this report. |
| 134 | 77 Dorset Avenue | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Ave & Marshalls Dr as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Dr or Dorset Ave. Proposals will encourage drivers to speed along McIntosh Road. Feels it is dangerous exiting Marshalls Dr on McIntosh Rd and proposals will not change this. | The current proposal is a balance between providing some parking for light commercial vehicles along a flank wall and maintaining visibility as much as possible. However to improve visibility for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive onto McIntosh Road, the existing DYL in McIntosh Road can be extended by 10m to include to include the speed cushions. |

No view expressed but other comments made

| Drawing | Address | Residents' Comments | Staff comments |
|---------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 116-17 | 61 Havering Drive | Wants parking bay outside 61 & 63 Havering Drive removed as high-sided vehicles obscure visibility. | 61 and 63 Havering Drive outline the same parking problem due to the parking of light commercial vehicles, it is possible that further proposals be advertised to change the existing free parking bays to two parking meter bays, however this reduces residential parking. |
| 118&21 | 20 Oaklands Avenue | Concerned that parents cannot find anywhere to park due to commuters. Suggests more meter bays. | |
| 130-31 | Address not supplied – email | Complains of commuter parking in McIntosh Road. Could we consider single yellow line restrictions with 'no parking' between 11am and 12 noon to allow parents to drop off. | Further parking provisions could be considered for the area. |
| 130-31 | 23 McIntosh Road | Comments on how dangerous Marshalls Drive junction with McIntosh Road is with vans parking. Would like designated bays marked opposite 23-31 McIntosh Road. | Council does not provide designated parking bays in this situation. |

APPENDIX III PARKING REQUESTS ARISING FROM CONSULTATION

For the purpose of this Appendix: the drawing number is **QF210.OA** followed by the scheme number shown in the table; Double Yellow Line is abbreviated to DYL and School Keep Clear is abbreviated to SKC.

| Drawing | Location | Residents' Comments | Staff Recommendations |
|---------|----------------------|---|---|
| 106-7 | 189 Pettits Lane | Thinks the restrictions at Pettits Lane/Parkside Avenue should be extended another 20m into Parkside Avenue from the junction due to excessive vehicle speeds (traffic calming ineffective). | Implement scheme as advertised, then: Consider increasing the length of restriction but this will displace more residential parking. Engineer can asses the safety of this junction at school start and finish times. |
| 106-07 | 169 Pettits Lane | Wants DYL extended to cover property frontage. | Implement scheme as advertised, then: Consider increasing the length of restriction but this will displace more residential parking. |
| 116-17 | 61 Havering Drive | Wants parking bay outside 61 & 63 Havering Drive removed as high-sided vehicles obscure visibility. | Consider making this bay a parking meter operational 8.30am-6.30pm, however the purpose of free bays is to provide free daily parking for residents. |
| 116-17 | 63 Havering Drive | Supports the proposals. As 61 Havering Drive, he would like to see the parking bay outside his house removed as vans continually park there, obscuring visibility when exiting their drive. If it cannot be removed, can it become a parking meter? | As above. |

| Drawing | Location | Residents' Comments | Staff Recommendations |
|---------|---------------------|--|---|
| 128-29 | 89 Dorset Avenue | Supports scheme but concerned at loss of parking in The Chase and Dorset Avenue, especially due to bus drivers who allegedly save spaces for each other. | One of several comments regarding indiscriminate parking. Members to consider reviewing parking provision in the Chase, Dorset Ave, Seymer Rd and McIntosh Rd including consultation with Bus Garage. |
| 128-29 | 64 Dorset Avenue | Has objected to parking alterations in the past. This road is subjected to indiscriminate parking by parents and workers at the bus garage: her challenges to this have allegedly resulted in criminal damage to her car. Wants a tree across her drive to be relocated (at her expense) to be able to extend her drive. Objects to any further loss of parking around the junction of Dorset Avenue and The Chase. Suggests where parking bays could be installed throughout the existing SYL in Dorset Avenue (between 1-65 & 2-60). Also suggests where parking bays could be installed in The Chase. | Indiscriminate parking across driveways is a borough wide issue particularly around primary school sites. However enforcement is targeted at these locations to the best that resources permit. Members to consider reviewing parking provision in the Chase, Dorset Ave, Seymer Rd and McIntosh Rd including consultation with Bus Garage. |
| 128-29 | 82 Dorset Avenue | Fails to see the benefit of proposals as parents will continue park hoping parking enforcement do not appear. Wants resident parking permit scheme in Dorset Avenue enforced between 9.30 – 2.30 stopping commuters and bus drivers but allow school parking. | As above |

| Drawing | Location | Residents' Comments | Staff Recommendations |
|---------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 130-31 | 28 Hill Grove | Wants DYL at both junctions extended into Hill Grove along flank walls on one side to maintain | Implement scheme as advertised, then: Consider investigating whether to increase |
| | | access for larger vehicles. Concerns over emergency access. | restrictions, however no complaints have been received from emergency services. |
| 130-31 | Address not supplied | Wants scheme to go further and address the problem of vehicles parking both sides of Hill Grove preventing large vehicles travelling along without damaging cars. Quoted Cedric Avenue where this problem had been resolved by staggered parking restrictions. | As above. Consider a staggered parking scheme as in Cedric Avenue but this will significantly reduce amount of on-street parking. |
| 130-31 | Address not supplied – email | Complains of commuter parking in McIntosh Road. Could we consider single yellow line restrictions with 'no parking' between 11am and 12 noon to allow parents to drop off. | Members to consider reviewing parking provision in the Chase, Dorset Ave, Seymer Rd and McIntosh Rd including consultation with Bus Garage. |
| 134 | Address not suppled | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Avenue & Marshalls Drive as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive or Dorset Avenue. Feels it is dangerous exiting Marshalls Drive on McIntosh Road. Recent problems for Fire Engine accessing Marshalls Drive, and suggests that the existing restrictions be extended on one side of Marshalls Drive up to the sub station. | Implement scheme as advertised, then: Advertise to extend the existing DYL on the northern kerb of McIntosh Rd a further 10m. This provides more visibility at Marshalls Drive whilst still leaving some on-street parking. Leaving some parking may discourage drivers from speeding along an empty road. |

| Drawing | Location | Residents' Comments | Staff Recommendations |
|---------|--------------------------|---|--|
| 134 | 19 Marshalls Drive | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Avenue & Marshalls Drive as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive or Dorset Avenue. The speed cushions are ineffective at slowing vehicles. | As above. |
| 134 | 4 Marshalls Drive | Wants to see McIntosh restricted on both sides between Marshalls Drive and Dorset Avenue. Thinks the scheme is a waste of time as it does nothing to address issue of excessive speed which a problem in the area. | As above. Speed was not the subject of this report. |
| 134 | 77 Dorset Avenue | Wants the DYL extended in McIntosh Road on both sides between the junctions of Dorset Avenue & Marshalls Drive as vans park along flank wall narrowing road and obscuring sight lines for drivers exiting Marshalls Drive or Dorset Avenue. Proposals will encourage drivers to speed along McIntosh Road. Feels it is dangerous exiting Marshalls Drive on McIntosh Road and proposals will not change this. | As above. |



| DRAWN BY CHECKED BY APPROVED BY NC MP MP SCALE DATE MP NTS Aug 2010 M ACAD REF: • DRAWING No REVISION Sheet Size: A3 (297x420) QF210.0A.100 A | | Park Area nd Junctions Review | REVISION AMENDMENT DATE | | 01 Junction reference number | NOTES | Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Wojesty's Stationery Office © Croem copyright. Unauthorised reproduction intringes Croem copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Barough of Havering 1000/24327 | ngs to StreetCare C the whole nor any p 1. | PURPOSE Feasibility |
|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------|---|--|---------------------|

| | | 1-1 | \prod | | | T | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|--|------------------------|
| | | | F | T | | | | |
| | 5.00 | C | | | | | | |
| | | 130 | T | | | | | |
| 15.00 | | 0 | , | | 7 | _ | | |
| PETTITS CLOSE | 15.00 | | | | t0 | Grea | at Pettits Court | |
| PEIN | | J | | | X | J 30 | 1 07 6 1 07 2 1 | |
| tr the the | | 6 | \square | (E | 18 | 07 5 P | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | 5.00 | | U | | | | |
| LI H | | | $\left \right $ | | | | | |
| 21 UENUE | 15.00 | | | \setminus | • | | | |
| PARKSIDE AVENUE | × | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| TA | 10 | | | | | | | $\left(\zeta \right)$ |
| 1 V61 | I | | | | | | | |
| | | 7 | Ň | | | | | |
| | | S | La La | | | | | |
| | | F | |) \ | \backslash | | TAT | |
| | | 1 | $\overline{\langle}$ | \sum | | PETITS | | |
| t a t | | | X | | | | | |
| A A A | | | | | } | | F. 1 18.30 | |
| 10.00 | \neg | | L | H. | 132 132 | ł | | |
| | $\left \right $ | | | 1 | | 24 | | |
| | PURPOSE ©COPYRIGHT | I | easibility | | | | Proposed 'at any time' waiting matrixitian (double wallow line) | |
| JoB πιε Marshalls Park Area | written permission. | | | | | All dim | restriction (double yellow line) nensions are in metres | |
| Schools & Junctions Review DRAWING TITLE Proposed Parking Restrictions | | CHECKED B | | APPROVED E | | NOT AL | LL EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS ARE | SHOWN |
| Proposed Parking Restrictions Pettits Lane 6, 7 & 7a scale (AT A4 SIZE) DATE 1:750 June 2010 DRAFT | | IH | DRAWING N | MP | REVISION | REVISION | AMENDMENT | DATE |

| | \sim | | \checkmark | | | | | $\langle \langle \rangle$ | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| $ $ $\rightarrow /$ \rightarrow | \sim | | | | | | | \setminus X | X. |
| | | | | 、 、 | | | | \rightarrow / \setminus | |
| | | | | $\overline{\}$ | | | | | \times |
| | Ν | $ \land \land$ | | | | | \sim | $\langle / / \rangle \rangle$ | $^{\prime}$ $^{\prime}$ |
| | | \backslash | | | | | $\langle \rangle$ | \sim | Λ |
| | | | | < | \sim | | \mathbf{X} | \sim | $\langle / $ |
| | | $\langle \rangle$ | \backslash | | | \backslash | | \land \land / | ΥI |
| | | \backslash | \backslash | | | | | $\land \land \lor$ | / |
| | | | | | | | \sim \sim / | $\backslash \backslash /$ | |
| | | | | \backslash | \sim | | \setminus X | | |
| | | | \backslash | \backslash | Ì | | $ \land / \land$ | $\langle $ | / |
| | | \backslash | \backslash | | | | | $ \setminus Y / /$ | |
| r I I | | | | | | | \mathbf{X} | X / / | |
| | | | | \mathbf{n} | \backslash | | \setminus / \setminus | | |
| | Ν | \nearrow | \ | \backslash | | | \sim | \checkmark / / | |
| | | | \backslash | | | \backslash | $// \searrow$ | \sim / / | |
| | | \setminus \setminus | | | | $\langle \rangle$ | $\langle / \rangle $ | Y / | $/ \Lambda$ |
| | | \backslash | | | < | λ | / X | | / / |
| | | \backslash | \setminus | ` | \backslash | $\setminus X$ | $\langle \rangle$ | $\langle $ | |
| 4 | | | | \backslash | | λ | \setminus / | | $\langle \rangle$ |
| | \ | \ | \ | \backslash | \setminus | $/ \setminus$ | / / | ' | \searrow |
| | / | | \backslash | \backslash | | ۲ Ì | $\setminus \times /$ | | \square |
| | | l l | \sim | $\langle \rangle$ | | $\backslash \neg$ | $\vee \setminus /$ | | $/ \mathbb{N}$ |
| | | <u>,</u> | \wedge | $\backslash \nearrow$ | 、 、 | \setminus | \rightarrow \setminus / | ' /人 / | / |
| N 6 8 | | \land | \nearrow | | \ F | | <pre>/ / /</pre> | / / X | |
| | | $ \rangle $ | | \backslash | $\langle \rangle$ | \sim | | | $\overline{}$ |
| | | | | 1 | \mathcal{X} | \ | | // | \searrow |
| | | Ч | | \> | / \ | \ | \setminus / / | | |
| 0 | | | ~ | \mathbf{X} | | \backslash | \vee / | $ \land \land$ | $\langle / $ |
| | | | | $^{\prime}$ | 、 、 | \backslash | | $// \times$ | \times |
| | | | | | \backslash | $\langle \rangle$ | / X / | | $^{\prime}$ $^{\prime}$ |
| | | F | | | | У | | \land \land \land | |
| | | \ | | | | | // ` / / | $' \setminus \setminus $ | $\langle $ |
| | | \ | | | | | / // | | \sim |
| | | | 1 | | | | | \land | Y |
| | | | | | | 1 | | $/$ \setminus \setminus | |
| | | | \ | | | | | | |
| PARKSIDE AVENU | _ | | ۱. | | | | | \setminus / \setminus | $\langle $ |
| | | | | | | | $\langle \rangle \langle \rangle$ | | |
| | | | | | | | $1 \setminus \vee \setminus$ | \wedge | 1 |
| | | | | | | T | | \times / \setminus | |
| | | | | | | | \land | | |
| | | | | | | | | $\langle \rangle$ | $\langle $ |
| | | | ΖΤ | | | 0 | - | $\mathbf{\lambda}$ | \sim |
| | λ | | - | | | 8 | | $5 \times $ | ۲ I |
| h / | | | | | | | 19 | $\diamond \setminus \setminus$ | |
| | | | - | | | | 108 1 | | |
| | | $\lambda \vdash$ | | | | | | | |
| | | $\backslash \square$ | | | | 1 | | | $\overline{}$ |
| | | \setminus | \ | | | | | | |
| | | λ | ١ | ۱ I | | | | T | |
| | | $^{\prime}$ | | \setminus | | | | \backslash | |
| | | | \backslash | | | | | | |
| h | | | $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ | \ | | | | | |
| | | | \backslash | \ | 1 | | | \backslash | |
| | / | | | | | | | | |
| | | | λ | | | | 1 | \backslash | $//\lambda$ |
| | | | | \setminus | | | | \land / | // |
| | / | / | • | \setminus | | | | \land // | |
| | | | | <u>۱</u> | 1 | | 1 | | · I |
| | · · · | | | λ | | | | \sim / / | ′ |
| | / | | / | \mathcal{A} | | | | $\langle //$ | ´ |
| | | | | X | | | | X// | Í |
| | | / | | Y | | | | | |
| | | | | ł | | | | | |
| | PURPOSE | | eqsibility | | | | | | |
| | PURPOSE COPYRIGHT | | easibility | | | | | any time' waiting | |
| STREETCARE - CULTURE & COMMUNITY E-MAIL: streetcare@havering.gov.uk | PURPOSE ©COPYRIGHT This drawing belongs to Sto Section, Neither the whole | | | | ngineering | | | any time' waiting ouble yellow line) | |
| | Section. Neither the whole written permission. | eetCare Cultur nor any part t | re & Commun thereof may t | nity, Traffic & Ei be reproduced w | | | restriction (d | ouble yellow line) 🔾 | |
| JOB TITLE Marshalls Park Area | Section. Neither the whole written permission. | eetCare Cultur nor any part t | re & Commun thereof may t | nity, Traffic & Ei be reproduced w | | | | ouble yellow line) 🔾 | |
| Job TTLE Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review | Section. Neither the whole written permission. | eetCare Cultur nor any part t | re & Commun thereof may t | nity, Traffic & Ei be reproduced w | | All dim | restriction (d ensions are in me | ouble yellow line) tres | |
| JOB TITLE Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review DRAWING TITLE | Section. Neither the whole | eetCare Cultur nor any part t | re & Commun thereof may t | hity, Traffic & El be reproduced w sion of the Con nuthorised reproc n or civil procee | troller of Juction dings. | All dim | restriction (d ensions are in me | ouble yellow line) 🔾 | |
| JOB TITLE Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review DRAWING TITLE | Section. Neither the whole written permission. Based upon Ordinance Survy Her Majesty's Stationery Off infringes Crown copyright a London Borough of Haverin DRAWN BY | eetCare Cultur nor any part f ice © Crown a nd may lead t g 100024327 CHECKED E | re & Commun thereof may t th the permiss copyright. Una to prosecution | hity, Traffic & El be reproduced w sion of the Con withorised reproc or civil procee | troller of Juction dings. | All dim | restriction (d ensions are in me | ouble yellow line) tres | |
| Job TTLE Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review DRAWING TTLE Proposed Parking Restrictions Parkside Avenue site 1 | Section. Neither the whole written permission. Based upon Ordnance Survy Her Majesty's Stationery Of infringes Crown copyright a London Borough of Haverin DRAWN BY NC | eetCare Cultur nor any part f ice © Crown of a 100024327 CHECKED E | re & Commun thereof may b copyright. Una to prosecution BY | hity, Traffic & El be reproduced w sion of the Con nuthorised reproc or civil procee APPROVED I MP | troller of Juction dings. BY | All dim | restriction (d ensions are in me | ouble yellow line) tres | |
| Job TTLE Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review DRAWING TTLE Proposed Parking Restrictions Parkside Avenue site 1 SCALE (AT A4 SIZE) DATE | Section. Neither the whole written permission. Based upon Ordinance Survy Her Majesty's Stationery Off infringes Crown copyright a London Borough of Haverin DRAWN BY | eetCare Cultur nor any part t ice © Crown o nd may lead t g 100024327 CHECKED E | re & Commun thereof may b th the permiss copyright. Una to prosecution BY DRAWING N | hity, Traffic & El be reproduced w sion of the Con nuthorised reproc or civil procee APPROVED I MP | troller of Juction dings. | All dim | restriction (d ensions are in me | ouble yellow line) tres | |









- - -









(0010 1105 10 UP 1 0





 $X = \{ e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \}$

o. −•``

~ . . .

| 10.00 10.00 Start of existing |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Start of existing |
| |
| 14.60 parking bay |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| THE CHASE |
| $\left / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /$ |
| $ \forall \downarrow \forall \downarrow \downarrow$ |
| $ / \times / $ |
| $ \langle X \rangle / \langle S \rangle / \langle X \rangle \rangle \langle X \rangle \rangle / \langle X \rangle / $ |
| |
| $\begin{tabular}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ |
| |
| |
| |
| Existing School Keep Clear sign |
| |
| term time to be removed. Change to operational |
| 8.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Havering |
| Image: Control of the control of th |
| We floor depart roots We floor depart roots Biter Code - Code Mindry Not mile Proposed 'at any time' waiting restriction (double yellow line) Strettore - Code and the e code water of the of any port thereof mg be reprodued without pro- |
| Image: Contract Area Schools & Junctions Review PURPOSE feasibility Image: Contract Area Schools & Junctions Review PURPOSE feasibility |
| We Havering Image: Statution of the stock of a computer status and of the stock of a computer stock of a computer status and of the stock of a computer stock of a |
| We Havering Image: Statution of the stock of a computer status and of the stock of a computer stock of a computer status and of the stock of a computer stock of a |
| With Havering Internet a construction of the production |



- · · ~**TC** (100 - - - -

| | | | TV | 1-1 | | |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------|---|---------------|
| | | 5 | LT | 201 | | |
| | L \IF | | | | PARKSIDE AVE | NUT |
| | | | | | I SIDE AVE | |
| | 7/~ 1 | | | | PARKSI | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| $X \setminus $ | | | 15.00 | | | |
| | | | | | A | |
| UENUE . | 15.00 | | | ١ | | |
| CIDE AVE' | | | | _ | 761 | |
| PARKSIDE AVENUE | | 15.00 | | 261 | | |
| | | | $\langle \rangle \rangle \langle \rangle$ | 00 | | |
| | 1 | | | , | | |
| 1 100 | 5 \ \ | | | L-J | | |
| | | $ $ Z | TAXNE AVENUE | | | |
| | 11 | | $Z \setminus $ | | | |
| | | | \ \ \ \ | | | |
| | | | $\setminus \nabla \setminus$ | \setminus | | |
| | | | | | | |
| $ \rangle \rangle$ | \vdash | | 1Z1 | $\langle \rangle$ | | \setminus |
| | | | | \setminus | | |
| | | $\overline{)}$ | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| \land | | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | \searrow / | | | 11 | | |
| | | 1 557 | | 10.00 | | |
| \mathbb{X} | لم . | | | | | |
| | \setminus / | | \rightarrow | | | |
| $ \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle $ | \checkmark | | | / / | | |
| | | | | 10.00 | | |
| | $\langle \rangle$ | / | | | | |
| | \rightarrow \setminus | | / / | | | |
| \land | | | | $\langle \rangle$ | \rightarrow | |
| | \land | | | \backslash | | |
| | \rightarrow / | / | | \wedge | $\langle \langle \rangle \rangle$ | |
| $ \land \land$ | | | $/ \setminus$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | |
| | PURPOSE | feasibility | , X | 0 | | |
| | ©COPYRIGHT This drawing belongs to Street | | | | Proposed 'at any time' waiting restriction (double yellow line) | $/ \rangle $ |
| JOB TITLE | written permission. | | | All dim | iensions are in metres | |
| Marshalls Park Area Schools & Junctions Review | Based upon Ordnance Survey Her Majesty's Stationery Office infringes Crown copyright and London Borough of Havering 1 | Mapping with the permis © Crown copyright. Une may lead to prosecution | sion of the Controller of authorised reproduction n or civil proceedings. | | | |
| DRAWING TITLE | L | 00024327 | APPROVED BY | NOT AL | L EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS ARE S | HOWN |
| Proposed Parking Restrictions Fontayne Ave 4 & Parkside Ave 5 | NC II | ۱ . | MP | | | |
| scale (at a4 size) date DRAFT 1:500 June 2010 ISSUE | ACAD REF: Sheet Size: A4 (210x297 | DRAWING 7) QF210. | n₀ revision OA.104-5 A | REVISION | AMENDMENT | DATE |








11 REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

SOUTH HORNCHURCH AND RAINHAM MINOR PARKING SCHEMES Outcome of public consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts Principal Engineer 01708 433751 mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough[X]Excellence in education and learning[]Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity[]Value and enhance the life of every individual[X]High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax[]

SUMMARY

This report presents the views of those responding to the statutory advertisement and public consultation of various minor parking schemes in the South Hornchurch and Rainham area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the representations made for each scheme or group of schemes as set out in Appendix II to this report decides either;
 - (a) To recommend to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the scheme or groups of schemes be implemented; or
 - (b) The scheme or groups of schemes be rejected.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing all of the schemes is £7,500 which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor Parking Schemes.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Head of StreetCare in consultation with the Chairman of the South Hornchurch Area Committee agreed that a series of minor parking schemes should be subject to statutory advertisement and public consultation. This was recorded as Decision 10/65.
- 1.2 The Decision followed a meeting of members of the South Hornchurch & Rainham Area Committee and Principal Engineer of the Traffic & Engineering Section of StreetCare on 21st January 2010 to review the current list of requests for minor parking schemes in the South Hornchurch & Rainham Area.
- 1.3 The details of the various schemes are set out in Appendix I to this report, along with drawing references.
- 1.4 Letters were hand-delivered to those potentially affected in early June 2010, with the closing date for comments being late June (letters were delivered over several dates, with commensurate closing dates).

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

2.1 The responses received to each scheme or group of schemes are summarised in Appendix II to this report.

3.0 Staff Comments

3.1 The various requests were agreed by the South Hornchurch & Rainham Members as local priorities. Staff have commented on each set of responses in Appendix II, but the Committee will need to balance safety, access and the ability to park on-street for many items.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of £7,500 can be met from the Council's 2010/11 revenue budget for Parking Schemes.

Legal implications and risks:

Parking management schemes (including restrictions and bays) require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may be detrimental to others.

Parking restrictions at junctions are designed to assist with vehicular access and to improve the intervisibility between pedestrians and drivers.

Short term parking bays near businesses are designed to promote a turnover of available parking for shoppers.

Blue-badge holders are able to park with an unlimited time in parking bays and up to three hours on restricted areas (unless a loading ban is in force).

There will be some visual impact, due to the required signing and road markings.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project File: QF210 South Hornchurch and Rainham Minor Parking Schemes

APPENDIX I MINOR PARKING SCHEMES SOUTH HORNCHURCH AND RAINHAM

| Location | Description | Drawing Reference |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Brookway/ Penerley Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/08 |
| Elmer Gardens | Double yellow lines around bend at northern end of street and turning and by school pedestrian access outside no.75 | QF210/SHR/10 |
| Wennington Road/ Ingrebourne Road Brookway/ Lambs Lane South | Double yellow lines around 5 arm junction, extending along Wennington Road to cover pedestrian refuge outside no.190 and pinch point outside no.215 (east side only). To maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/48 |
| Ford Lane | Double yellow lines on north side between existing sections between Rainham Road and opposite no.103. To maintain access on street. | QF210/SHR/50 |
| Frederick Road and Manser Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. To maintain access on street. | QF210/SHR/52 |
| A1306 New Road/ South Street | Existing double yellow lines on west side of South Street extended to total of 53m into South Street. To maintain access on street. | QF210/SHR/53 |
| A1306 New Road/ Walden Avenue | Existing double yellow lines on west side of Walden Avenue extended to total of 57m into Walden Avenue | QF210/SHR/53 |
| Walden Avenue/ Queens Gardens | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/53 |
| Wennington Road | Double yellow lines, both sides of the street from Wennington Fire Station to start of rural clearway to the east, on approach to A1306 New Road To help fire brigade access, especially to A1306. | QF210/SHR/54 |

| Location | Description | Drawing Reference |
|--|---|---|
| Palliser Drive | Single yellow line, whole street, in force Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 9:30am. To stop all day commuter parking. | QF210/SHR/55 |
| Palliser Drive/ Ellis Avenue/ Wilfred Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/55 |
| South End Road/ Jersey Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/57 |
| South End Road/ St. John's Close | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/57 |
| South End Road/ Princes Park | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/57 |
| South End Road outside Albyn's Court | Double yellow lines across Albyn's Court Access. Time limited parking in layby outside Albyn's Court, 3 hours parking, no return within 4 hours, Monday to Saturday | QF210/SHR/57 |
| South End Road Layby outside 166 | 8:30am to 6:30pm Time limited parking in layby 2 hours parking, no return within 4 hours, Monday | QF210/SHR/58 |
| to 174 South End Road/ Guysfield Drive | to Saturday 8:30am to 6:30pm Double yellow lines around junction, extending north to boundary of nos.122/124 (east side) and 15 metres either side of the boundary of nos.85/87 (west side) through pedestrian refuge. | QF210/SHR/58 |
| Wennington Road | Single yellow line on northeast side of street from boundary of nos.208/210 to a point 10 metres south of the southeastern kerbline of Eastwood Drive (excluding the existing zebra crossing outside Brady School). | QF210/SHR/59-01 & QF210/SHR/59-02 |
| | Request from school and London Buses to keep Wennington Road clear at school journey times. | |

| Location | Description | Drawing Reference |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Wennington Road/ Eastwood Drive | Double yellow lines around junction, extending to boundary of nos.290/292 Wennington Road (southwestern side) to cover pinch point. | QF210/SHR/59-02 |
| Upminster Road South/ Pinewood Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Cloister Close | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Martin Drive | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Waverley Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Brights Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Sunningdale Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road South/ Grangewood Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/60 |
| Upminster Road North/ Parsonage Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ Westlyn Close | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ Allen Road | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |

| Location | Description | Drawing Reference |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Upminster Road North/ Lambs Lane North | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ Briscoe Road | Modify double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ King Edward Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ Maclennan Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/61 |
| Upminster Road North/ Fairview Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/62 |
| Upminster Road North/ Acer Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/62 |
| Upminster Road North/ Lake Avenue | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/62 |
| Upminster Road North/ Greenacres Close | Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. | QF210/SHR/62 |

APPENDIX II OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Brookway/ Penerley Road, QF210/SHR/08

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that scheme be implemented.

Elmer Gardens, QF210/SHR/10

Double yellow lines around bend at northern end of street and turning and by school pedestrian access outside no.75

6 responses of objection because of lack of local parking and pressure scheme will have on on-street parking.

Staff comments

The proposals were designed to keep the area open for access, especially at school times when the road is congested.

The Committee will need to balance safety, access and parking.

Wennington Road/ Ingrebourne Road & Brookway/ Lambs Lane South QF210/SHR/48

Double yellow lines around the 5 arm junction, extending along Wennington Road to cover pedestrian refuge outside no.190 and pinch point outside no.215 (east side only). To maintain access and visibility.

Wennington Road, QF210/SHR/59-01 & QF210/SHR/59-02

Single yellow line on northeast side of street from boundary of nos.208/210 to a point 10 metres south of the southeastern kerbline of Eastwood Drive (excluding the existing zebra crossing outside Brady School).

Request from school and London Buses to keep Wennington Road clear at school journey times.

Wennington Road/ Eastwood Drive, QF210/SHR/59-02

Double yellow lines around junction, extending to boundary of nos.290/292 Wennington Road (southwestern side) to cover pinch point.

12 responses (as a whole to all three proposals). 9 objecting because of impact on local parking, 2 supporting (including Brady School) because of difficulty for traffic (especially buses) to pass. 1 response understanding the problems, but suggesting a car park is built in the sport centre grounds.

Staff comments

The proposals were designed to keep the section of road clear for passing traffic at school times. The extended restrictions at the junction of Wennington Road, Lambs Lane South, Ingrebourne Road etc were proposed to keep the various pedestrian crossing point clear so pedestrians (especially children travelling to Brady School and Chafford School) could see and be seen.

The Committee will need to balance safety, access and parking.

Ford Lane, QF210/SHR/50

Double yellow lines on north side between existing sections between Rainham Road and opposite no.103. To maintain access on street.

2 responses, 1 in support, 1 in objection. Both respondents concerned about where users of Brittons Park would park. The objector suggested that a larger car park should be provided.

Staff comments

The Committee will need to balance access and parking.

Frederick Road and Manser Road, QF210/SHR/52

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. To maintain access on street.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that scheme be implemented.

A1306 New Road/ South Street, QF210/SHR/53

Existing double yellow lines on west side of South Street extended to total of 53m into South Street. To maintain access on street.

1 response in support, with a suggestion the restrictions are extended.

Staff comments

Recommend that scheme be implemented.

A1306 New Road/ Walden Avenue, Existing double yellow lines on west side of Walden Avenue extended to total of 57m into Walden Avenue, QF210/SHR/53

A1306 New Road/ Walden Avenue, Existing double yellow lines on west side of Walden Avenue extended to total of 57m into Walden Avenue, QF210/SHR/53

1 response in objection, suggesting the matter is left until after the Mardyke is redeveloped. 1 response in support, but requesting controls to deal with people parking all day.

Staff comments

Scheme proposed to keep access into Walden Avenue and Queens Gardens clear.

The Committee will need to balance access and parking.

Wennington Road, QF210/SHR/54

Double yellow lines, both sides of the street from Wennington Fire Station to start of rural clearway to the east, on approach to A1306 New Road To help fire brigade access, especially to A1306.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that that scheme be implemented as it was originally suggested to assist with access to the A1306 from Wennington Fire Station.

Palliser Drive, QF210/SHR/55

Single yellow line, whole street, in force Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 9:30am. To stop all day commuter parking.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that scheme be implemented.

Palliser Drive/ Ellis Avenue/ Wilfred Avenue, QF210/SHR/55

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that scheme be implemented.

South End Road/ Jersey Road; South End Road/ St. John's Close; South End Road/ Princes Park, QF210/SHR/57

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility.

South End Road outside Albyn's Court, QF210/SHR/57

Time limited parking in layby outside Albyn's Court, 3 hours parking, no return within 4 hours, Monday to Saturday 8:30am to 6:30pm

4 responses received. 3 objecting to the proposals (2 as residents of Albyns Court), 1 expressing some concern on behalf of an elderly resident.

Staff comments

The scheme was proposed to assist Albyns Court, but the objections suggest the scheme should be rejected. Staff recommend the dropped kerb access to Albyns Court should be restricted as designed however.

South End Road, Layby outside 166 to 174, QF210/SHR/58

Time limited parking in layby 2 hours parking, no return within 4 hours, Monday to Saturday 8:30am to 6:30pm

1 response supporting proposal, with request for restrictions elsewhere. In addition, Cllr Burton has indicated that the businesses support the proposals.

Staff comments

The scheme was proposed to create a turnover of parking spaces for the shops and as no objections have been received, Staff recommend implementation.

South End Road/ Guysfield Drive, QF210/SHR/58

Double yellow lines around junction, extending north to boundary of nos.122/124 (east side) and 15 metres either side of the boundary of nos.85/87 (west side) through pedestrian refuge.

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that that scheme be implemented.

Upminster Road South junctions, QF210/SHR/60

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. Pinewood Avenue Cloister Close Martin Drive Waverley Road Brights Avenue Sunningdale Avenue Grangewood Avenue

5 responses received.

4 for the Grangewood Avenue proposal. 1 requesting a sign be relocated, 1 objecting because of lack of parking and a dropped kerb being refused in the past because of the effect on a bus stop. 2 objecting because of lack of parking and with a request to move the bus stop and install parking bays.

1 generally objecting because of pressure of on-street parking (resident lives opposite Grangewood Avenue)

Staff comments

The proposals were designed to keep the junction of Upminster Road South and Grangewood Avenue clear for 10 metres on all arms (being the minimum Highway Code guideline). Moving the bus stop is a matter for TfL, but there does not appear to be a location not affecting residents close by. The Committee will need to balance safety, access and parking

Upminster Road North junctions, QF210/SHR/61

Double yellow lines around junction to maintain access and visibility. Parsonage Road Westlyn Close Allen Road Lambs Lane North Briscoe Road King Edward Avenue Maclennan Avenue Fairview Avenue Acer Avenue Lake Avenue Greenacres Close

No responses received.

Staff comments

Recommend that that schemes be implemented.































This page is deliberately left blank



12 REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 19 October 2010

Subject Heading:

CMT Lead:

Report Author and contact details:

Policy context:

Financial summary:

Traffic Management Order Amendment

Cynthia Griffin

David Pritchard ext 3213 david.pritchard@havering.gov.uk

Changes to Fees and Charges

The report details changes to various parking charges in response to the Council's Response to the Government's Emergency Budget proposals.

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

| Clean, safe and green borough | Y |
|--|---|
| Excellence in education and learning | Υ |
| Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity | Y |
| Value and enhance the life of every individual | Y |
| High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax | Y |

SUMMARY

The Chief Executive presented to Cabinet on the 14th July 2010 a report entitled "Responding to the Government's Emergency Budget and the policy implications of the Coalition Agreement" the report detailed various measures to improve efficiency and actions to provide budgetary savings. The report noted various parking initiatives including changes to some parking fees. Parking fees and charges are in the main regulated by traffic management orders and therefore to amend the parking fees and charges specific traffic management orders require amending. This report sets out the fee changes and the traffic management order amendments required.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the committee advises the Cabinet Member to approve the alterations to the on street and off street parking charges set out in paragraphs 1-6 below.
- 2. That the committee advises the Cabinet member to approve the proposed amendment of the Havering (Off Street Parking Places) Special Parking Area Order 1995 to extend the maximum period of stay in Dorrington Gardens, Billet Lane, North Street, Front Lane, Corbets Tey Road, Keswick Avenue, Appleton Way, Fentiman Way, Balgores Square, Rex Close, Viking Way, Cherry Tree Lane, Elm Park (Hotel), Elm Park (Library), Gaynes Road and Woodhall Crescent to 12 hours.
- 3. That the committee advises the Cabinet member to approve the proposed amendment of the administration fee levied for changing vehicle or personal details for Resident Permits, Health and Homecare Permits and Business Permits from £10.15 to £15.
- 4. That the committee advises the Cabinet Member to agree that the consideration of any objections received and the decision to amend or not to amend applicable traffic management orders is delegated to the Head of StreetCare.

REPORT DETAIL

1. <u>Harmonisation of Carers Permits</u>

There are currently two (2) types of Carer permit in place;

- 1. A private Residents Carer Permit that allows family and close friends to park in resident zones in order that they may provide personal care to a resident. The cost of this permit will change from the current £35.55 per annum to £36.00 per annum.
- 2. A Health & Home Care Permit that allows professionally employed carers to park in resident parking zones, car parks and some limited on-street yellow line locations in order to provide direct personal care to their clients. The cost of this

Highways Advisory Committee – 19 October 2010

permit will change from the current £13.60 per annum to £36.00 per annum, harmonizing the carer permit tariff.

2. <u>Resident Parking Permits</u>

The current differential fee structure will remain with the permit cost changing as per the table below. It should be noted that these fees are comparable to other neighbouring Councils.

| Permit Type | Current Fee | New Fee |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| 1 st Car | £13.20 | £20 |
| 2 nd Car | £17.25 | £25 |
| 3 rd Car and above | £76.15 | £60 |

3. <u>Resident Visitor Permit Charges</u>

The cost of a book of ten resident visitor permits (Scratch Cards) will change from £5.10 to \pounds 10 for a book. It should be noted that the current traffic orders in place allow for up to 4 hours parking via the use of one scratch card and visitors can use a second permit (scratch card) for a second period of 4 hours if they wish. Given that the majority of restrictions operate from 08:30 am to 06:30 pm, the maximum charge for all day parking would be £3 under these changes. The current town centre tariff for a comparable parking period is £10.

4. Disc Parking Charges

To increase disc parking from £13.20 to £36 as per the carers permits. These permit bays, 458 bays in 73 locations, are located across the borough and allow a permit holder to park in any of the disc permit bays up to a maximum period of 4 hours in some areas.

5. Consolidation of On-Street Meter Time Bands

There is a large number of old style coin operated meters located across the borough with add hoc time bands, it is proposed to continue with the 1-12 minute band as this greatly supports parents taking and collecting children from schools at a minimal 20p tariff.

Tariff time bands will be consolidated as follows:

- 12 24 and 24 36 minutes tariffs will be consolidated in to one single tariff of 12 30 minutes at the rate of 60p, deleting the 40p option
- 36 48 minutes and 48 minutes 1 hour tariff will be consolidated in to one single tariff of 30 minutes 1 hour at the rate of £1, deleting the 80p option
- 1 hour 1 hour 12 minutes, 1 hour 12 minutes 1 hour 24 minutes and 1 hour 24 minutes 1 hour 36 minutes tariffs will be consolidated in to a single 1 hour 1 hour 30 minutes tariff at the rate of £1.60, deleting the £1.20 & £1.40 options
- 1 hour 36 minutes 1 hour 48 minutes and 1 hour 48 minutes 2 hours tariffs will be consolidated in to a single tariff of 1 hour 30 minutes - 2 hours at the rate of £2, deleting the £1.80 option

Highways Advisory Committee – 19 October 2010

By introducing more consistent time bands, it will be clearer for the public and assist in reducing difficulties arising from the number of unnecessary time bands, essentially this proposal consolidates the current 10 time bands into 5 time bands creating ease of choice.

6. <u>Consolidation of On-Street Pay and Display Time Bands</u>

There are a number of On-Street Pay and Display machines located across the borough with add hoc time bands. It is proposed to continue with the 0 -1 hour tariff band as this greatly supports local traders and businesses in the areas where these schemes operate at a minimum cost of 20p.

Tariff time bands will be consolidated as follows:

- 1 hour 1 hour 12 and 1 hour 12 1 hour 24 minutes tariffs will be consolidated in to one single tariff of 1 hour - 1 hour 30 minutes at the rate of £1.40, deleting the £1.20 option
- 1 hour 24 1 hour 36 minutes, 1 hour 36 1 hour 48 minutes and 1 hour 48 2 hour tariffs will be consolidated in to one single tariff of 1 hour 30 minutes 2 hours at the rate of £2, deleting the £1.60 and £1.80 options

By introducing more consistent time bands, it will be clearer for the public and assist in reducing difficulties arising from the number of unnecessary time bands. Essentially this proposal consolidates the current 6 time bands into 3 time bands, creating ease of choice.

7. Extension of Mixed Tariff Bands in Outlying Car Parks

Tariff bands in a number of the following car parks will be extended to enable a maximum stay of 12 hours so as to provide residents, visitors and businesses alike with the flexibility to extend their parking needs:

Dorrington Gardens, Billet Lane, North Street, Front Lane, Corbets Tey Road, Keswick Avenue, Appleton Way, Fentiman Way, Balgores Square, Rex Close, Viking Way, Cherry Tree Lane, Elm Park (Hotel), Elm Park (Library), Gaynes Road and Woodhall Crescent.

8. Administration Charges

There are many occasions where requests for permit detail changes (Resident Permits, Health and Homecare Permits and Business Permits) are required for various reasons. Where such changes are requested the current administration charge of ± 10.15 will be increased to ± 15 .

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

There is a risk that the changes will not meet revised budget expectations and that will need to be robustly managed. There will be some costs associated with the proposed changes for advertising and adjustments to computer software but the costs will be minimal and met from within existing budgets.

Legal implications and risks:

The changes to most of the fees can be rapidly achieved by the publication of a notice, but a few of the changes will require the amending of traffic management orders and such amendments will need to be managed as per the prevailing legislation. Providing the appropriate legislation is complied with, there are no significant legal implications or risks.

Human Resources implications and risks:

There are no Human Resource implications.

Equalities implications and risks:

Accessible and affordable parking provision benefits the wider community and the Cabinet approved changes will help better manage the Council's parking provision for all citizens.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None