

# HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.00	<b>T</b>	
7.30pm	Tuesday 21 September 2010	Havering Town Hall Main Road, Romford
		main Roud, Romord

Members 9: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group (5)	Residents' Group (2)	Labour Group (1)	Independent Residents' Group (1)
Frederick Thompson <b>(C)</b> Billy Taylor <b>(VC)</b> 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 17 August 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 HAVERING'S 2011/12 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FUNDING SUBMISSION -Report Attached
- 7 MERCURY HOUSE- SHORT TERM PARKING FACILITIES Outcome of public consultation
- 8 LAKE RISE AND ROSEMARY AVENUE PARKING REVIEW Outcome of public consultation
- 9 ELM PARK WALKABILITY ROSEWOOD AVENUE AND CORONATION DRIVE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS - Report Attached
- 10 HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW Outcome of area survey

#### 11 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 17 August 2010 (7.30pm – 10.30pm)

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group	Frederick Thompson (in the Chair), Lynden Thorpe, Steven Kelly, Billy Taylor and Damian White
Residents' Group	Linda Hawthorn and John Mylod
Labour Group	Denis Breading
Independent Local Residents' Group	David Durant

Councillor Barry Oddy was also present for part of the meeting.

There were sixteen 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.

#### 9 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 July 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to an amendment to a sentence relating to Councillor Durant who requested that his comments regarding Sustrans Connect2 scheme be amended to read: "He did not oppose the double yellow lines at the junction in the scheme but opposed the bus stop clearways".

#### 10 HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered and agreed in principle the schedules that detailed work in progress and applications received by the service.

The Committee **NOTED** the information in the work programme schedules.

#### 11 **PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN LODGE LANE,** COLLIER ROW – Comments on advertised proposals

The Committee received a report that highlighted issues London Buses had brought to the attention of the Council about the problems buses experience when approaching the existing bus stop in Lodge Lane, Collier Row due to inconsiderate parking.

Following a site meeting with a representative of London Buses. It was identified that some drivers parked their cars close to the existing bus stop whereby buses experienced difficulties in pulling close to the bus stop and also when departing.

The report proposed to provide a clearway at the existing bus stop. Clearways generally consisted of a solid yellow marking running adjacent to the kerb and this had a legal control in prohibiting all vehicles other than buses from stopping in the area during the prescribed times, generally 24 hours a day.

The Committee was informed that in addition to the clearway, it was proposed also to provide 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions on both the approach and departure sides of the bus stop. The purpose was to provide a clear run for buses when approaching the bus stop flag and likewise provide a clear exit when leaving the bus stop.

During the debate, Members of the Committee discussed issues relating to the proposed clearway and double yellow lines. A Member suggested that the yellow lines be cut back.

Following discussion, Councillor Steven Kelly proposed a motion that was seconded by Councillor Dennis Breading that 'At Any Time' parking restrictions not be implemented as part of this scheme.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** the following:

- That the Committee recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the bus stop clearway detailed in the report and shown on drawing be implemented.
- That it be noted that the estimated cost of £2,000 would be met by Transport for London through the 2010/11 allocation for measures to improve access for buses in Lodge Lane and Collier Row Road.

#### 12 PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS - JUNCTION OF HAVERING DRIVE, PETTITS LANE NORTH AND MASHITERS HILL

The Committee received a report that recommended the implementation of parking restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction of Havering Road, Mashiters Hill and Pettits Lane North following public consultation and advertisement.

# The Committee **RECOMMENDED** the following

- 1. That the double yellow line parking restrictions detailed in the report be implemented.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £400 would be met from the 20010/11 Revenue Budget Minor Parking Schemes budget.

The voting for the report was 8 votes to 1 with Councillor Durant requested that it be noted that he abstained from voting.

### 13 AIRFIELD WAY / HERON FLIGHT AVENUE ACCIDENT REDUCTION PROGRAMME – Results of public consultation

The Committee received a report that set out as part of the 2010/11 Havering Borough Spending Plan settlement an accident reduction programme approved by Transport for London.

A feasibility study had been carried out to identify accident remedial measures along Airfield Way and Heron Flight Avenue. It was considered that the accident remedial measures, as described in the recommendations would improve road safety.

The following was proposed:

- Pedestrian refuges and minor carriageway widening
- Upgrading anti-skid surfacing
- Slow road markings
- Speed table and speed control humps along Heron Flight Avenue

It was **RECOMMENDED** that the accident remedial measures detailed in the report and shown on the drawing be implemented.

### 14 PETTITS LANE NORTH / VICTORIA ROAD / HEATH PARK ROAD ACCIDENT REDUCTION PROGRAMME - Results of public consultation

The Committee received a report that set out as part of the 2010/11 Havering Borough Spending Plan settlement an accident reduction programme approved by Transport for London.

A feasibility study had been carried out to identify accident remedial measures along Victoria Road, Heath Park Road and Pettits Lane North and the following measures were proposed.

- New and upgraded pedestrian refuges
- Upgrading zebra crossings including tactile pavings, illuminated belisha beacons and buff colour anti-skid surfacing.

- 'At any time' waiting restrictions
- Keep clear and slow road markings

It was **RECOMMENDED** that the accident remedial measures detailed in the report and shown on the drawings be implemented.

# 15 UPMINSTER ROAD/HIGH STREET ACCIDENT REDUCTION PROGRAMME - Results of public consultation

The Committee received a report that detailed the findings of a feasibility study carried out to identify accident remedial measures along Upminster Road and High Street and three pedestrian refuges were proposed along Upminster Road and High Street. The following proposals were outlined in the report:

- High Street outside property no. 207 Pedestrian refuge and slow road markings.
- Upminster Road outside St Andrew's Church Pedestrian refuge and slow road markings.
- Upminster Road west of Glanville Drive Pedestrian refuge and slow road markings.

The report informed the Committee that in November 2009, Transport for London had approved funding for this scheme part of the 2010/11 Havering Borough Spending Plan settlement.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by a resident who expressed her objection to the proposed refuge at Lodge Court.

During the debate, Members of the Committee discussed issues relating to the proposed refuges, some Members were of the opinion that there were too many refuges along this road already.

The Committee were informed that the central refuge proposed by St Andrew's Church had the support of London Buses at it would help bus access and also that the site had a record of one serious and one slight pedestrian injury.

Following discussion, Councillor Durant proposed that only the pedestrian refuge and slow road markings on Upminster Road outside St Andrew's Church be implemented. This was seconded by Councillor Mylod.

The vote for the motion was 8 votes to 1. Councillor Thompson voted against. The substantive motion was passed by 8 votes to 1 with Councillor Thompson voting against the motion.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that only the scheme outside St Andrew's Church be implemented.

#### 16 **PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE ACCESS FOR BUSES IN BEVAN WAY,** HORNCHURCH

The Committee received a report that outlined that in 2006, the Council had carried out carriageway widening works in Newmarket Way and Bevan Way up to Haydock Close to enhance access for buses on route 193. The measures implemented operated effectively except on the north side of Haydock Close where the carriageway was narrow. As a result, London Buses had brought it to the attention of the Council that buses experience problems at this pinch point and had asked if similar works in widening the carriageway could be carried out to improve the access for buses.

It was **RECOMMENDED** that the proposals to widen the carriageway of Bevan Way be implemented at the following location

• Bevan Way, east kerbline – commencing from the extended kerbline of north side of Haydock Close and continuing northwards for a distance of 45 metres.

It was further **RECOMMENDED** that:

- 1. That the respondents who responded to the consultation be notified in writing about the Committee's decision.
- 2. That it be noted that the cost of implementing the measures is £20,000. This would be met by Transport for London through the allocation for the 2010/11 Local Implementation Plan for Measures to Assist Buses.

### 17 PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTION IN HILLRISE ESTATE, COLLIER ROW – Objections to advertised proposals

The Committee received a report that had brought to the attention of the Council by London Bus Services, part of Transport for London (TfL) the problems buses on the route 175 operated through the Hillrise Estate, experienced from inconsiderate parking along their designated routes.

The report outlined a feasibility study that was carried out and measures to improve access for buses along the route.

With its agreement, Councillor Barry Oddy addressed the Committee. Councillor Oddy stated that he previously lived in the area and felt that with a large proportion of flats developments in the estate the yellow lines would displace residents' car parking spaces.

Discussion amongst members of the Committee focussed on whether all the proposed bus clearway restrictions and yellow lines were required. Members of the Committee were of the opinion that implementing the scheme would lead to some car parking spaces being lost. The Committee suggested that in order to assist the buses the skew junction improvement be implemented.

Councillor Taylor proposed that only the following parts of the report's recommendations be implemented:

- Hillrise Road junction with Highfield Road.
- Avelon Road junction with Highfield Road.
- Avelon Road junction with Chase Cross Road.

This was seconded by Councillor Damian White.

The motion to recommend the above three schemes was passed unanimously. The substantive motion was passed unanimously.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that the above schemes be implemented.

#### 18 **BUS STOP ACCESSIBILITY AND PARKING RESTRICTIONS – UPPER RAINHAM ROAD – Outcome of public consultation**

The Committee received a report that followed a review of the bus stops in Upper Rainham road by staff from the Traffic & Engineering Section of StreetCare, Transport for London and London Buses. This work had sought to identify possible accessibility improvements.

The report recommended that Bus Stop Clearways be implemented in four locations on Upper Rainham Road and that the Committee decide whether or not to proceed with double yellow line parking restrictions through the same section of the street.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by two residents who expressed their objection to the scheme. They spoke against the double yellow lines proposed. One of the concerns raised related to the removal of parking space by the pedestrian refuges which would increase traffic speed and that the Council should be doing more to tackle this problem by installing speed cameras. The resident also stated that with the yellow lines proposed, this would remove the opportunity for her visitors to park in front of her drive.

With its agreement, Councillor Barry Oddy addressed the Committee. Councillor Oddy spoke against the scheme stating that there were already many restrictions in the area and that residents parking at the rear of their premises were not in good state and as such parking in front gardens and on the street was vital. He also considered the bus stop clearways as being too long and that the yellow lines would cause displacement of cars.

Discussion amongst members of the Committee focussed on the effect of the yellow lines which could lead to increase in traffic speed.

The report recommended that the schemes be implemented but following a unanimous vote it was **RECOMMENDED** to reject the scheme.

#### 19 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 the conclusion of consideration of the remaining items on the agenda.

Chairman 21 September 2010 This page is deliberately left blank

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ Requested/ ltem Potential Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Scheme proposals with funding in place for HAC approval in principle Lister Avenue (part) 20mph Zone as a result of the Proposals associated with new David Ballm LBH and Nightingale 1 development require public/ statutory Developer 1.000 David Ballm 06/08/2010 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 45m west to allow resident to 2.000 06/08/2010 942454 Resident 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 location1 would be at resident's cost. Officers do not feel a mini-roundabout Mini-roundabout at junction with would be appropriate in design terms. Northumberland Avenue to slow This case relates back to previous traffic in advance of humped Squirrels Heath scheme and to reduce speed on this 3 zebra crossing which resident is TfL LIP 15,000 Resident 13/09/2010 965850 Road, Gidea Park section of road, additional speed tables unhappy with in terms of causing could be provided (one each side of disturbance following earlier crossing location) through TfL Minor scheme Improvements funding.

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ Requested/ ltem Potential Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Current bus stop is just before approach zig-zags to zebra crossing and not LBH considered desirable by Officers in terms Revenue Met. Police Pettits Lane North -Relocate first Chase Cross of traffic overtaking a stationary bus and [for footway Mark Philpotts Traffic Unit bound bus stop approximately 70 pedestrians being masked on crossing. 03/09/2010 bay removal 1.000 4 opposite Fire LBH StreetCare and London Alternative location would require removal Station metres north. and Buses of footway parking bays and a bus stop Clearway clearway, but supported on safety provision] grounds by Officers. General parking requests for HAC prioritisation (LBH Revenue Budget) Several flatted developments along this section of street with basement parking. On-street parking causing visibility issues at vehicle access points and restrictions Restrictions outside, opposite LBH 5 Butts Green Road will assist, but will remove heavily-used on 2,500 Resident 03/08/2010 975084 and adjacent to Emerson House Revenue 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. Move 2-wheel footway residents' Other bays in area fully on carriageway. Church Road, parking bays back into LBH Mark Philpotts This location causes access and safety 6 1.000 06/08/2010 Resident carriageway near Harold Court Harold Wood LBH StreetCare Revenue issues for pupils walking to school. School

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ ltem Potential Requested/ Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Request for more residents' Mark Philpotts Hamilton Drive, LBH permit bays, especially near 69-3,000 7 Feasible where road space is available 06/08/2010 Resident Harold Wood LBH StreetCare Revenue 109 Request for more residents' Mark Philpotts Athelstan Road. LBH 8 Feasible where road space is available 3.000 Resident 06/08/2010 LBH StreetCare Harold Wood permit bays Revenue Estate has a history of parking issues, but when the Council last reviewed around 5 years ago, no scheme took place Firham Park Request for restrictions to help because residents could not agree on way LBH Mark Philpotts 9 with access to residents' TBC Resident 06/08/2010 Avenue, Harold forward. This localised issue had the LBH StreetCare Revenue Wood driveway resident advised to apply for a wider dropped kerb which would deal with his own problem. Two different CPZs. Romford end is all Carlton Road, Change 8:30am to 10:00am day with residents' bays, Gidea Park part LBH Mark Philpotts TBC 06/08/2010 10 Resident Romford restriction to 8am to 6:30pm time with no bays. May be worth a Revenue LBH StreetCare questionnaire for the street first. Remove parking bay to help Will reduce amount of available bays, but Cllr Brice Hearn Road. LBH 11 750 Resident 06/08/2010 Romford access to commercial site. help with access Revenue Thompson Recent parking consultation have shown that Wayside Close residents generally do not want any more changes. To make Access concerns for deliveries/ LBH Wayside Close, 12 TBC Resident 6/8/210 922384 Romford access easier, either double vellow lines Revenue emergency services etc are needed on one side or verges paved for footway parking (funding not available)

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ ltem Potential Requested/ Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Como Street, 2 more residents' bays adjacent Mark Philpotts LBH 13 Feasible 750 Resident 06/08/2010 LBH StreetCare Romford to 54 Linden Street Revenue Road narrow with many dropped kerbs, so bays would have to be staggered. Londsdale Road. LBH TBC 14 Request for residents' bays Resident 06/08/2010 Cllr Tebbutt Romford Scheme would bring street into local CPZ Revenue may be worth a questionnaire first Request for more residents' Mark Philpotts Wheatsheaf Road. LBH 3,000 06/08/2010 15 Feasible where road space is available Resident LBH StreetCare Romford permit bays Revenue Request for footway parking to No space available at all in street, request Mark Philpotts Beaufort Close. LBH help servicing access, but does 16 N/A Resident 06/08/2010 Romford LBH StreetCare should be rejected. Revenue not want yellow lines One verge could be paved for footway Narrow road with parking causes parking, but funding not available (£15k LBH 17 Jutsums Avenue larger vehicles to drive over 1.000 Resident 06/08/2010 Cllr Osborne required). Double yellow lines on both Revenue verges sides would remove problem Would extend existing CPZ into area and Request for residents' permit Mark Philpotts Jubilee Avenue so all could park within zone. LBH bays as people from Mark's 18 500 Resident 06/08/2010 Questionnaire first might be useful to LBH StreetCare estate Revenue Road park in street gauge local views Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to LBH gauge views would be useful - several 500 19 Links Avenue CPZ/ Residents' parking Resident 06/08/2010 Cllr Armstrong Revenue requests for this Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to LBH Mark Philpotts Hockley Drive CPZ/ Residents' parking 20 500 Resident 06/08/2010 LBH StreetCare gauge views would be useful Revenue

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ ltem Potential Requested/ Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Edward Close, 2 hour parking restriction to stop Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to Mark Philpotts LBH 21 500 Resident 06/08/2010 LBH StreetCare Gidea Park commuters gauge views would be useful Revenue Request for parking review in Chalforde Gardens LBH Mark Philpotts Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to 22 terms of restriction times and 500 Resident 06/08/2010 Gidea Park gauge views would be useful Revenue LBH StreetCare need for permit bays Oxley Close, Gidea Double yellow lines throughout Mark Philpotts Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to LBH 06/08/2010 23 500 Resident Park gauge views would be useful LBH StreetCare Revenue street Feasible, but would mean double yellow Restrictions to assist deliveries lines, perhaps staggered throughout Hill Grove. Gidea LBH Mark Philpotts street. Perhaps a questionnaire would be 24 500 06/08/2010 and emergency access (several Resident LBH StreetCare Park Revenue requests) useful. Footway parking not feasible as footways are flags. Feasible, perhaps a questionnaire to Marshalls Drive. LBH Mark Philpotts gauge views would be useful - refer to Hill 25 500 Request to be included in CPZ Resident 06/08/2010 LBH StreetCare Gidea Park Revenue Grove which is next street Area has many dropped kerbs. Access concerns for deliveries/ Restrictions for access will remove on-Birch Crescent/ emergency services, vans LBH Mark Philpotts 26 750 06/08/2010 street parking provision, perhaps a Resident Macdonald Avenue parking in area etc (several LBH StreetCare Revenue questionnaire to gauge views would be requests) useful

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ Requested/ ltem Potential Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Several requests for this and with 1 resident not supporting. Enough interest LBH Mark Philpotts Fairfield Avenue, Restricted parking request to 27 to go straight to public advert. Suggest 1,500 Resident 06/08/2010 Upminster deal with commuters LBH StreetCare Revenue bring street into line with adjacent roads (8am to 9:30pm, Monday to Friday) Feasible, no permit bays within the area Introduce residents' permit bays LBH Dunster Crescent. around Upminster Bridge Station - may 28 1.000 Resident 06/08/2010 946038 Hornchurch into CPZ and extend CPZ hours Revenue need wider review and guestionnaire first Parking on both sides of street Moor Lane, Restrictions would be required on one LBH 29 1,000 Cllr Ford 06/08/2010 Cllr Ford Cranham causing problems for buses side of street. Revenue Parking on Sundays causing traffic flow issues and blocking buses. Request to extend London Mark Philpotts Hall Lane, LBH existing Monday to Saturday Feasible. 30 1,500 Buses and 10/09/2010 Upminster, by park LBH StreetCare Revenue restriction to 7 days a week. **Cllr Barrett** Restrictions at junction with Masefield Drive. Inconsiderate parking in narrow Pond Walk. Suggest a questionnaire to find out what LBH Cllr Van den Cllr Van den 06/08/2010 31 500 Cranham residents would like to see first Revenue Hende Hende road Many bays do not meet current dimension Footway parking bays near each standards or leave 1.5m for pedestrians. Swan Avenue, LBH 32 other on opposite sides of street 1,500 Cllr Ford 06/08/2010 Cllr Ford Cranham Footway parking should be reviewed, Revenue causing obstruction redesigned and consulted

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

ltem Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
33	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
34	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
35	Marlborough Gardens, Cranham	Extended restrictions at bend outside Hall Mead School and review existing School Keep Clears	Unlawful "no parking" markings removed some months ago following a resident enquiry. Officers agree that permanent "no waiting" restrictions are required and SKC should be reviewed.	LBH Revenue	1,500	Resident/ Cllr Barrett	06/08/2010	Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare
36	Langley Close	Extend double yellow line restrictions from junction with Faringdon Avenue to cover adjacent and opposite gates for St. Ives House for HGV access	Feasible - would provide HGV access, but reduce on-street parking	LBH Revenue	500	Business	09/08/2010	976542

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Likelv Origin/ ltem Potential Requested/ Scheme Description Officer Advice CRM / Contact Ref Funder Budget Request Placed on from List Existing restrictions 8am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. Changes feasible, Change parking restrictions to but if the HAC are amenable to the idea, favour parking by parents LBH Andrew 37 Balgores Lane the area would have to be set further 1.500 17/08/2010 978862 dropping off children at Gidea Rosindell MP Revenue away from Main Road because of traffic Park College flow issues. Residents may not appreciate dropping off near their premises. Review of footway parking and Some locations on service road prevent restrictions at service road from access for service vehicles, but review LBH 38 Upminster Road Hacton Lane where vehicle 2,500 Resident 05/08/2010 977046 may require removal of some parking Revenue damage and access problems space have been experienced lain Hardy, LBH Request for additional residents' LBH Junction Road, 39 Feasible where road space is available 3,000 02/09/2010 Resident Romford permit bays Revenue StreetCare Residents' bays installed across vehicle Removal of residents' permit bay Princes Road. crossovers as was the design at the time, LBH 40 in front of vehicle crossover as it 1.500 Resident 02/09/2010 989128 but enforcement difficult and so bay Romford Revenue keeps getting blocked should be removed. Double yellow lines across The Council has powers to enforce dropped kerb within parking bay against parking in front of dropped kerbs, LBH 59-75 Ongar Way outside block 59-75 Ongar Way 500 Cllr Burton 13/09/2010 Cllr Burton 41 but restrictions would make it clear to Revenue where disabled resident is having motorists. difficult access.

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

ltem Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
42	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
Sche	me proposals w	ithout funding available for	r HAC to consider and decide a co	ourse of a	ction			
43	Butts Green Road	Speed control measures by flats approaching Slewins Lane junction	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
44	Petersfield Avenue		No pedestrian facilities within 300 metres, but no recent, recorded injury problems.		7,000	Resident	04/08/2010	976212
45	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
46	Anson Close	Lack of parking with a request for the Council to sort out the problems.	Large verges in area could be converted to parking spaces, but at a cost of around £2,500 per space.		TBC	Resident	06/08/2010	919854
47	Plover Gardens, Cranham	Request for parking area to be constructed or road extended for parking	Large verges in area could be converted to parking spaces, but at a cost of around £2,500 per space.		TBC	Resident	06/08/2010	Mark Philpotts LBH StreetCare

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

ltem Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
48	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	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		15,000			965850
49	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
50	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
51	Junction Road	Traffic calming requested	Road hump scheme would reduce speeds, but not a priority for casualty reduction.		25,000	Andrew Rosindell MP	01/09/2010	982160
52			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

# Highways Advisory Committee September 2010

S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item5 HighwaySchemesApplicationsSeptember2010.xlsSept2010HAC

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Potential Likelv Origin/ Requested/ ltem CRM / Contact Scheme Description Officer Advice Budget Ref Funder Request Placed on from List Street was last review for casualty reduction 2006/07. No indication that further work required for casualtyreduction. Only other works could be North Hill Drive Request for speed restrictions 25,000 Resident 13/09/2010 985546 53 speed humps, but not advisable on street which carries local through traffic and buses. Street not subject to significant casualty problem. Road hump scheme would slow Andrew Junction Road Request for traffic calming 25.000 13/09/2010 982160 54 traffic down, but Officers do not have Rosindell MP funding to check current speeds. No casualty rate in street or estate. Funding sought for 20mph in past, but not 55 Birkbeck Road Request for speed humps 25.000 Resident 13/09/2010 982048 funded as there are no casualties. HAC requested casualty data - 4 years to May 2010, 4 slight injuries. 8/06 - jcn with Request for traffic calming - Item Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 8/06 - jcn with Hyland Way 35,000 960872 56 Resident 12/07/2010 51 from August HAC Hornchurch Rd, shunt; 7/06 - jcn Hyland Close, parking blocked visibility; 12/09 snow/ reckless. Scheme proposals on hold for future discussion when required to be taken forward

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

**Highway Schemes Applications** 

Scheme Date Potential Likelv Origin/ Requested/ ltem Description CRM / Contact Scheme Officer Advice Placed on Budget Ref Funder Request from List Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well -HAC requested for approval in principal Mark Philpotts Rainham Village LBH Viking Way 8,000 21/06/2010 57 commence work with local for questionnaire to local area with results Parking Review Revenue Extension LBH StreetCare parking questionnaire. Review reported back to future HAC likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme. Loading bays, disabled persons Changes required in order to make Rainham bays, bus stop clearways/ buses operation of Interchange and Library work Interchange & TfL LIP/ only route and general waiting 5,000 in the context of bus routeing and LBH Regen. Regeneration 58 17/03/2010 Library LBH restrictions to support Rainham servicing. Work needs to be underway Development Interchange project around April 2012

# Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes				
Transp	Transport for London Local Implementation Plan 2010/11 - Corridors											
QJ001	Hornchurch High Street &	Casualty Reduction Programme	Works being arranged	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	60,000	Part of scheme approved - Unused budget to be transferred to other TfL programme				
QJ002	Havering Road, Orange Tree Hill and North Road	Casualty Reduction Programme	Design work in progress	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	70,000					
QJ003		Local improvements to include Casualty Reduction Programme	Scheme being designed. Avon Road shops being consulted on time-limited parking and new parking bays	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	70,000	Additional funding indicated on LIP for 2011/12				
QJ004		Casualty Reduction Programme	Design work in progress	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	40,000	Parking lay-by outside shops to be reviewed (implications of echelon/ parallel parking requested by HAC 17/8/2010)				
QJ005	-	Casualty Reduction Programme	Design work in progress	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	70,000					
QJ006	Airfield Way and Heron Flight Avenue	Casualty Reduction Programme	Works being arranged	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	60,000					
QJ007		Casualty Reduction Programme	Works being arranged	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	70,000					
QJ008		Casualty Reduction Programme	Design work in progress	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	80,000					
QJ009	-	Casualty Reduction Programme	HAC approval not required, assists with staff casualty monitoring to suggest future programme	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	30,000	For information				

### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QJ010	-	Casualty Reduction Programme	Approved in principle by HAC 15/6/2010	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	32,000	Sites to be indentified and consulted with outcome to future HAC
QJ018	St Edwards Way/ Mawney Road junction improvements feasibility (Romford Ring Road Package)	Junction improvement	Feasibility to be reported to HAC to inform further design work	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	40,000	Part of £170,000 package for 2010/11 with further LIP funding planned for wider package in coming years
Regen	Subway Improvements at Oldchurch Road	Local improvements	HAC approval not required, unless cycle routes taken forward.	SC	TfL LIP	Mar-11	40,000	Potential cycling improvement possible, but will require HAC approval. Works mainly lighting, surfacing etc improvements
13	,	Casualty Reduction Programme	Design work in progress	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	60,000	Sites identified, police and local councillors to be consulted. VA sign supplier identified to provide compact, lamp column mounted kit.
QJ014	Waterloo Road/ Exchange Street junction improvement (road widening and Toucan Crossing facilities - Romford Ring Road Package)	Junction improvement	Feasibility to be reported to HAC to inform further design work. Design developed, traffic modelling and safety audit to take place before report.	МК	TfL LIP	Mar-11	30,000	Part of £170,000 package for 2010/11 with further LIP funding planned for wider package in coming years

# Highways Advisory Committee

# September 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
твс	Gooshays Drive and Gubbins Lane Corridor Package	Masterplanning	Approved in principle by HAC 15/6/2010	ST	TfL LIP	Mar-11	100,000	Anticipated as a 2/3 year scheme to support improvements along corridor, possibly to include accessibility to Harold Wood Station in context of Crossrail. Masterplanning stage currently
QJ019	Upminster Town Centre Highway Improvements. Review of Bell Corner to replace sigals with roundabout with other measures to reduce congestion	Local area improvements	Surveys and traffic modelling in progress.	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	80,000	2011/12 LIP funding planned depending on outcomes. Review of Bell Corner underway and proposals for business loading bays being considered.
твс	Main Road and North Street Corridor Studies (Smoothing Traffic flow)	Corridor Study	Surveys to take place after summer holiday period.	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11		Study stage to inform future schemes to be proposed for future LIP funding
QJ020	Elm Park Walkability	Local area improvements	Approved in principle by HAC 15/6/2010	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	25,000	HAC Report September 2010
QJ021	Gidea Park Walkability - building on previous studies to improve walking and public realm, will include parking facilities and bus interchange		Design work in progress	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	100,000	Future LIP funding planned for 2011/12 and 2012/13.
QF103	Sustrans Connect 2, Whitchurch Road/ Dagnam Park Dirve	Junction widening, pedestrian/ cyclist access improvments etc	Works in progress.	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	40,000	Works should be complete early October 2010.

#### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

### Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Funding Budget **Objective/**Theme **Current Status** Staff Lead Funder Scheme Notes Ref Ends Ingrebourne Valley Greenway as part of match QF103 Sustrans Connect 2 Design work in progress RD TfL LIP 100,000 Works cost allocation Mar-11 funding supporting Sustrans Connect 2 HAC approval only required Regen Cycle Parking Programme Supporting cycling Design work in progress DD TfL LIP Mar-11 20,000 where cycle parking is planned on the public highway Hornchurch to Harold Hill Potential future schemes may Cycle Route (route review 25,000 QG064 Supporting cycling Consultation in progress MK TfL LIP Mar-11 be identified for future funding and measures to assist cyclists) Bus Stop Acessibility. Route Upgrades to existing bus stops QJ022 496, Gallows Corner to MP TfL LIP 50,000 and relocating to better places Bus Stop Accessibility Consultation in progress Mar-11 Romford where possible Upgrades to existing bus stops Bus Stop Acessibility. Route Bus Stop Accessibility and relocating to better places QJ023 Design work in progress MP TfL LIP Mar-11 50,000 248 Corridor where possible Minor improvements to assist buses - Road widening at junction of Haydock Close/ TBC Localised improvements Works being arranged MK TfL LIP Mar-11 25,000 Bevan Way to help buses turn.

#### S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

#### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

Item Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QJ040	Lodge Lane/ Collier Row Road - parking restrictions and bus stop clearway on Lodge Lane, approaching juntion with Collier Row Lane	Localised improvements	Works being arranged	МК	TfL LIP	Mar-11	7,000	
TBC	Minor improvements to assist cycling along LCN+ Network and identified by Havering Cycling Liaison Group		Clydesdale Road scheme in consultation	МК	TfL LIP	Mar-11	18,000	Clydesdale Road Scheme is one site with some funding being comtibuted to parking/ cycling scheme.
Transp	oort for London Local Im	plementation Plan 20	10/11 - Neighbourhoods					
твс	Rainham Village Traffic Management Scheme	Rainham Compass	Regeneration to provide presentation to HAC in September (provisional)	CD	TfL LIP	Mar-11	600,000	2-year programme supporting Council funding. Viking Way extension and Village works form part of scheme. Planning consent required and then HAC approval for traffic orders and traffic order changes.
QJ045	South Street Environmental Improvements - Decluttering and streetscape works	Localised improvements	Consultation in progress with local businesses	SC	TfL LIP	Mar-11	100,000	No traffic changes proposed, HAC approval not required.

September 2010

#### **Highways Advisory Committee**

# Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes		
QF058		Pedestrian improvements to link cultural areas	Regeneration requested to provide presentation to HAC in due course.	BF	TfL LIP	Mar-11	80,000	Proposals for upgrade of existing pedestrian refuge near Queen's Theatre Car Park, new pedestrian refuge outside Fairkytes (both Billet Lane) and a new zebra crossing on North Street near Queen's Theatre.		
Transport for London Local Implementation Plan 2010/11 - Smarter Travel										
	School Travel Plan Implementation - Crowlands Junior & Infants School, new crossing in Jutsums Lane, Guardrail in Jutsums Lane, parking controls etc	School Travel	Design work in progress	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	60,000			
	School Travel Plan Implementation - St Edwards Primary School - new zebra crossing on Pettits Lane South	School Travel	Design work in progress	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11		Zebra crossing not feasible (visibility), local dropped kerb upgrades being designed.		
Transport for London Local Implementation Plan 2010/11 - Cycling on Greenways										
QF103	Ingrebourne Valley Connect 2 - Feasibility and design	Connect 2	Design work in progress	RD	TfL LIP	Mar-11	50,000	HAC approval for some highway scheme required as part of wider project		
Transp	ort for London - Major S	Schemes								

# **Highways Advisory Committee**

# September 2010

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes			
QE006	Romford Station Access	Local area improvements	Works in progress.	SC	TfL LIP	TBC	78,000	Most of scheme previously agreed through Romford Area Committee, minor elements may need approval by HAC in future			
QF058	Hornchurch Town Cetre	Town Centre Improvements	Regeneration requested to provide presentation to HAC in due course.	CS	TfL LIP	TBC	400,000	Future HAC approval may be required for some elements			
Local I	Local Implementation Plan 2010/11 - Local Transport										
QJ026	Zebra Crossing Lighting Upgrades	Casualty Reduction Programme	HAC approval not required	MP	TfL LIP	Mar-11	48,000	For Information/ Traffic & Engineering Team tracking			
S106 H	lighway Improvements	Programme									
QG068	Station Road, Upminster - Puffin to Toucan Crossing conversion	Connect 2	Previously approved via Upminster Area Committee	RP	S106	ТВС	40,000	Scheme with Transport for London Signals, awaiting feedback and signals slot confirmation			
S278/ S	S38 Development Works	5									
QJ036	Exchange Street	Development Control	Consultation in progress	DJ	S278	N/A	20,000	Provision of 3 speed humps associated with original Romford Brewery development			

September 2010

Highways Advisory Committee

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QE069	Union Road (former Oldchurch Hospital)	Double Yellow Line restrictions and 20mph Zone	Proposals being prepared for public advert	DB	S38	N/A		Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement
QD023	Riverside Close		Proposals being prepared for public advert	DB	S38	N/A		Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement
QE067	Kidman Close	20mph Zone	Proposals being prepared for public advert	DB	S38	N/A		Proposals associated with new development require public/ statutory advertisement
LBH Pa	arking Schemes Progra	mme						
QG122	Queens Hospital CPZ	Extension to the Romford Controlled Parking Zone	Residual works planning for implementation in September 2010	IH	LBH	N/A	8,000	S106 funding for main scheme lapsed and wasn't supported by residents. Other issues being implemented using minor schemes revernue budget
QF210	Clydesdale CPZ		Previously approved, works in progress	IH	LBH	N/A	8,000	Works in progress, alongside maintenance works.
QJ058	Rosemary Avenue & Lake Rise		Results of public consultation to be reported to HAC	MP	LBH	N/A	8,000	Report to September HAC
QG111	Upper Rainham Road	BSA (Clearways) and restrictions by the Cardrome	HAC rejected scheme 17/8/2010, remove from next schedule	RP	LBH	N/A	2,500	Rejected

**Highways Advisory Committee** 

September 2010

# Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QJ059	Gidea Park CPZ Review	scheme to review operation of Gidea Park	Results of questionnaire to be reported to HAC to decide if to proceed with detailed design and consultation	MP	LBH	N/A	TBC	Report date slipped to October 2010
QJ044	Hornchurch Town Centre	issues from town centre car parks following the	Results of questionnaire to be reported to HAC to decide if to proceed with detailed design and consultation	MP	LBH	N/A	10,000	Report to September HAC
QF210	South Hornchurch & Rainham Minor Parking Schemes	Minor parking issues across the committee area	Various requests in consultation, results to be reported to HAC for decisions	MP	LBH	N/A	8,000	Report date slipped to October 2010
	Mercury House short stay parking/ drop off	Davs next to Mercury	Public advert delayed, now in progress	DJ	LBH	N/A	1,500	Report to September HAC
	Collier Row Pay & Display Phase 2		Results of public consultation to be reported to HAC	MP	LBH	N/A	TBC	Report date slipped to October 2010
QJ061	Gidea Park School	Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions	Consultation in progress	DJ	LBH Education	N/A	1,500	Linked to planning conditions for school development
QJ061	Hylands School	Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions	Consultation in progress	DJ	LBH Education	N/A	1,500	Linked to planning conditions for school development

# September 2010

# **Highways Advisory Committee**

#### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QJ061	Ayloff School	Local parking review for junction restrictions, bend restrictions and updating of School Keep Clear restrictions	Consultation in progress	DJ	LBH Education	N/A	1,500	Linked to planning conditions for school development
ТВС	Hornchurch Town Centre	South scheme.	Not started	ТВ	LBH Revenue	N/A	TBC	
QF210	Victoria Road, Romford	Review Parking within Ring Road to provide Pay- and-Display parking.	Consultation in progress	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A	GINN	Cost includes 2 pay-and-display machines
QF210	Coach drop off facilities, Romford	Review to find locations at low cost suitable for coach drop off.	Design work in progress	RP	LBH Revenue/ S106	N/A	58,000	Costs include £50k S106 from Swan Walk development
TBC	Goodrington School, Walden Road	School Keep Clear restrictions by school gate and "banjo" area	Design work in progress	AN	LBH Revenue	N/A		
S0024	Bower Park School, Havering Road	Review extent and times of operation of School Keep Clear zig-zags	Design work in progress	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
S0024	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

#### S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
QJ025	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 Driv	Design work in progress	NC	LBH Revenue	N/A		
QJ054	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.	Local parking survey in progress	MP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	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.	Not started	ТВ	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Roneo Corner Shops	Parking bay for shops in lay-by 10 to 18	Not started	ТВ	LBH Revenue	N/A		

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

# Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
твс	Osborne Road	Review parking controls for afternoon operation at Brentwood Road end because of obstructive parent parking	Not started	н	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Albany Road	Parking both sides of the road is restricting approach to traffic signals at Hornchurch Road	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
QF210	Hartland Road and Broadstone Road	Footway parking scheme, where footways have been reconstructed	Consulation in progress	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Fairford Way	Residents' survey into parking issues	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Grenfell Avenue and estate	Residents' survey into parking issues	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Eyhurst Avenue/ Ambleside Avenue and area	Residents' survey into parking issues	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Service Road to Towers School off Osborne Road	Junction protection and day time restrictions to assist school access	Not started	ІН	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Ravensborne Crescent/ Coombe Road	Additional residents' parking bays	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A		
TBC	Market Link/ The Mews area	Review parking restrictions and parking bays for access into Market Place and The Mews	Not started	DJ	LBH Revenue	N/A	6,000	
#### London Borough of Havering

#### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

#### Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

Item Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
TBC	Bridge Close, Romford	Upgrade existing part time restrictions to double yellow lines for the whole street	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A	1,200	
TBC	Brooklands Road	Additional residents' parking bays	Not started	RP	LBH Revenue	N/A	1,500	Subject to HGV access to Medora Road
TBC	Abbs Cross Lane	Double yellow lines through pedestrian refuge outside Abbs Cross School	Design work in progress	VS	LBH Revenue	N/A	600	
твс	Hacton Primary School	School Keep Clear restricitons at school entrances	Not started	ІН	LBH Revenue	N/A	2,000	
Other a	schemes/ joint-funded s	schemes						
QJ033	Ciydesuale Road, additional	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
QJ052	Hillfoot Road Width Restriction	Resident Questionnaire to determine whether or not to physical width restriction keep restriction	Consultation in progress, outcome to be reported to October 2010 HAC	MP	LBH Revenue	N/A	400	Costs for consultation only
твс	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.
TBC	Suttons Lane	Pedestrian refuge to access shops, near Randall Drive	In consultation	VS	LBH AC Capital	N/A	8,000	

#### Highways Advisory Committee September 2010

#### London Borough of Havering

#### Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

#### Funded Highway Improvement Schemes Progress

ltem Ref	Scheme	Objective/ Theme	Current Status	Staff Lead	Funder	Funding Ends	Budget	Notes
твс	Suttons Lane	Minor kerb and parking bay adjustments at junction with Standen Avenue	In consultation	VS	TfL LIP	Mar-11	2,000	
	Hubbards Close prevention of through traffic from A127	Hubbards Close from	Consultation in progress, outcome to be reported to October 2010 HAC	MP	LBH Revenue	N/A	400	Costs for consultation only
твс		Right turn at traffic signals into Oldchurch Rise	Approved in principle by HAC 17/8/2010	DB	LBH Revenue	N/A	1,000	Requires consulation with London Buses and Emergency Services

#### S:\BSSADMIN\Committees\Highways Advisory\2010\0921\100921 item 5 HighwaySchemesProgressSeptember2010.xlsSeptember2010HAC

#### Highways Advisory Committee September 2010



# 6 REPORT

### Highways Advisory COMMITTEE 21 September 2010

Subject Heading:

CMT Lead:

Report Author and contact details:

Policy context:

Financial summary:

Havering's 2011/12 Local Implementation Plan Funding Submission

Cynthia Griffin

Daniel Douglas Transport Planner 01708 433220 daniel.douglas@havering.gov.uk

Mayor's Transport Strategy (2010) Havering Local Implementation Plan (2005/6 – 2010/ 2011 Local Development Framework (2008) Council Regeneration Strategies

Havering's LIP Submission to Transport for London for 2011 / 12 Financial Year – seeking endorsement for detailed proposals to spend indicative allocation of £2.7m

#### 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 seeks approval of the list of schemes proposed to be included in Havering's 2011/12 LIP Funding Submission.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee consider the draft 2011/12 LIP Funding Scheme Submission as detailed in Appendices A and B and provide comments for the Cabinet Members for Community Empowerment and Environment.

**REPORT DETAIL** 

#### Background

- The Council makes an annual Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Submission to Transport for London (TfL) for funding transportation initiatives across the Borough. It must be consistent with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy aspirations and the Council's own Local Implementation Plan. This report concerns the Submission for LIP funding for 2011/12.
- TfL require all projects in LIP Submissions to conform to the Mayor of London's new Transport Strategy (MTS) published in May 2010. They must also accord with the Local Implementation Plans of boroughs which set out how they will address the Mayoral priorities at a local level and set out longer term transportation strategies and policies.
- 3. Transport for London has awarded Havering an indicative LIP funding amount of **£2.7m for 2011/12** for the 'Corridors and Neighbourhoods' and 'Smarter Travel' programme areas
- 4. The types of schemes applicable to these areas are :

**'Corridors and Neighbourhoods' :** projects for the development of holistic schemes and local area improvements. These cover bus priority, bus stop accessibility, cycling, walking, local safety schemes, schemes that smooth traffic flow, projects involving shared space and removal of clutter, controlled

parking zones, 20 mph zones, schemes to assist freight, regeneration, accessibility and environment improvements.

**'Smarter Travel' :** initiatives covering school and workplace travel plans, travel awareness initiatives, road safety education, training and publicity schemes

- 5. Additionally, TfL has allocated monies under 'Local Transport Funding' of **£100k** to be spent on transportation projects of the Council's choice.
- 6. The LIP funding allocation for "Maintenance" (covering Principal Road Renewal and Bridge Strengthening and Assessment) as well as for "Major Schemes" (covering town centre areas, and Station Access schemes and Streets for People) is separate to the above. The Council's Submission (see below) includes proposals for funding for Maintenance. If the Council wishes to secure funding for Major Schemes then applications for this can be made at any time. Officers maintain a close dialogue with TfL staff to ensure that the most appropriate funding opportunities are investigated and pursued.

#### Cabinet Meeting July 2010

7. Cabinet at its meeting 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 is finalised. Cabinet delegated its approval to the Lead Members for Community Empowerment and Environment.

#### The proposed LIP Funding Submission for 2011 / 12

- 8. The Council's recommended Submission for LIP projects for Corridors and Neighbourhoods and Smarter Travel schemes is outlined in Appendix A. The Appendix also includes proposals for funding for Maintenance which reflect condition surveys and informal technical discussions between Havering and Transport for London officers. The projects in Appendix B are 'reserve' schemes that may be brought forward if other approved schemes in the Submission cannot be progressed.
- 9. Havering's proposed Submission has been carefully prepared to accord with TfL's detailed LIP Funding Guidance and specific aspirations indicated by the Mayor of London for specific Mayoral initiatives and major 'flagship' projects such as Crossrail and the 2012 Olympics. The former include 'Better Streets', Cleaner Local Authority Fleets, Street Trees and cycling. The submission also has regard to Havering's Living Ambitions Agenda and established regeneration priorities. It has to make provision for funding schemes from the 2010/11 financial year that are being developed over 2 or more years as well as bringing forward some schemes which have been

"reserve" schemes in the current financial year. It also has regard to the Council's responsibilities under traffic management legislation.

#### **Next Steps**

10. In line with the recommendations in the Cabinet report, and following this meeting, the detailed Submission will be the subject of a report to the Lead Members for Community Empowerment and Environment. Subject to Member approval it will be formally submitted to Transport for London for them to confirm the Council's final LIP allocation. Members will be advised of the approval of the Submission when it is confirmed (expected to be in late autumn).

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

#### Financial implications and risks:

The funding that the Council will obtain from TfL through the LIP Submission for 2011/12 will be the main source of capital funding for transportation projects and initiatives in the Borough. There was no indication at the time of preparing the Cabinet report that there will be any significant change in the level of funding for 2011 / 12. However, the position with regard to the indicative funding levels for subsequent years is less certain in the light of the wider economic circumstances and the cuts to public sector finance. The schemes included in the Submission reflect Council priorities, and as far as is possible, their delivery will be programmed in line with these priorities should there be any reduction in the funding available. Additionally every opportunity will continue to be taken to secure funding from other sources and programme areas, including Section 106 contributions, to supplement this in line with TfL's requirement that boroughs should reduce their dependency on TfL funding. The need to minimise as far as practicable ongoing maintenance costs will be taken into account in all schemes that are awarded funding.

The Council Capital Programme for 2010/11 includes £2m to support better road maintenance resulting from capital investment in safety and other schemes. There is an indicative budget available to support the 2011/12 schemes, subject to the necessary Council approvals.

If the Submission is not made the Council will not receive its most significant funding for highways, road safety and other transportation planning projects. TfL is expected to confirm its approval of the make-up of Havering's LIP Submission in autumn 2010.

#### Legal implications and risks:

There are no specific legal implications or risks arising from this Submission although further legal resources will need to be committed to bring into effect the measures for which funding is sought. Consideration of the Network Management Duty mentioned in paragraph 9 is a statutory requirement.

#### Human Resources implications and risks:

None directly related to this decision.

#### Equalities implications and risks:

An important factor in drawing up the funding Submission will be to improve the ease, convenience and safety of everyone in the Borough who needs to move around in the course of their day to day living and business. The Submission is anticipated to contain a range of measures supporting sustainable transportation modes such as cycling, walking and public transport which will benefit individuals and communities who would otherwise be potentially at risk of experiencing social exclusion. As the ultimately selected schemes are designed and developed full regard will be given to their implications for equalities and social inclusion.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

#### **APPENDIX A**

Projects and programmes comprising Havering's 2011/12 LIP Submission within the total current indicative LIP award of £2,700,000.

Funding category and project title/ description	Additional Commentary/ Locational Information	Value for 2011/12 (£000K)
CORRIDORS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS		
Delivery of projects including subway improvements at London Road, Exchange Street widening at its junction with Waterloo Road, junction improvements at Mawney Road / Ring Road and further work on 'Greening the Ring Road'	Ring Road, Romford and adjoining roads	150
Delivery of projects resulting from 'Corridor' studies in 2010 /11 to tackle congestion and smooth traffic flows	Main Road and North Street, Romford	100
Delivery of 'Better Streets' projects including de- cluttering and pavement alignments	South Street Phase 2 Public Realm Improvement Works, Romford	129
Environmental improvements including repaving	Romford Market	50
Romford Taxi Marshall scheme	Exchange Street, Romford	22
Works to enable two wheel parking off the carriageway along Straight Road, Harold	Straight Road between Hilldene Avenue and	50

Hill	Hailaham Baad	
	Hailsham Road	
'Masterplanning' of the corridor between Harold Hill and Harold Wood to improve access to rail station (links to 'Ambitions' project)	Gooshays Drive and Gubbins Lane, Harold Hill and Harold Wood	100
Junction improvements linked to redevelopment of the Whitworth and Broxhill Centre sites (links to 'Ambitions' project)	Lower Bedfords Road / Straight Road	50
Works to existing cycle route (including signage) linking libraries, rail stations and Havering College	Hornchurch to Harold Hill	70
Rainham Village Traffic Management Scheme (design and consultation stage in 2010 / 11 and scheme implementation in 2011 / 12) to provide attractive and safer pedestrian area with short stay parking (links to Rainham 'Compass' project)	Extension of Viking Way to Upminster Road South, Rainham	600
Rainham Interchange, Rainham (including junction works) to provide access for buses, taxis, cyclists and pedestrians to enable the station to become the main transport hub for this part of London Riverside (links to Rainham 'Compass' project)	Rainham Station	150
Delivery of Local Safety Scheme for South Havering (casualty reduction measures)	Southend Road, Coronation Drive and Rainham Road	120

Delivery of Local Safety Scheme (casualty reduction measures)	Front Lane and Avon Road, Cranham	60
Upminster Town Centre (delivery of traffic flow improvements, 'Better Streets' works and accessibility improvements for pedestrians and cyclists)	Upminster Town Centre	150
Delivery of Local Safety Scheme for Upminster (casualty reduction measures)	St Mary's Lane, Upminster Road and Corbets Tey Road, Upminster	100
Improvement of traffic flow and pedestrian safety at Collier Row.	Collier Row Road, between Hampden Hill roundabout and Carter Drive.	10
Delivery of Gidea Park 'Walkability' project to improve pedestrian access to / from rail station, review bus stop accessibility and examine parking provision	Gidea Park station and its vicinity	100
Ingrebourne Valley Sustrans Connect 2 project Phase 2 (match funding for continued delivery of scheme approved by Cabinet for the Harold Hill to Rainham 'Greenway')	Ingrebourne Valley	250
Climate Change/ Sustainable Energy Package (comprising street lighting improvements as set out in the Council's savings strategy and Climate Change Action Plan)	Not location specific at this stage	50
Cycle Training Programme to provide cycle training for school pupils	Havering schools	60

SMARTER TRAVEL		
Smarter Travel Package	Delivery of smaller travel programmes (comprising of staff costs)	70
Preparation of Workplace Travel Plans	London Riverside Business Improvement District at Rainham, LBH Staff Travel Plan, 'Greener Ways to Work' and promotional and campaign materials	13
School Travel Engineering Package (highways works at specific schools, a review of Keep Clear restrictions, improvements to safety and accessibility of school crossing patrol sites)	St Albans Primary and Mead Schools (for highway works) and10 sites for review of restrictions.	55
School Travel Plan Small Grants package	Small grants for schools to implement School Travel Plan measures.	20
School Travel Plan Development package	Preparing the 'Taking Steps' magazine, staff costs of STP advisors, re- writes of STPs, training and partnership work (eg BUSTED) and promotional and marketing materials	16
School Travel Plan Awareness package	Walk to School week, Walk on Wednesday, Havering Show (including Planet	98

	Havering), Theatre in Education (inc ASB on buses), Transition Packs, walking the way to health initiative and campaigns to support 'Biking Boroughs' initiatives.	
Road Safety Package	Theatre in Education, Younger Driver Vehicle Awareness Campaigns Sustainable Routes to School for Infants and Juniors	57
MAINTENANCE		
Carriageway Works	Rainham Road (Cherry Tree Lane – Stanley Road)	159
Carriageway Works	Hornchurch Road	88
Carriageway Works Carriageway Works	Rainham Road (Shelley Road – Roneo Corner)	127
Carriageway Works	Rush Green Road	109
LOCAL TRANSPORT (TfL		
monies allocated to		
borough to be used at the		
discretion of Council)		
Casualty Reduction	Mawney Road, White	100
Package for Collier Row	Hart Lane and Chase Cross Road	

#### **APPENDIX B**

## Reserve list of Projects and Programmes outside indicatively allocated 2011/12 LIP funding.

Funding category and project title/ description	Additional Commentary/ Locational Information	Value for 2011/12 (£000K
CORRIDORS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS		
Casualty reduction measures (several schemes)	Hornchurch Road, Ardleigh Green Road, North Hill Drive and Gooshays Drive	170
Access improvements at Elm Park Station	The Broadway, Elm Park (between Elm Park Station and Elm Park Avenue)	70
Bus Stop Accessibility improvements (two schemes)	Havering Road and Petits Lane North and Nos. 37-55 Collier Row Lane	95
Pedestrian Refuge	Beehive Court in Gubbins Lane, Harold Wood	35
Zebra Crossing Lighting improvements	No specific locations	50
Taxi Marshall scheme	Hornchurch	22
Traffic Flow Improvements	Rainham Road / Elm Park Avenue	50
Installation of a 'Pegasus' Crossing (to support NE London Greenways East London Green Grid)	Lower Bedfords Road and Bedfords Park	90
'Better Streets' works design	Upminster Road South, Rainham	100

Casualty Reduction Measures	Not specific	60
Local Safety Scheme Minor Improvements and Feasibility Study	Not specific	90
SMARTER TRAVEL		
School Travel Plan Implementation (speed table at junction of Albany Road and Barton Avenue to assist school crossing patrol)	Wykeham Primary School	30
School Travel Plan Development (improvement of dropped kerbs and introduction of part-time waiting restrictions where school crossing patrols operate)	Not specific	15
School Travel Plan Small Grants package.	Not specific	15



# **7** REPORT

## HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 21 September 2010

Subject Heading:

MERCURY HOUSE Short term parking facilities. Outcome of public consultation

Report Author and contact details:

Daniel Jackson Engineer 01708 433115 daniel.jackson@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[X]High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax[]

#### SUMMARY

Following complaints from trades, delivery drivers and visitors to Mercury House, staff have 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. This report outlines the results of the public consultation for the provision of a short term parking facilities in the service road situated to the north-west of Mercury House and requests authorisation for implementation.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the short term parking bay detailed in this report and shown on Drawing MHSR/01/01 be implemented
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £1,500 for the scheme can be met from the 2009/10 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes.

**REPORT DETAIL** 

#### 1.0 Background

- 1.1 As part of the Councils strategic buildings policy, more staff are being moved into Mercury House, which is generating more deliveries to the building and the numbers of staff collecting and dropping off equipment/ supplies has increased. Although Mercury House does have a rear goods access, this is shared with a number of retail units and there are regularly vehicles loading and unloading in this area. Deliveries have been parking in the bus stop clearway that fronts Mercury House and the coach parking bay to the side of Mercury House resulting in penalty charge notices being issued thus making servicing of the building more difficult and impacting on bus operations.
- 1.2 To improve the access to Mercury House, it has been proposed that the existing coach parking bay to the north-west side of Mercury House be extended and changed into a free parking bay with a maximum stay period of 30 minutes. This provision should make accessing Mercury House easer and reduce the amount of drivers and visitors to Mercury House parking in the bus stop clearway.
- 1.3 The bay would therefore be in operation 8am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday, parking for 30 minutes with no return within 3 hours.
- 1.4 A Chairman's Decision was signed on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010 giving staff authority to proceed with the advertisement and public consultation on the proposals.

1.5 4 letters were delivered to those in the area potentially affected by the scheme on 26th May 2010 (Debenhams, The Liberty 1 and 2 Management and LBH Town Centre Management). In addition, the proposals were advertised with a closing date of 30th August 2010 for responses.

#### 2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 1 response was received from LBH Town Centre Management. These comments are summarised in Appendix I of this report.
- 2.2 LBH Town Centre Management raised concerns about the loss of a coach parking bay to the town centre and its impact on coaches.

#### 3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 Staff are of the view that that the proposed short stay parking bays adjacent to Mercury House would have a positive impact on the servicing of the building, providing ease of access for deliveries and staff.
- 3.2 The coach bays are not frequently used, i.e. more than twice a week. There are 2 coach parking bays located opposite and 4 bays within 50 metres. In addition the service road is subject to redevelopment which will mean coach parking will be provided in other areas of Romford.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

#### Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of £1,500 can be met from the 2009/10 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes.

#### Legal implications and risks:

Parking 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:**

Blue-badge holders are able to park for an unlimited time and without charge in parking bays described within this report.



#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Chairman's Decision, (Romford Area Committee) 30<sup>th</sup> March 2010

#### Drawings

MHSR/01/01 - Service road flanking Mercury House, Romford – Conversion of existing coach bay to 5 short stay parking bays

#### **APPENDIX I**

#### SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Respondent	Comments
LBH Town Centre Management	Proposal raises concerns as the bays are used frequently and could be detrimental to tourism if alternative locations are not sought before implementation.





## **8** REPORT

## HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 21 September 2010

Subject Heading:

#### LAKE RISE AND ROSEMARY AVENUE PARKING REVIEW 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

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that one of the following decisions be taken :
  - Reject the current proposals, but introduce the double yellow lines on junctions and bends as set out on drawings QF210/RL/101 to QF210/RL/109; or
  - (ii) Reject the scheme as advertised in the current proposals completely; or
  - (iii) Implement the scheme as advertised in the current proposals as set out on drawings QF210/RL/101 to 109; or
  - (iv) 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 extends shown on Drawing QF210/RL/150); or
  - (v) Propose a set of constraints for the design and consultation of a different scheme from that advertised in the current proposals.
- 2. That if option 1(i) or option 1(ii) is recommended that the Committee recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment a suitable period of time within which the matter shall not be reviewed again.
- 3. That it be noted that the estimated cost of up to £10,000 for implementation will be met from the Council's 2010/11 revenue budget for Minor Parking Schemes.

**REPORT DETAIL** 

#### 1.0 Background

1.1 Work to review the parking regime in the Lake Rise and Rosemary Road area has been ongoing since 2005.

- 1.2 The area is currently part of Sector 5 review area of the Romford Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), which is in operation 8:30am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday. The zone has no residents' permit bays, but does contain some free parking bays in Lake Rise/ Rosemary Avenue and some meter bays in Oaklands Avenue and the rear of the Town Hall.
- 1.3 The area currently restricted is 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 are within the scheme (Drawing QF210/RL/150).
- 1.4 The chronology of the review issues since 2005 is set out below.
- 1.5 A questionnaire was circulated to residents in the area inviting comments on parking issues following a decision by the Central Area Committee in July 2005.
- 1.6 The outcome of the consultation was split between extending the current restrictions in the area and introduction of a residents' permit parking scheme;
- 1.7 A residents' permit parking scheme was developed and agreed for public consultation by the Central Area Committee and North Romford Area Committee in March 2006;
- 1.8 Proposals for the residents' permit parking scheme were advertised in November 2008. The scheme was proposed to operate 8:30am to 6:30pm, Monday to Saturday (to be in line with the current CPZ restrictions) and the scheme would introduce residents' permit parking bays. The existing part of the scheme would have been unchanged with the retention of the free parking bays;
- 1.9 The outcome of the consultation was reported to a joint meeting of the 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 several suggestions as to how the scheme should be taken forward.
- 1.10 As a result, the joint Area Committee considered a number of options for taking the matter forward as set out in Appendix II of this report. The Committee agreed that a scheme should be taken forward to detailed design and consultation which was subject to the following constraints;
  - A scheme 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.
- 1.11 The scheme was designed and approved for consultation by the two Area Committee Chairmen and the Chairman of the Regulatory Services Committee.
- 1.12 Drawings QF210/RL/101 to 109 show the detail of the scheme. Some 400 letters and plans were hand-delivered to residents on or just after 15<sup>th</sup> December 2009 with the proposals also being advertised. The closing date for responses was 8<sup>th</sup> January 2010.
- 1.13 Because of the timing of the local elections, it was not possible for a joint-Area Committee to be held before the elections. Changes to the decisionmaking process requires the matter to now be reported through the Highways Advisory Committee process.

#### 2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of public consultation, 39 responses had been received (10% response rate).
- 2.2 Of those responding, 12 supported the scheme (31%), 15 objected to the scheme (38%, but some given anonymously) and 12 either did not give a view, made non-related comments or requested a different scheme (31%). A summary of comments are set out in Appendix I to this report.
- 2.3 There are many different comments given by the respondents. There are some people who do not think enough bays are proposed and some thinking there are too many (in terms of preventing two-way traffic flow). Some want a scheme to operate all day, some are content with the advertised times and some want different times (citing shift workers as being the issue).

2.4 There are some comments that the original scheme has pushed commuters into the unrestricted areas, some disagreeing with the point. There is some indication that people are concerned that a simple restriction is introduced, they will have no facility to park. Some concerns have been raised that the scheme will lead to an increase in dropped kerb applications which would remove further on-street provision.

#### 3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 It is clear, from the various consultations since 2005, that consensus within the area is difficult to achieve and any decision made will not be supported universally.
- 3.2 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. However, if people visiting Romford can find a free bay, they can of course use it.
- 3.3 The addresses of those responding to the current consultation do not give conclusive information of views being concentrated in a particular area there are simply not enough responses available; although there are some hints that the current scheme may be causing an overspill parking issue on the edges of the current zone.
- 3.4 The physical layout of the current proposal does restrict two-way traffic flow over short sections with the parking bay layouts, but there is sufficient opportunity for traffic to pass each other and there are no locations where emergency and servicing vehicles would be unduly hindered. The design provides for the maximum amount of parking bays for the area.
- 3.5 It is difficult to give the Committee clear advice on what recommendations should be made to take the scheme forward. It seems that there are so many competing views; the Council will not be able to make a decision which satisfies all with an interest.
- 3.6 It occurs to Staff, the Committee may wish to consider the following options;
  - Reject the current proposals, but introduce the double yellow lines on junctions and bends as set out on the attached drawings QF210/RL/101 to QF210/RL/109; or
  - (ii) Reject the scheme as advertised in the current proposals completely; or
  - (iii) Implement the scheme as advertised in the current proposals as set out on drawings QF210/RL/101 to QF210/RL/109; or
  - (iv) 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 extends shown on Drawing QF210/RL/150 ); or

- (v) Propose a different scheme from that advertised in the current proposals.
- 3.7 Staff suggest that if one of the first two options is taken forward, then the Committee may recommend that the matter will 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 will 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.
- 3.8 Staff recommend 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.
- 3.9 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.
- 3.10 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.
- 3.11 In proposing a different scheme, Staff would remind the Committee that a scheme extending the current operation with residents' permit parking bays was not favoured by residents and a part time scheme has produced split views a different option is likely to lead to similar split views or rejection. The Committee may wish to reflect on the options previously discussed by other committees as set out in Appendix II.
- 3.12 Staff finally suggest that despite some residents not being in favour of residents' permit parking bays (not being required or not accepting other people parking in front of their premises), if none are included within a scheme, then many residents will be disadvantaged as they cannot provide any more off-street parking.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

#### Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of up to £10,000 for implementation can be met from the 2010/11 Minor Parking Schemes.

#### Legal implications and risks:

Waiting restrictions and parking 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 in residential areas are often installed to improve road safety and accessibility for residents who may be affected by long-term non- residential parking.

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

Blue-badge holders are able to generally 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 Scheme File Ref: QJ058 Lake Rise/ Rosemary Avenue Parking Scheme

#### **Design Drawings**

- QF210/RL/101 to 109 Rosemary Avenue/ Lake Rise Area Proposed Residents Parking Scheme
- QF210/RL/150 Extent of current Controlled Parking Zone

APPENDIX I SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

#### Rosemary Road & Lake Avenue Residents' Parking Scheme Consultation Summary December 2009

Around 400 properties within the area were consulted between 15<sup>th</sup> December 2009 and 8<sup>th</sup> January 2010.

39 responses by letter or email received and summarised below – 10% response rate.

12 responses in support of the scheme, 15 responses in objection to the scheme and 12 responses not giving a view, making non-related comments or requests for different scheme.

#### Support for Scheme

Ref:	Address	Comment
1	17 Rosemary Avenue	Supports scheme and suggests that even if Lake Rise opposes, the Rosemary Avenue section should be installed.
2	21 Rosemary Avenue	Agrees with scheme.
3	19 Rosemary Avenue	In favour of scheme, but would also like a 14:30 to 15:30 restriction and hopes scheme will be a good start with a future review.
4	8 Rosemary Avenue	Supports scheme which will make a big difference and should be implemented in the road even if not in others.
5	54 Lake Rise	Agrees with proposals and it ticks all the boxes.
6	7 Rosemary Avenue	Welcomes scheme, but has concerns about bay being lengthened opposite drive which will make the swing in and out more difficult. Concerned that after 11am and at the weekend the current problem would be exacerbated. Comments about how the scheme will be managed.
7	12 Pettits Lane	Scheme appears reasonable but as the resident has used the existing bay in Woodlands road feels they should be within the proposed scheme and assumes this to be an oversight.

8	65 Lake Rise	Since the first scheme, the parking problem has been extended further along the road extending up to and beyond midnight. However, the scheme needs to have an afternoon restriction to stop afternoon/ evening commuters, say 3pm to 4pm.
9	52 Lake Rise	Scheme is satisfactory.
		However, as Lake Rise curves and visibility is restricted it seems dangerous to have parking bays opposite each other. At present with parking on both sides of Lake Rise outside property vehicles have to do <u>d</u> ge each other to pass.
10	110 Lake Rise	Scheme offers a reasonable solution to current problems in the area.
		Comments regarding detail of bay layouts and question about whether or not vehicle wheels or body has to be within bay markings.
11	10 Lake Rise	Current suffer from commuter problems and the proposals are a good compromise which hopefully will be acceptable to residents of Lake Rise. The double yellow lines on the bend are essential for safety.
12	105 Lake Rise	Agree with the proposal for a residents parking scheme but cannot understand why the restrictions at the Main Road end are being altered as they have operated satisfactorily for years.

### **Objections to scheme**

Ref:	Address	Comment
1	26 Lake Rise	Does not see any reason for the scheme as there is not a problem. More parking bays will cause congestion, litter and make the road dangerous.
		More vehicles parked adjacent to each other will make it more difficult to exit driveways Agrees with yellow lines on bend.
		If commuters are a problem, just introduce a time restriction. Why are the joint committee keen to turn Lake Rise into a

		car park for hotel guests and customers?
2	36 Lake Rise	<ul> <li>10m parking bay outside 36/38 with a bay on the opposite side of the road will further restrict 2-way flow.</li> <li>Slight curve adjacent to property will reduce sight lines and endanger access.</li> <li>Reducing 2-way traffic makes it difficult and dangerous for Council utility vehicles, ambulances etc.</li> </ul>
3	38 Lake Rise	Considers the road to be too narrow for vehicles to be parked on both sides and would be unsafe. Has invested in off-street parking. Proposals will mean resident will have to reverse onto the road blind when high sided vehicles are parked. People parking in Main Road do not park on the road and nor should residents in this road. No accidents have occurred in the one side parking areas and so it is safe roads versus individual inconvenience and favours the safer solution with clear access at all times for emergency vehicles.
4	4 Parkland Avenue	<ul> <li>Strong objections as there are no parking problems in the street.</li> <li>Proposals will cause problems for every resident in this and the other roads affected by the scheme and there would be insufficient parking for residents and their visitors.</li> <li>There will be constant arguments between residents over limited parking places and the scheme is designed as a money making exercise.</li> <li>Scheme would lead to more crossovers and parking on gardens which does not fit in with the Council and Government's call for more environmentally sound urban landscapes.</li> <li>Political comments.</li> </ul>
5	17 Lake Rise	Several comments questioning and criticising the operation of the permit scheme. Concerned that additional bays on the opposite side of the road to existing bays will cause danger and congestion. Sees the scheme as a money spinner.

		Concerned that the reduction of the controlled times at their end of the street will cause problems the rest of the day and Saturdays.
6	2 Parkland Avenue	Parking charges are a tax over and above road and local taxes and cannot see any benefit.
		Comments regarding financial viability of scheme operation.
		Supports double yellow lines at park entrance and perhaps double sided printing of the circular.
7	No address given	Cannot understand why existing scheme needs to be abandoned.
		Suggests a new controlled zone for an hour per day with residents only parking and a line to allow parking in front of crossovers by residents for the restricted time.
8	70 Lake Rise	Concerned that the scheme will render the roads being unsightly painted with inappropriate costs being a burden on residents.
9	23 Lake Rise	Concerned that the reduction in parking prohibition will cause congestion and be unsafe.
10	No address given	Strong political comments made.
11	29 Pettits Lane	Unhappy that they are excluded from the permit scheme area because they live on the other side of the road, even though they currently use the bay in Woodlands Road.
12	125 Pettits Lane	Objects to scheme as they are excluded from the permit scheme and would make life difficult for deliveries and visitors.
13	Number not given, Raphael Avenue	Strongly against proposal as there is no problem with parking and would mean paying money for nothing.
14	Number not given, Raphael Avenue	Cannot see why Raphael Avenue has been included as it is unusual for non-residents to park. If all the bays are taken, what are residents meant to do.
		Residents should be issued free parking for one vehicle. It seems a way for the Council to raise revenue.
		Has it been taken into account whether refuse vehicles can

		gain access if vehicles were parked in the bays.
15	9 Rosemary Avenue	Objects to scheme as scheme has not been properly considered, will not improve parking and will make it worse in some roads. The Council should be supporting residents in time of financial crisis and should not be actively creating ways of extracting money from residents, especially charging for what is currently free. Why can't permits be provided to residents for free. If the aim is to prevent shoppers and commuters from parking, why are the proposed bays not for residents only all day, seven days a week? Current restrictions operate 8:30am to 6:30pm, Monday to
		Saturday and changes may result in more parking outside the hour restriction – shoppers and shift/ flexible working commuters. Proposal makes no consideration for Saturday parking.
		Currently, there is restricted parking in Rosemary Avenue on Saturdays. Proposal will make it a free place to park for non residents all weekend. At certain times of the year Saturday parking by shoppers can be a problem.
		No issue with current arrangements and Council should not be spending when it should be cutting back and not spending on a scheme not supported by residents.
		More precise information about the problems is needed and assurance required that scheme will solve problems with majority of residents supporting.

### No view expressed or other comments

1	40 Lake Rise	The scheme will answer some of the commuter parking issues and certain dangerous corners with parked cars will be much safer. However, still concerned that outside of the times of operation there will still be long stretches of parking on both sides, especially on market days
2	62 Lake Rise	Feels that the scheme would be better operating 11am to 12pm to deter late starters.

		Concerned that single yellow lines are of the same time on both sides of the road and feels that on one side they should operate all day to assist emergency and commercial vehicles. Concerned that commuter parking will be replaced by shift worker parking. Concerned that the parking bay outside no.60 is opposite a junction. Concerns about how local people park vans and people parking between dropped kerbs causing access issues.
3	15 Parkland	Scheme better than the original, but there is nowhere
0	Avenue	enough resident parking bays and more could be fitted in.
		Without an increase there will be car juggling and more paving over of gardens.
		Questions legal basis for conditions of parking permit requiring nearside of vehicle to be against kerb.
4	16 Woodlands Road	Requests additional residents' bay rather than a single yellow line.
5	101 Lake Rise	Seeks clarification on parking bay dimensions and how various parts of the permit scheme works.
6	15 Wayside Close	Resident had been against a scheme but if the restrictions are provided elsewhere, Wayside Close should have single yellow line (7am to 10am, Monday to Saturday). Double yellow lines at the road entrance. No residents' bays. Problems in street are not commuters, but other residents in the street causing obstructions.
7	90 Lake Rise	Comments that the bay proposed outside 90 cannot be provided as the resident has planning consent for a dropped kerb.
8	4 Raphael Avenue	Comments about a recent vehicle crossover being built which will prevent a proposed bay from being provided.
9	1 Brockton Close	Requests that Brockton Close has the double yellow lines at the junction with Lake Rise, but for a part time restriction in the Close 8am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday as this would not affect surrounding roads.
10	1, 2, 3, 4 & 6 Brockton Close	Requests that Brockton Close has the double yellow lines at the junction with Lake Rise, but for a part time restriction in the Close 8am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday because of

		problems with commuter parking, shoppers, visitors to the park and residents in Lake Rise.
11	86 Lake Rise	Comments about a recent vehicle crossover being provided and so a bay would need to be shortened.
	14 Pettits Lane	No objections to scheme but wonders why visitors permits are valid for 4 hours when the restrictions are only for one hour per day.
12	15 Raphael Avenue	Concerned that the restrictions proposed [double yellow lines] into Pettits Lane at its junction with Parklands Avenue being 10 metres are not long enough.
		10 metres is not long enough for traffic speed and stopping distances.
		Asks what provision for off street parking is being made for users of Raphael Park.

APPENDIX II SUGGESTIONS CONSIDERED BY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE, MARCH 2009
Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Maintain the status-quo	No further resources expended.	Areas currently unrestricted will continue to suffer reported problems.
Introduce "at any time" restrictions at junctions and bends.	Minor road safety improvements at a limited cost.	Some parking will be displaced, but would be considered acceptable for safety and access reasons.
Convert existing "free bays" within existing scheme to residents' permits operational in line with current times – 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Saturday (Lake Rise, Rosemary Avenue and Woodlands Road)	Will remove commuter and other parking from existing streets.	May displace commuter and other parking into streets outside existing scheme area.
Maintain existing controls as they stand, but introduce new controls elsewhere on the "one hour per day" basis (or similar) operating Monday to Friday with or without permits.	Smaller area affected with similar advantages for the extension.	Smaller area affected with similar disadvantages for the extension Could create confusion amongst residents and the travelling public, especially where one end of the street is restricted all day and the other for a short period. Would complicate administration for Parking Service.

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages
Restrict entire area for one hour or similar in the morning, Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 10am has been suggested by several residents – this would be the same as the scheme operational in the Lodge Avenue (Sector 1) area.	Simple to design, implement, enforce and understand. Will remove all-day commuter parking from area. Users of Raphael Park will be able to park on an unrestricted basis outside of the times of operation. Residents' visitors will be able to park on an unrestricted basis outside the times of operation.	Residents and their visitors will not be able to park on-street during the restricted times. Some residents do not have enough off-street parking spaces. Parking will be unrestricted outside of these times which would allow unrestricted by shoppers and shift- commuters for example.
Restrict entire area for one hour or similar in the morning, Monday to Friday, such as 8:30am to 10am or similar, with residents' bays provided wherever there is space.	Simple to design, implement, enforce and understand. Will remove all-day commuter parking from area. Users of Raphael Park will be able to park on an unrestricted basis outside of the times of operation. Residents' visitors will be able to park on an unrestricted basis outside the times of operation. Residents and their visitors who wish to park on-street during the restricted times will be able to do so. Residents who do not need or want permits will not be compelled to pay for them.	Those residents wishing to use permits will have to pay for them in line with the borough-wide policy. A new set of permits will need to be set up from a Parking Service point of view which will create set up costs. Parking will be unrestricted outside of these times which would allow unrestricted by shoppers and shift- commuters for example.

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages
Provide a scheme with	This proposal will	More complicated for residents
restrictions (with or without residents' permit	prevent all long-term non-residential parking.	and drivers to understand.
parking) in operation		Further restrictions on park
one hour in the morning and one hour in the		users.
afternoon. Either		Could possibly disperse
Monday to Friday or		afternoon parking into Lodge
Monday to Saturday		Avenue area.
		Afternoon enforcement would compete for civil enforcement
		officer resources at peak times
		for school leaving times.



6					23		
CULTURE & COMMUNITY The semicore over The semicor	REVISION AMENIDMENT DATE JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 1 OF 9	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS	Image: Constraint of the second systemPROPOSEDImage: Constraint of the second systemPRESIDENTS'Image: Constraint of the second systemPARKING BAYImage: Constraint of the second systemPARKING BAY	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	PURPOSE         CONSULTATION           ©COPRIGHT         Engineering           This draining belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering         Section, Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior           Based upon Ordance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of the Majety's Stationery Office @ Crawn copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infinings Crawn copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Hovering 100024527           NOTES



		3		81	<b>ð</b> ,		
CULTURE & COMMUNITY The memory some New Teamory and the one of the service in t	REVISION     AMENDMENT     DATE       JOB TITLE ROSEMARY     AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME       DRAMING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 2 OF 9	RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTING PARKING	Image: Constrained by the second systemPROPOSEDImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAY	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	PURPOSE         CONSULTATION           ©COPYRIGHT         This drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission of the Controller of the Majesty's Stationery Office © Crawn copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infininges Crawn copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Brough of Howering 1002/4327           NOTES         NOTES



STREEF CALLURE     CULTURE     COMMUNT       The winnorm colspan="2">The winnorm colspan="2"       The winnorm colspan="2"       DRAFT       The winnorm colspan="2"       CHECKED BY       MLP       SCALE       DARE       DRAFT <tr< th=""><th>REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME DRAWING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 3 OF 9</th><th>EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA</th><th>EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS</th><th>Image: Constrained by the second systemPROPOSEDImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAY</th><th>PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY</th><th>PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES</th><th>PURPOSE         CONSULTATION           ©COPRIGHT         CONSULTATION           Big Conversion         StreatCare           Nite drawing beings to StreatCare         Culture &amp; Community, Traffic &amp; Engineering           Section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior           written permission.         StreatCare           Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Majety's Striatory Office © Crown copyright. Unsubficient production infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Howering 10024327</th></tr<>	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME DRAWING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 3 OF 9	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS	Image: Constrained by the second systemPROPOSEDImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAYImage: Constrained by the second systemPRIDAY	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	PURPOSE         CONSULTATION           ©COPRIGHT         CONSULTATION           Big Conversion         StreatCare           Nite drawing beings to StreatCare         Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering           Section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior           written permission.         StreatCare           Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Majety's Striatory Office © Crown copyright. Unsubficient production infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Howering 10024327



STREEF CULTURE & COMMUNTY       NE WINNER CULTURE & COMMUNTY       NE WINNER CULTURE & COMMUNTY       NE WINNER COMMUNTY       NE WINNER       INTE WINNER       INTE WINNER       INTE WINNER       CHECKED BY       MLP     MLP       SCALE     DATE       ACAD REF:     DRAWING NO       Sheet Size: A3 (297x420)     DRAWING NO	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 4 OF 9	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	<b>C — — — — — — — — — —</b>	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	Section, heither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission. Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Majesty's Stationery Office © Crosm copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Corm copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. NOTES PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	CONSULTATION ongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineer



	I	,											
0 (A3) 0ATE EF: - 09	THE WITCH AND	AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AF RESIDENTS PARKING SC	-	BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING	EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS	Image: Construct of the second system       PRESIDENTS' PARKING BAY IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	- 0 -	SINGI F YFI I OW	DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	Landan Borough af Havering 100024327 . NOTES	Survey Mapping with the permission of the C ny Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised rep ght and may lead to prosecution or civil prod	PURPOSE CONSULTATION COPYRIGHT Dis drawing belongs to StreetCore Culture & Community. Traffic & Engineering Section. Netther the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior



										<u>ح</u> ک		
DRAWN BY     CHECKED BY     APPRVED BY       MLP     IH     MLP       1:500     (A3)     OCT       0CT     09     ISUE       ACAD     REF:     -       Sheet size: A3 (297x420)     QF210/RL106	F 9	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE RISE AREA DERODOCED DECIDENTS DADKING SCHEME	1	AG SED	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING	VEHICLE CROSSOVERS	<b>–</b> – – RESIDENTS' PARKING BAY IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	LINE LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED DOUBLE	infringes Cown copyright ad may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Havering 100024327 NOTES	use or using being or burden or out the or only for the order of the o	CONSULTATION



CUIT       CUIT <th cols<="" th=""><th>REVISION AMENDMENT JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE PROPOSED RESIDENTS PA DRAMING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 7 OF 9</th><th>EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND BAYS NOT SHOWN SCHEME IS PROPO REPLACE EVERYTHI CURRENTLY OPERA WITHIN THE AREA</th><th>EXISTIN VEHICL CROSS</th><th>Image: Construction   Image: Construction   PROPOSE     Image: Construction   PRESIDEN     Image: Construction   PARKING     In OPER   10AM     10AM   TC     MONDAY   FRIDAY</th><th>PROP SINGL IN 10AM FRIDA</th><th>PROPOSI DOUBLE YELLOW</th><th>PURPOSE     CONSULTATION       ©COPYRIGHT     The drawing belongs to StreetCore Culture &amp; Community, Tre Section, Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be repr written permission.       Based upon, Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of ther Majest's Stationery Office @ Corem copyright. Unauthories landon Borough of Horeing 10002-4327       NOTES</th></th>	<th>REVISION AMENDMENT JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE PROPOSED RESIDENTS PA DRAMING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 7 OF 9</th> <th>EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND BAYS NOT SHOWN SCHEME IS PROPO REPLACE EVERYTHI CURRENTLY OPERA WITHIN THE AREA</th> <th>EXISTIN VEHICL CROSS</th> <th>Image: Construction   Image: Construction   PROPOSE     Image: Construction   PRESIDEN     Image: Construction   PARKING     In OPER   10AM     10AM   TC     MONDAY   FRIDAY</th> <th>PROP SINGL IN 10AM FRIDA</th> <th>PROPOSI DOUBLE YELLOW</th> <th>PURPOSE     CONSULTATION       ©COPYRIGHT     The drawing belongs to StreetCore Culture &amp; Community, Tre Section, Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be repr written permission.       Based upon, Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of ther Majest's Stationery Office @ Corem copyright. Unauthories landon Borough of Horeing 10002-4327       NOTES</th>	REVISION AMENDMENT JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AVENUE/ LAKE PROPOSED RESIDENTS PA DRAMING TITLE PROPOSED LAYOUT SHEET 7 OF 9	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND BAYS NOT SHOWN SCHEME IS PROPO REPLACE EVERYTHI CURRENTLY OPERA WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTIN VEHICL CROSS	Image: Construction   Image: Construction   PROPOSE     Image: Construction   PRESIDEN     Image: Construction   PARKING     In OPER   10AM     10AM   TC     MONDAY   FRIDAY	PROP SINGL IN 10AM FRIDA	PROPOSI DOUBLE YELLOW	PURPOSE     CONSULTATION       ©COPYRIGHT     The drawing belongs to StreetCore Culture & Community, Tre Section, Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be repr written permission.       Based upon, Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of ther Majest's Stationery Office @ Corem copyright. Unauthories landon Borough of Horeing 10002-4327       NOTES
STREET CARE NULTURE & COMMUNITY TREMOVER COMMUNITY NULTURE NO CONSTRUCTION FAX INC 0708 433704 ML POPROVED BY ML POPROVED BY M		ATING	SSOVERS	POSED DENTS' (ING BAY PERATION 1 TO 11AM. DAY TO AY	DPOSED GLE YELLOW E OPERATION OPERATION M TO 11AM. NDAY TO DAY	POSED BLE OW LINES	_TATION 	



SHEET 8 OF 9 Sheet Size: A3 (297x420) SHEET 8 OF 9 SHEET	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE ROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME	EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS	Image: Constraint of the second systemPROPOSEDRESIDENTS' PARKING BAY IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES	PURPOSE         CONSULTATION           ©COPRIGHT         CONSULTATION           The drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering Section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission.         Based upon ordinance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Migsty's Stationery Office © Corem copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Cram copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Berough of Horeing 100024327



Revision     Amendment     Date       Job TITLE ROSEMARY ROPOSED     REVENUE/ RESIDENTS     LAKE PROPOSED     RESE RESIDENTS     AREA PROPOSED       DRAWING PROPOSED     LAYOUT     STREET STREET     STREET CULTURE     COMMUNITY REVENTION REVENTI	EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING BAYS NOT SHOWN AS THIS SCHEME IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EVERYTHING CURRENTLY OPERATING WITHIN THE AREA	PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY PARKING BAY IN OPERATION 10AM TO 11AM. MONDAY TO FRIDAY	PURPOSE     CONSULTATION       ©COPYRIGHT     The drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community. Traffic & Engineering section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission of the Controller of the Majesty's Stotionery Offse © Corun copyright. Unauthorised reproduction frinninge Corum copyright. Unauthorised reproduction fried © Corum 1002;4327       NOTES     PROPOSED       DOUBLE     DOUBLE       YELLOW     LINES



/////								$\neg$	Shelter		
Sheet Size: A3	SCALE 1:500 (A3)	drawn by MLP		DRAWING TITLE EXTENT O CONTROLL	JOB TITLE ROSEMARY AV PROPOSED RI	REVISION AN				NOTES	PURPOSE ©COPYRICHT This drawing belong Section, Weither the written permission. Based upon Ordnanc Her Melgiesty's Station infringes Crown copy London Borough of
A3 (297x420) QF210	OCT 09	CHECKED BY	ering	URRENT PARKING ZOI	AVENUE/ LAKE RISE D RESIDENTS PARKING	AMENDMENT				EXISTING AR SECTOR 5 ( ROMFORD C	PURPOSE INFORMATION ecopyrRIGHT This drowing beforgs to Staction, Neither the whole nor cary part thereof may be reproduced without pr Section, Neither the whole nor cary part thereof may be reproduced without pr written permission. written permission of the Cantroller of ther Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction there Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction intringes Crown copyright and may lead to proseeution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Hovering 100024327
QF210/RL150		APPROVED BY MLP	STREET CARE CULTURE & COMMUNITY The WINDORH COME NOW FOR THE ROU NOW FOR COME OF ANTO TELEPHONE No: 01708 433719 FM: No: 01708 433719 FM: No: 01708 433719		N5¥	DATE				OF THE CPZ	TION with, Traffic & Engineering - be reproduced without prior - be Controller of nauthorised reproduction nauthorised reproduction on or skill proceedings.

This page is deliberately left blank



# 9 REPORT

[X]

[]

[]

[]

[X]

# HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 21 SEPTEMBER 2010

Subject Heading:

ELM PARK WALKABILITY Rosewood Avenue and Coronation Drive Pedestrian Crossing Improvements

Report Author and contact details:

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

This report recommends that one new uncontrolled pedestrian crossing is provided and five existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossings are upgraded in the Elm Park local centre.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the pedestrian crossing improvements, including the removal of two mature trees, as detailed in this report and shown on Drawing QH012/OF/51 be implemented.
- 2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £15,000 including fees and tree replacement can be met from the 2010/11 allocation for Walking Improvements funded by Transport for London.

**REPORT DETAIL** 

#### 1.0 Background

- 1.1 In encouraging people to walk more, Transport for London has 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.
- 1.2 Pedestrian crossings of side roads were improved in St Nicholas Avenue and Maylands Avenue in 2009/10.
- 1.3 Work has continued into 2010/11. The existing pedestrian crossings to be improved will be provided with tactile paving and kerbs flush with the carriageway, realigned where necessary to suit pedestrian desire lines. The existing locations are 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.
- 1.4 The proposed location is at:
  - Rosewood Avenue outside no.1 Station Parade and children's nursery.
- 1.5 The existing crossing of Coronation Drive will require the removal of two mature Lime trees. The removal of a mature highway tree requires replacement with five new trees. The proposed locations for these are yet to be decided. Residents in the vicinity who have previously requested a tree will be offered one and further consultation with residents will take place in September. The planting season commences November.

# IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

#### Financial implications and risks:

That it be noted that the estimated cost of £15,000 including fees and tree replacement can be met from the 2010/11 allocation for Walking Improvements funded by Transport for London.

#### Legal implications and risks:

None.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

#### **Equalities Implications and Risks:**

The provision of uncontrolled crossing facilities makes it easier for the less mobile sectors of the community to cross streets.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

#### **Design Drawings**

Drawing No.

QH012/OF/51 Walkability Elm Park – Rosewood Avenue & Coronation Drive Pedestrian Crossing Improvements



# **10** REPORT

# HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 21 September 2010

Subject Heading:

### HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE (SOUTH) PARKING REVIEW Outcome of area survey

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	[X]
High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	[]



This report presents the views of those responding to a parking survey in the area to the south of Hornchurch Town Centre. It proposes an area and principles for a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and seeks authority to design and advertise a detailed scheme.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the responses and information set out in this report either;
  - (a) The Committee considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement of the scheme, subject to comments put forward by the Committee, to cover the area shown on Drawing QJ044/109 and with the following principles;
    - The scheme shall operate between 8am and 8pm, Monday to Saturday;
    - 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;
    - That pay-and-display parking bays be provided where not directly affecting residents and where can be used for visitors to shops and restaurants in the area;
    - Double yellow lines be provided on all junctions and bends within the scheme area; 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 £10,000 which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor Parking Schemes.

REPORT DETAIL

#### 1.0 Background

- 1.1 Residents in streets to the south of Hornchurch Town Centre have 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.
- 1.2 It has been suggested that the parking is a combination of commuters parking to work in the town centre and shoppers visiting the area. In

addition, some residents have also related parking problems occurring in the evening where evening visitors to the Town Centre cause similar problems.

- 1.3 On 21<sup>st</sup> 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. Drawing QJ044/101 shows the review area.
- 1.4 Approximately 1800 letters were hand delivered to the area on or just after 7<sup>th</sup> October 2009, with a questionnaire (a copy of which is in Appendix I of this report), with a closing date of 11<sup>th</sup> December 2009 for completion.
- 1.5 By the close of consultation, 351 responses had been received (20% response rate). The breakdown of responses is set out by street and question in Appendix II, with a summary of comments set out in Appendix III.

#### 2.0 Analysis of responses

- 2.1 The views were mixed across the various questions and therefore Drawings QJ044/102 to 108 show graphically how views are expressed across the review area in response to the questions.
- 2.2 Question 1 asks if there is a problem which needs dealing with 46% of respondents feel there is and 50% feel there is not. The views change across the review area with the areas immediately south and east of the Town Centre experiencing the greatest problems.
- 2.3 Of those believing a scheme is justified, the data is as follows;
  - 51% prefer a residents' parking scheme and 26% prefer waiting restrictions (Question 3);
  - 26% prefer a scheme operating all day, 48% prefer a scheme to operate all day and into the evening and 23% prefer a scheme to be in operation for an hour per day (Question 4);
  - 24% prefer a scheme to be in operation Monday to Friday and 70% prefer Monday to Saturday (Question 5);
  - 96% agree that double yellow lines should be introduced on junctions, bends and where servicing is difficult (Question 6);
- 2.4 Where respondents did not feel a scheme is required, they were asked what type of scheme they would prefer if one were introduced. The data in this case is as follows;
  - 27% prefer a residents' parking scheme and 42% prefer waiting restrictions (Question 7);

- 11% prefer a scheme in operation all day, 10% prefer a scheme to operate all day and into the evening and 43% prefer a scheme to be in operation for an hour per day (Question 8);
- 45% prefer a scheme to be in operation Monday to Friday and 19% prefer Monday to Saturday (Question 9);
- 87% agree that double yellow lines should be introduced on junctions, bends and where servicing is difficult.
- 2.5 Many issues were commented upon, but the following were highlighted a number of times (in no particular order);
  - The Royal Mail sorting office was the cause of localised congestion and access problems;
  - Parking problems have increased since the introduction of car park charges/ car park charges should be removed/ reduced for commuters and shoppers;
  - Against being charged for on-street parking;
  - Problems caused by vehicles parked near junctions;
  - Local restaurants and businesses causing parking problems with staff and visitors;
  - A parking scheme will push the problem further down the road;
  - Council is killing off shopping/ businesses;
  - Council should introduce measures to assist local businesses

#### 3.0 Staff comments

- 3.1 The responses are split for and against a scheme across the review area, but the closer one gets to the Town Centre, the more support there is for something to be done.
- 3.2 There is wide-support for double yellow lines on junctions, bends and where servicing is difficult. If restrictions were installed at these sites, then further pressure will be brought onto the areas closest to the Town Centre.
- 3.3 Those responding against a scheme have 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.
- 3.4 If the Committee feel that a scheme is required closer to the Town Centre and assuming car park charges are to remain; Staff suggest that the area shown on Drawing QJ044/109 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.

- 3.5 Staff suggest that such a scheme would be in operation from 8am to 8pm, Monday to Saturday, with residents' bays. In addition, there are 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 have highlighted.
- 3.6 If the Committee agrees with Staff 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 HAC/ Cabinet Member process.

# IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

#### Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of introducing a controlled parking zone within the area identified (should this be the decision made following consultation on a detailed scheme) is £10,000; which can be met from the 2010/11 revenue allocation for Minor 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**

1. Chairman's Decision Ref: 09/159

# Drawings

- QJ044/101 Review Area
- QJ044/102 Question 1
- QJ044/103 Question 3
- QJ044/104 Question 4
- QJ044/105 Question 5
- QJ044/106 Question 7
- QJ044/107 Question 8
- QJ044/108 Question 9
- QJ044/109 Proposed Town Centre South Zone

# APPENDIX I PARKING QUESTIONNAIRE



#### HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE PARKING REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Please enter your name and address and answer Question 1 and *either* Part A *or* Part B as appropriate

				1
Nam	ne:		Date:	
Add	ress:			
1.	In your justify a If your	evere enough to	Yes No	
	RT A ise comp	lete if you feel the Council should take actio	n with parking	
2.		consider the parking problem to be caused by o dents (shoppers, commuters etc) or both?	ther residents,	<ul><li>Res</li><li>Non-res</li><li>Both</li></ul>
3.	either Re	m of parking control would you prefer to ease the sidents' Parking Scheme (Res) or Waiting Res		Res Res
4. 5.	parking s All day – All day, o One hou For whic	at hours would you like to see any restrictions of scheme operating? - 8am to 6:30pm to match existing restrictions in extending into the evening – 8am to 8pm ir in the morning – 10:30am to 11:30am th days of the week would you like restrictions of	h Hornchurch	<ul> <li>All day</li> <li>All day/ evening</li> <li>1 hour</li> <li>Mon - Fri</li> </ul>
6.	Monday	scheme operate? to Friday or Monday to Saturday support double yellow lines being placed at junc	tions, on bends	Mon - Sat
0.	and whe	e in force, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.		

**NOTE**: A Residents' Parking Scheme is one where residents' parking bays are provided in each road where they can be safely installed, with a yellow line restriction placed between bays. Waiting Restrictions are where 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)

#### PART B

This section is for those who do not consider there to be a parking problem to give their views should the Council ultimately decide to implement a scheme

7.	What form of parking control would you prefer to ease the situation – either Residents' Parking (Res) or Waiting Restrictions (WR) – Please see notes for explanations	Res Res
8.	Over what hours would you like to see any restrictions or residents' parking scheme operating? All day – 8am to 6:30pm to match existing restrictions in Hornchurch All day, extending into the evening – 8am to 8pm One hour in the morning – 10:30am to 11:30am	<ul> <li>All day</li> <li>All day/ evening</li> <li>1 hour</li> </ul>
9.	For which days of the week would you like restrictions or a residents' parking scheme operate? Monday to Friday or Monday to Saturday	Mon - Fri Mon - Sat
10.	Do you support double yellow lines being placed at junctions, on bends and where servicing/ fire fighting access is difficult	□ Yes □ No

# COMMENTS

Please include any brief comments you may have directly relevant to *on-street* parking problems in your area. You are invited to give any other reasons you feel the parking problems have increased.

# QUESTIONAIRES SHOULD BE RETURNED BY FRIDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2009

PLEASE NOTE, 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.

TRAFFIC & ENGINEERING, STREETCARE, THE WHITWORTH CENTRE, NOAK HILL ROAD, ROMFORD RM3 7YA

#### APPENDIX II QUESTION RESPONSES BY STREET

	Abbs Lane	Abbs X Lane	The Avenue	Bruce Avenue	Devonshire Road	Dorrington Gardens	Drapers Court	Etton Close	Fairlands Close Florence	Hich Street		Kernow Close Mavis Grove	Mill Dark	Avenue	Ravenscourt Grove	Sandown Avenue	Shirley Gardens	Stanley Close	Stanley Road	Station Lane	Victor Approach	Victor Close	Victor Court	Victor Gardens	Victor Walk	Woodfield Way	Totals
Responses	17	8	50	33	50	11	1	4	1 :	3	7	1 7	,	35	8	6	1	3	43	25	4	7	2	12	4	8	351
Q1: Yes	13	4	16	15	12	9	1	4	0	1	4	1 6	6	25	1	6	0	0	11	5	4	6	2	10	0	4	160
No	4	4	31	17	38	1	0	0	1 :	2	2	0 (	)	8	6	0	1	3	30	18	0	1	0	0	4	4	175
<b>Q2</b> :Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Non Res	4	0	10	9	6	8	0	3	0	0	1	0 5	5	20	0	5	0	0	8	3	4	0	1	6	0	4	97
Both	8	4	6	7	4	1	1	1	0	1	3	1 1		5	1	1	0	1	3	2	0	6	1	4	0	0	62
Q3:Res	6	0	12	9	5	4	0	1	0	1	4	0 2	2	9	0	3	0	0	4	4	4	5	1	7	0	1	82
WR	4	2	2	5	6	4	1	2	0	0	0	1 3	3	13	0	2	0	1	6	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	58
Q4: all day	4	0	1	3	1	4	0	1	0	0	3	0 1		7	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	2	0	2	41
all day/ evening	8	1	9	8	6	3	1	4	0	1	1	1 4	L	10	1	0	0	0	6	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	77
1 hour	0	1	4	4	5	1	0	0		-	D	0 1		10	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	36
Q5:Mon-fri	1	1	4	7	5	0	1	0	-	-	0	0 1		9	0	3	-	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	39
Mon-Sat	11	1	10	7	6	8	0	4		-	4	1 4	L	17	1	2		1	7	4	3	6	2	8	0	4	112
Q6:yes	12	4	16	15	11	9	1	4	•	1	3	1 6	5	26	1	6		1	10	4	3	6	2	9	0	3	153
no	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0 0	0	1	0 (	-	0	0	0		0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	7
Q7:Res	3	2	5	4	6	3	0	1	0	1	1	0 (	)	3	0	0	1	1	7	4	0	2	0	0	3	1	48
WR	1	2	12	7	10	0	0	2	1 (	0	C	0 2	2	5	4	0	0	0	8	13	0	1	1	1	1	3	74
Q8:all day	1	1	1	2	6	2	0	0	1 (	0	0	0 0	)	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
all day/ evening	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	D	0 0	)	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18
1 hour	1	2	12	8	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	0 2	2	5	5	0	1	1	9	13	0	1	0	1	1	3	75
Q9: Mon-Fri	1	2	11	10	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	0 0		5	4	0	1	1	11	12	0	1	0	1	2	2	79
Mon-Sat	1	2	6	1	3	2	0	3	1 (	0	C	0 2	2	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	34
Q10:Yes	5	4	27	15	24	3	0	3	1	1	3	0 2	2	9	7	0	0	2	22	17	0	1	0	1	1	4	152
No	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	C	0 (	)	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	16

APPENDIX III SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

# Abbs Cross Gardens

1	The estate Manager of The Herons has requested that the Council install yellow lines 25ft either side of the entrance, so that the Waste Lorry can enter and egress easily. Also in order that the elderly residents can see to exit.
4	Worst area for parking congestion is by the Sorting Office (Post Office) where parked vehicles prevent traffic from flowing.)
1	Would like double yellow lines
2	Need double yellow lines at junction with Abbs Cross Lane.
1	There are no parking facilities for employees of sorting office and along with school traffic, causes havoc every morning.
1	Parking problems continue into late evening owing to the many bars and restaurants in the area.
3	There is a lot of double parking in Abbs Cross Gardens from the entrance/exit of Appleton Way up to the entrance of The Herons.
1	Need double yellow lines either side of the entrance to The Herons.

# Abbs Cross Lane

1	Request for speed cushions to prevent speeding traffic of a night.
2	Parking problems have increased since Council introduced parking fees at the car parks. There would not be so many problems if it was free.
1	If bollard outside Care Home was removed this would assist minicabs taking elderly/disabled people to/from care home.
1	Abbs Cross Lane from traffic lights to Abbs Cross Gardens should have parking restrictions as it is a very busy through road.

#### Abbs Cross Lane continued/

1	Heavy parking and congestion in vicinity of the sorting office caused by postal workers and commuters.
1	Large works vans are always parked outside 35-41 Abbs Cross Lane. These belong to residents who live in houses nearer the junction.
1	Need yellow lines at junctions, so long as they do not continue further up the road.

## The Avenue

3	Completely against parking restrictions – it is just another excuse to charge parking fees. No problems from junction of Sandown Avenue down to Abbs Cross Lane.
1	Any restrictions would reduce the amount of parking available and prevent residents from parking close to their homes.
17	The increase of on-street parking is a direct result of charging to park in the car parks.
1	On-street parking in Sandown Avenue and Dorrington Gardens is causing traffic flow problems through these roads.
6	If you abolish car parking charges this will rectify the problem.
2	Cars dangerously parked at the Station Lane end of The Avenue and junctions with main road.
1	Parking problems caused by workers who can no longer park free in Hornchurch
1	Any residential parking schemes introduced will simply move the problems on and will put the shops out of business.
2	Only action needed for this area is installing double yellow lines at junctions and on bends.
1	If you install residential parking it would only work if you allowed 1 bay per household. This would not be possible and would cause friction between neighbours.

The Avenue continued/

4	
1	No problems at the Abbs Cross end of the Avenue.
1	Would be most upset if the restrictions increased Council Tax.
1	We would happily pay for residential parking and would happily pay for a second car and also for visitor permits.
1	Worst areas for parking problems is outside numbers 1 – 24 and numbers 2 – 18 because they cannot have off-street parking.
3	Part of the parking problem is caused by the local restaurants not providing any parking for their workers or customers.
1	It is very frustrating for residents who are being penalised because their roads are being used by drivers as a free car park. Especially since there is a car park providing plenty of spaces just round the corner just for 20p per hour.
1	Shoppers and other non-residents use The Avenue to park at various times of the day and night. This prevents residents from being able to park outside their own properties.
2	Problems with commuters, shoppers and late night revellers all parking in The Avenue. They also park across residents' drives and also park so close to their drives that it is very difficult to get away.
1	Would support the 10.30am - 11.30am parking restriction provided that residents were given parking permits.
1	No problem with parking in this road during the day, however parking at junction with Station Lane is a problem after 6.30pm. This is because visibility of approaching traffic is impeded by parked vehicles.
1	You are charging us to see our children and family.
1	No real problems. I do not wish any new restriction to be applied in my road.
1	The questions on the form are slanted towards what the council really wants – that is raising cash from the motorist.
1	No Problems at the moment. Any restrictions will not benefit the owners of the houses at the beginning of the road who suffer from inconsiderate parking and they will disadvantage the 90% of residents who do not have any parking problems whatsoever.

The Avenue continued/

1	If you do continue to charge for parking I would suggest a reasonable fee would be £1.00 per 4 hours plus. It is the excessive charging by the council for parking in central Hornchurch that has forced people to park in the surrounding streets at the expensive of local residents.
1	I oppose the implementation of any of the schemes in the section of The Avenue between Sandown Avenue and Ringwood Avenue as there are no parking problems whatsoever.
1	Changes made to off-street public parking seem to have increased on-street parking.
1	Commuter parking has increased down the side roads since the council begun charging for parking in the car parks.
1	Car parks are now empty, streets are congested with commuter parking. This scheme is another money making scheme.
1	Problems caused by more workers driving into Hornchurch; more people eating in Hornchurch; more residents owning more than one car; more residents owning a car.
1	No problems near No 81. Any restrictions imposed will push the problem into surrounding roads further out. That is what happened when you started charging to park in the local car parks. Matter is made worse of an evening because of the number of restaurants.
2	Car parking charges made situation worse. Have nothing against reasonable parking charges but some provision should have been made for local residents. Commuters are unwilling to pay for parking so the best scheme should be residential parking. Many drivers use two parking spaces.
1	Although we have off-street parking, owing to the heavy parking it is sometimes too difficult and dangerous to drive off.
1	Dangerous congestion at junction of The Avenue and Station Lane and it is too tight to turn left into The Avenue coming from the Hornchurch direction. It is especially difficult at the weekend.
1	It is very dangerous for pedestrians at The Avenue/Abbs cross zebra when it is dark because you cannot see people waiting to cross.

The Avenue continued/

1	Junction of The Avenue and Station Lane should have double yellow lines.
1	Since the extra parking fees have been introduced there have been more cars parking in The Avenue. This is sometimes a problem when these cars are parked close to my drive. It would be helpful if the space between driveways could be made larger.
1	Area around No 69 has no problems. Minor problem at the Station Road end and that is caused by the parking charges in the town centre car parks. Solution would be to rescind it.

## Bruce Avenue

2	Bruce Avenue does not have any parking problems and there is no need for paid residential parking. Occasionally some people cannot park outside their own homes but there are always spaces further down the road.
1	Regarding question 10 – highway code states 30ft from a corner.
4	Amazed the Council sent out questionnaire when the problems of on street parking were caused by them in the first place by charging for parking that had always been free.
4	Significant factor in the increase of local parking has been the car parks pay and display policy. I do not agree with residential parking permits as this is just another cost to the local residents and again money payable to Havering Council. The council have already gained additional funds from the pay and display. I already pay enough council tax, out of which 4% already goes towards the StreetCare facility. NO! NO! NO!
1	Today (12-11-09 at 10am) there were over 100 empty car spaces in the car park, before you paid for parking, these spaces were full, so the council is responsible for congestion. Dorrington Gdns and Sandown Avenue are the only two roads with a problem caused by the Council. Therefore before rooking the residents with parking permits, you should solve the problem of empty car parks and congested roads. You are not looking for solutions – but making money.
1	I find parking worse at the weekend – It does not affect me Monday to Friday.
1	No problems with parking at the moment but if restrictions are installed in Dorrington and Sandown, the problems will be passed on to Bruce Avenue.

#### Bruce Avenue continued/

1	Would like to strongly state that everyone very unhappy with the whole situation. It is very unfair to shopkeepers, workers, shoppers and residents.
1	The only parking problems are in Sandown avenue and Dorrington Gardens. Do not want to pay for residential parking just to subsidise other drivers who work in Hornchurch and will not pay to leave their cars in the car parks.
1	Bruce Avenue is unaffected but Sandown and its other turnings is awful. This is only since nearby car park started to charge. 20pence is not much for shopping, but the high daily charge for workers has forced them to park in the surrounding roads. A more reasonable fee of £3 to £4 would be more reasonable.
1	Area around No 10 does not have a problem, but if restrictions were implemented, it could have an adverse affect to this road.
1	Parking bays and permits will create a problem where there isn't one.
1	Problems are at the higher number end of Bruce Avenue and roads leading to the Town Centre are very congested due to commuter parking, caused by car parks charging. Agree that people should pay to park cars – they should not drive to Hornchurch, park for free then get a train.
1	This consultation is flawed because parking only became difficult since charges were introduced in the Hornchurch car parks.
1	The suggestion to place double yellow lines at junctions is surely covered by the highway code.
1	This is merely another attempt by the Council to extract more money from residents.
1	Parking becoming impossible in this street for several reasons; families have more than 2 cars; many properties have works vans, particularly at weekends. Also, commuter parking. If residents parking is introduced it would have to cover the whole street, otherwise you will simply "push" the problem further down the street.
1	Sandown Avenue is totally congested during the week and empty of a weekend. Something needs to be done, soon, because it is almost impossible to get off our drive.
#### Bruce Avenue continued/

1	Shoppers now appear to use the car parks and owners do not recognise the Highway Code (rule 217) and they park on the junctions, across drives and across exits which causes problems for large lorries, refuse trucks etc.
1	On a personal concern the garage doors/drive up, in Sandown avenue – cars park right up to the edge and opposite the door, making it almost impossible to get off my drive. Double yellow lines would ease this situation.
7	There was never any problem with parking until charges were introduced. Council should re-introduce free parking in the car parks and one situation could be resolved.
1	Junction parking, especially at junctions of Bruce Avenue and Sandown and Dorrington Gardens, is very dangerous, causing restricted sight lines for oncoming vehicles. Highway code RTA1988 Sect 22 and cue reg 103 243 states "do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 ft) of a junction". This is ignored by most of the drivers. I have contacted Cllr Mylod on this subject previously.
1	Parking in the dead end of Bruce Avenue where I live is a severe problem. Drivers double park. I have a disabled child who has a blue badge and struggle to get off my property.
3	Selfish parking by some residents, together with cars being parked on junctions, cause many problems and are an accident in waiting.
1	Parking restrictions are a good thing but will only "push" the problems further down the road.
1	Problems caused by works vans being brought home; families having more than 1 vehicle per household; some have drives but do not use them.

## **Devonshire Road**

6	No parking problems in Devonshire Road. Do not install restrictions as it will spoil the area – although it would make the borough a nice extra income.
2	Only restrictions needed are yellow lines at junctions.
1	No restrictions needed in this road or Station Lane.

Devonshire Road continued./.

All car parks should be free otherwise you force drivers to park in surrounding roads to avoid fees and make roads congested.
Parking in Devonshire Road is mainly residential but influx of commuters in the morning, waiting restrictions would be detrimental to the majority of residents. Placement of yellow lines between parking bays would restrict the availability of spaces for residents.
Would not have had any problems if the Council had not introduced charges in the car parks. These should be free for people working in Hornchurch. Car parks are relatively empty now and the roads are full of cars. Stop charges and get cars off the road and into the car parks.
They are killing off shopping in the High Street, that was already struggling.
No to parking control, no parking restrictions, NO NO NO
Today's problems are a result of imposing charges in Hornchurch. This consultation should have had an option to remove these charges. It is just a ploy to give the council the justification to impose more restrictions.
Should have residential parking from 8.30 to 9.30 am to stop commuter parking and Town centre workers.
Too many commuters park in these roads making life difficult for residents who are primarily senior citizens, who have trouble getting out because the buses/assistance vehicles they use cannot get through to them because of vehicles parked outside their homes.
Resident of No 170 complains that the space outside his house is too small for most cars to park there, so the larger cars "overhang" his drive, which in turn makes it difficult for him to get off his drive.
Double yellow lines urgently needed extending at junction of Devonshire Road and Abbs Cross Road because cars park on either side of the road preventing vehicles from turning into Abbs Cross Road.
No problem with parking. Restrictions only cause headaches for residents and the many elderly and vulnerable people who live there.
Only some minor inconveniences caused by parking, but insufficient to warrant expense and inconvenience to residents.

Devonshire Road continued./.

4	Leave things as they are – no need to mend something that is not broken.
1	Very difficult to park on hardstanding because since road was resurfaced the levels are different.
1	Commuter parking the cause of problems.
1	Double yellow lines needed in Station Lane between Stanley Road and The Avenue.
1	Do not allow cyclists to use the pavements and ensure they always have their lights on.
1	Many residents who have dropped kerbs do not use them. They should be made to pay to park in the road and where there is permit parking they should be made to buy them.
1	Too much fast traffic, need road humps. Also need speed limit reduction to 20 mph.
1	Need yellow lines across access to service road because people park across the access.
1	No problems in Devonshire Road, please do not make our road look like a supermarket car park with lined bays.
1	No problems in this road other than too many transit vans in this and adjoining roads

# **Dorrington Gardens**

1	No to yellow lines except on junctions.
4	The cause of increased parking is due to charges introduced for parking in local car parks. Since this was introduced the number of parked cars has increased dramatically. The remedy for the situation is to remove the charges.
1	Most problem parking only began when charges for parking were introduced. People park across residents' drives and across access to residents' garages and are abusive when politely requested to remove the vehicles.

Dorrington Gardens continued/

1	Resident managed to keep space for workmen who were working on his terraced house.
1	Although in agreement with residents parking scheme, I do not agree with charges, bearing in mind that these problems only started when the Council began charging for parking in the car parks. Also we have to pay a fee to cross the Dorrington Road car park in order to access my garage at rear of my property.
1	Evening parking is horrendous on bends and side roads in area of Appleton Way and Station Lane where the restaurants are.
1	Parking increased due to parking charges being introduced. Even though we paid a huge amount for a dropped kerb, the public still park across drive blocking access.
1	Shop workers cause parking problems, but if you force them to pay draconian charges the shops will close and that will solve your problem.
1	Very dangerous parking on junctions Station Lane end of Appleton Way, especially Friday/Saturday nights.

### **Etton Close**

1	Etton Close very narrow. Many non-residents visiting local restaurants park their cars in Etton Close. If road was wider this would not be a problem. Part of the road has no proper footway forcing pedestrians to walk in the road. The vehicles also block entry into the road causing problems for any emergency vehicles. For all these reasons, resident feels parking restrictions are needed all day and evening.
2	Visitors to local restaurants of a night, visitors to test centre and commuters using the station, all park in Etton Close. Residents pay high council tax, why should they have to pay for parking permits.
1	A coach from Fellson Coaches has parked several times outside No 2 Etton close, cutting out the light from resident's windows.
1	Would like to see double yellow lines on both sides of the whole length of Etton Close. Reason for this request is because non-residents block drives, park and cause road t be very narrow and causing problems for lorries and large vehicles.

### **Fairlands Close**

1	Would prefer restricted waiting and return time to enable people to drop off
	children at the school then drive off and similarly to use local shops ie short
	term parking.

#### Florence Close

1	On street parking only began since car parking charges were introduced.
1	Any restrictions would be unfair to residents who do not have facilities for off-street parking.
1	Residential parking scheme would be ideal to prevent all non-resident parking which will increase soon because of new restrictions coming into force in Station Lane.
1	There are just too many residents requiring spaces and not enough room to accommodate them. Residential bays would make it even worse because there would be fewer spaces.
1	Normal waiting restrictions unfair to residents because they could not park where they wanted
1	A double yellow line along the south side of the road would prevent parking there, but this very rarely happens anyway.
1	Would be happy to sacrifice front garden in order to have a dropped kerb which would help by one space.

# **High Street**

1	We live in flats which have private parking spaces but non-residents continually park there.
1	Non-residents and local business people do not want to pay for parking and therefore use residential streets to park causing no end of problems for residents.
1	Residents who have yellow lines outside their homes have to park a long way from their homes unless they want to pay high charges to park in Appleton Way. They need short term parking to be allowed outside their homes to allow them to load and unload.

# High Street continued/

1	Please install restrictions that will help local traders rather than lose them their customers due to too many restrictions.
1	No problems with parking. NO action needed otherwise will deter local trade.

### **Kernow Close**

1	Need full restrictions on junction of Kernow Close and Station Road to
	prevent continuous parking there.

#### **Mavis Grove**

1	Need waiting restrictions because high number of non-residents from the bars and restaurants are parking in the roads rather than pay to park. They are also obstructing driveways.
1	Inconsiderate parking and double parking very dangerous to residents of Drapers Court.
1	Prefer just restrictions on the junction of Mavis Grove and Station Lane
1	Non-residents forced to park in Drapers Court Car Park because of parking restrictions in Mavis Grove, taking spaces from residents.
1	Suggest making Mavis Grove one way from Station Lane, thus avoiding traffic entering Station Lane to turn right. This would allow parking on the side of Mavis Grove without restrictions. This would prohibit cars and HGV's from entering Mavis Grove just to turn round. Would have to prohibit traffic turning right into Mavis Grove approaching from Hornchurch tube station.
1	Mavis Grove and Mill Park avenue are now car parks for non-resident drivers. There should be parking restrictions in place similar to those in Romford and Brentwood.



Sheet Size: A3 (297x420)	International Amendment date Revision Amendment date Juge The HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAWING THE REVIEW AREA	ommunity, Treffic & Engine may be reproduced withou permission of the Controller t. Unauthorised reproductio soution or civil proceedings



Sheet Size: A3 (297/420)	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE NOB TILE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAWNG TILE RESPONSES QUESTION 1	NO	PURPOSE HAC   ©COPYRIGHT This drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Treffic & Engineering scelars, leading belongs to streetCare Culture & community, Treffic & Engineering sortion and particular and may be reproduced without prior written permission.   Based upon Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Weigety's Stationery Office © Coren copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Coren copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Brough of Harering 10024327   NOTES   QUESTION 1   IS THERE A PARKING   PROBLEM



STREE CULTURE & COMMUNIT   INTRETICARE   INTRETICARE   CULTURE & COMMUNIT   INTRETICARE   INTRETICARE <th colsp<="" th=""><th>REVISION AMENDMENT DATE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAMING TITLE RESPONSES</th><th>RESIDENTS' SCHEME RESTRICTIONS</th><th>PURPOSE HAC   SCOPYRIGHT HAC   This drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture &amp; Community, Traffic &amp; Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission. Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced infinges Common copyright usual training to compare the usual traffices Common copyright usual training to prosecution or civil proceedings.   NOTES QUESTION 3 WHAT FORM OF CONTROL</th></th>	<th>REVISION AMENDMENT DATE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAMING TITLE RESPONSES</th> <th>RESIDENTS' SCHEME RESTRICTIONS</th> <th>PURPOSE HAC   SCOPYRIGHT HAC   This drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture &amp; Community, Traffic &amp; Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission. Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced infinges Common copyright usual training to compare the usual traffices Common copyright usual training to prosecution or civil proceedings.   NOTES QUESTION 3 WHAT FORM OF CONTROL</th>	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAMING TITLE RESPONSES	RESIDENTS' SCHEME RESTRICTIONS	PURPOSE HAC   SCOPYRIGHT HAC   This drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Traffic & Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission. Engineering Section, Weither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced infinges Common copyright usual training to compare the usual traffices Common copyright usual training to prosecution or civil proceedings.   NOTES QUESTION 3 WHAT FORM OF CONTROL



EVALUACIONEL DELAE			
Sheet Size: A3 (297x420)	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TILE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAMING TILE RESPONSES QUESTION 4	ALL DAY/EVENINGS	PURPOSE HAC   ©COPYRIGHT The drawing belongs to StreetCare Culture & Community, Treffic & Engineering Section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission.   Based upon Ordances Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of theread upon or drawer of the Common operight. Loundon section, and thereing 10024327   NOTES   QUESTION 4   HOURS OF   OPERATION



STREETCARE CULTURE & COMMUNITY INFRE	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE NOB TILE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAWING TILE RESPONSES	MON TO FRI	PURPOSE HAC   ecoPYRIGHT HAC   becommunity, Traffic & Engineering Section. Neither the whole nor any part thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission.   Based upon Ordinaces Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Weight's Stationces Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of ther Weight's Stationces Survey Mapping with the permission or civil proceedings.   Based upon Ordinace Survey Mapping with the permission or civil proceedings.   Infinges Come copyright. Unauthorise of the controller of ther Weight's Stationce Survey Mapping with the permission or civil proceedings.   MOTES   QUESTION 5   DAYS OF OPERATION



EXAMPLE F			
Sheet Size: A3 (297x420)  State Size: A3 (297x420)  S		RESIDENTS' SCHEME RESTRICTIONS	PURPOSE HAC   ecopyrRIGHT Traffic & Engineering Section. Neither the whole nor only put thereof may be reproduced without prior written permission.   Besed upon Ordnames Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of the Weigsty's Stationery Office © Comm copyright. Unauthorised reproduction intringes Cream copyright and reprosecution or civil proceedings. London Biorough of Hovering 100024327   NOTES QUESTION 7 (PART B) WHAT FORM OF CONTROL



AVENZEONEL DISTAC			
CULTURE & COMMUNT INFO &	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE NOB TILE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAWING TILE RESPONSES QUESTION 8	ALL DAY/EVENING	



RAVENCEURET DRIVE		
CULTURE & COMMUNITY TWHE & COMMUNITY THE &	REVISION AMENDMENT DATE JOB TILE HORNCHURCH TOWN CENTRE SOUTH PARKING REVIEW DRAMING TILE RESPONSES QUESTION 8	PURPOSE     HAC       Soprreger Brain and upper obtaines to compare these of may be deproduced without pro- survive form copyright under the parmission of the Controller of Intringe Crown copyright under the parmission of the Controller of Looden Borough of Havering 10002A227     HAC       WIES     QUESTION 8 (PART B) WHAT FORM OF CONTROL     FRI       MON - FRI     MON - SAT       MON - SAT     MON - SAT