

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Town Hall Main Road Romford
12 July 2011 (7.30 - 10.40 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group Jeffrey Brace, Barry Oddy, Billy Taylor (Chairman),
Frederick Thompson (Vice-Chair) and Lynden Thorpe

Residents' Group Brian Eagling and John Wood

Labour Group

Independent Residents Group David Durant

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Denis Breading, Steven Kelly and Damian White.

Substitute Members: Councillor Barry Oddy and Jeff Brace (for Councillors White and Kelly respectively).

Councillors Armstrong, Hawthorn, Osborne and Brice Thompson were also present for part of the meeting.

There were approximately eight 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 the event of an emergency.

There were no declarations of interest

8 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 June 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9 AMBLESIDE AVENUE PARKING REVIEW - OUTCOME OF QUESTIONNAIRE CONSULTATION

The Committee noted officers' comments that the report was not available and the item was therefore deferred to the next meeting.

10 FAIRFORD WAY AREA PARKING REVIEW

The report before the Committee presented the views of those responding to a parking survey in the Fairford Way area of Romford and proposed further action based on the responses across the area.

At its meeting of 17 August 2010, the Committee considered a Highways scheme application for a residents' parking scheme in the Fairford Way area.

Staff advised the Committee that before any detailed work took place, it would be useful to undertake a parking review questionnaire of the area to gauge the extent of any local issues.

The Committee agreed that the Head of StreetCare should proceed. Forty-three letters with a questionnaire were hand-delivered to residents in the area on or just after 27 September 2010. The letter, questionnaire and summary of responses were appended to the report.

By the close of the consultation, nine responses were received from residents, an approximate 21% response rate. A majority of residents who commented were of the opinion that the parking problems are caused by commuters, and residents of Kenilworth Avenue whose rear garages back onto Fairford Way.

The responses suggested that the residents responding were in favour of a Residents Parking scheme (80%) rather than waiting restrictions, which should operate all day Monday to Saturday.

In terms of double yellow lines being placed at junctions, on bends, past pedestrian refuges and where servicing/ fire fighting access was difficult, 80% of all respondents agreed with these proposed measures.

The Emergency Services were not consulted at this stage.

In staff's view, it was clear that the respondents from Fairford Way/Close would like a residents parking scheme in operation all day, Monday to Saturday.

The report also stated that there was support for double yellow line restrictions on junctions bends, etc and officers suggested that restrictions should be designed in the locality if the Committee agreed to take the matter further.

Many of the comments made demonstrated the problems with many different people trying to access the road network and the difficulty there was in trying to balance parking, servicing and access.

Residents' parking permits were available on an unlimited basis (subject to vehicles being registered at the permit address) and so there was a risk that parking demand would exceed capacity.

Councillor Oddy proposed the rejection of the scheme as the response rate was low and this motion was seconded by Councillor Thorpe.

After a brief discussion the Committee, having considered the responses and information set out in the report, **RESOLVED** to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that following Recommendation:

(b) Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme

11 **RAVENSBOURNE CRESCENT & COOMBE ROAD PARKING BAYS**

The report outlined the responses to a public consultation for proposed additional parking bays in Ravensbourne Crescent and Coombe Road. This report recommended options for implementation or rejection of aspects of the scheme.

Following the meeting of 17 August 2010, the Committee considered a Highways Scheme Application from residents for additional residents' parking bays in Ravensbourne Crescent and Coombe Road (already being within the Harold Wood CPZ)

The Committee agreed that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the design and consultation on suitable measures.

The report detailed the proposals. Approximately 130 letters were hand-delivered to residents potentially affected by the scheme with a closing date of 7 January 2011. In addition, the proposals were advertised. The Emergency Services and London Buses were also consulted.

The report summarised the 6 responses received. Three of the responses objected to part of the scheme within the vicinity of their properties, one resident had some concerns with the scheme, one resident was in favour of the scheme and one resident felt that more should be done.

London Buses made no comment on the scheme as no bus routes operated within the vicinity.

The Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit and the London Fire Brigade had no objections to the scheme and no response was received from the London Ambulance Service.

Staff were of the view that the proposed scheme would provide an increase in parking facilities within the area and ease the current parking problems for residents caused by lack of spaces.

Members of the Committee were concerned that some residents were requesting schemes which could lead to problems for other people in the same area. They also were concerned at the low rate of responses for the proposed scheme.

A member was of the view that some "free" bays would be more useful in the area. Officers advised that this would be a fresh idea and so have to go through the full consultation process.

After a brief discussion by the Committee, Councillor Thorpe proposed rejection of the scheme as the response rate was low, this motion was seconded by Councillor Brace.

The Committee having considered the responses and information set out in this report **RESOLVED** to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that following Recommendation (ii):

- The scheme be rejected.

12 **BROOKLANDS ROAD, MARSHALLS ROAD & MEDORA ROAD PARKING BAY EXTENSION**

The report before the Committee set out the responses to a public consultation for proposed additional parking bays in Brooklands Road, Marshalls Road and Medora Road. This report recommended options for implementation or rejection of aspects of the scheme.

Following the approval of the Committee approximately 250 letters were hand-delivered to residents potentially affected by the scheme with a closing date of 7 January 2011. In addition, the proposals were advertised. The Emergency Services and London Buses were also consulted.

By the close of the consultation, five responses were received. The responses were summarised and appended to the report.

The report detailed that two residents were in objection to part of the scheme (within the vicinity of their property), one was due to apply for a vehicle crossover and two other residents were in favour of the scheme.

London Buses made no comment on the scheme as no bus routes operate within the vicinity.

The Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit and the London Fire Brigade had no objections to the scheme. No response was received from the London Ambulance Service.

In staff's view the proposed scheme would provide an increase in parking facilities within the area and ease the current parking problems for residents caused by lack of spaces and where residents had objected to the scheme. Officers were of the view that some bays could be removed near those residents, whilst retaining other bays.

A member was concerned about the time and money being spent on consultations with a poor level of response from residents.

Councillor Thorpe commented that the response was very poor to make a judgement and proposed rejection of the scheme, this motion was seconded by Councillor Oddy.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that:

- That the proposals be rejected.

13 **GRENFELL AVENUE AND ESTATE PARKING REVIEW**

The report before the Committee presented the views of those responding to a parking survey in the Grenfell Avenue area of Romford and proposed further action based on the responses across the area.

At its meeting of 17 August 2010, the Committee considered and agreed that various parking-related matters in the Grenfell Avenue area, raised by a ward Councillor on behalf of residents should proceed to consultation.

About 304 letters with a questionnaire were hand-delivered to residents and businesses in the area. By the close of consultation 78 responses were received from residents (17% to 27% response rate depending on street). The responses were summarised in the report.

The report stated that a majority of the respondents were of the opinion that there was not a parking problem within their street.

As there was not a significant response from residents, staff concluded that a scheme should not be taken forward at this stage.

The Committee **RESOLVED**:

That having considered the responses and information set out in this report the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the design and consultation for a scheme.

14 **EYHURST AVENUE PARKING REVIEW**

The report before the Committee presented the views of those responding to a parking survey for the Eyhurst Avenue area and proposed further action based on the responses across the area.

Following the meeting of 17 August 2010, the Committee considered a scheme to deal with parking problems caused by people not wishing to use the nearby car park in Elm Park.

The Committee agreed that before any detailed work took place, it would be useful to undertake a parking review questionnaire of the area to gauge the extent of any local issues.

A questionnaire was hand-delivered to 155 residents and businesses in the area. At the close of the consultation, 47 responses were received from residents in the Eyhurst Avenue area, about a 30% response rate. A majority of the respondents felt that there was not a parking problem within their street.

In officers' view, a 30% response was fair for such a survey and was therefore felt to be representative. The report detailed that of those who responded, the majority (about 70%) did not consider there to be a problem and so staff did not recommend taking the matter further.

The Committee without debate **RESOLVED** to recommend that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the scheme.

15 **BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS IN LODGE LANE, COLLIER ROW**

The Committee considered a report that outlined options for improving accessibility for passengers at the existing bus stop in Lodge Lane by Frinton Road, Collier Row following concerns expressed by a wheelchair user.

A local resident who used a wheel chair had brought to the attention of Transport for London problems he and other passengers experience when using the existing bus stop in Lodge Lane due to inadequate facilities to gain access to buses.

The bus stop in question was situated outside no. 70 Lodge Lane on bus route 294 travelling between Havering Park and Noak Hill via Romford town centre.

A site meeting was held with representatives of Transport for London and London Buses. It was identified that there was a narrow width between the edge of the kerb and the bus shelter which prevented access of wheel chairs. At present, the bus drivers stopped before the bus shelter, an area which was not safe to facilitate boarding for passengers with mobility difficulties.

The Committee was informed that in order to overcome the problem, it was proposed to relocate the bus shelter back from its existing position. This would increase the access width and hence permit wheel chair users to manoeuvre without hindrance.

The proposals also included provision for a clearway at the existing bus stop. The report included the drawing of the proposals.

Twenty letters were hand delivered in the immediate vicinity of the bus stop with a closing date of 9 June 2011. Six responses were received and these were analysed in the report. Five respondents supported the proposals while one resident had objected. The objection was considered in conjunction with London Buses. The design had indicated that there was a flexibility to relocate the bus shelter up to 600 mm whereas London Buses would give further consideration if the shelter could be relocated more than 600mm depending on site conditions and land constraints.

Officers therefore advised that the proposals should be implemented given that some measures would be taken in responding to the issues raised by the objector.

The proposal was anticipated to improve accessibility for passengers at the existing bus stop and make the stop compliant under the Disability Discrimination Act of 1995.

Members of the Committee spoke in favour of the scheme as it supported disabled people. A member sought clarification as to the gap needed for wheelchair users. Officers explained the issue was not the gap past the shelter, but the space needed to get someone off the bus and then to manoeuvre within the shelter area to then access the footway.

A member suggested a smaller shelter to replace the current shelter in order to satisfy the objector to the scheme.

Another member asked if the shelter, as well as being moved back, could be moved up to be better screened by the conifers of no.70 Frinton Road. Staff noted this suggestion with the agreement of members for implementation.

The Committee having considered the report **RESOLVED** to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the following measures are implemented:

- i) That the existing bus shelter be relocated back from its existing position by 1 metre as shown on drawings in the report.
- ii) That the existing stop is restricted by a clearway. The restriction will commence from the approach side of the existing bus cage (outside no 76 Lodge Lane), extending southwards for a distance of 25 metres as shown on drawing no. QK008-of-101.
- iii) That it be noted the cost to implement the measures is estimated to be £6,000 which would be met by Transport for London through a special budget called 'Enabling Works' allocated in 2011/12 for measures to improve accessibility at existing bus stop in Lodge Lane.

16 **HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

The report presented Members with all new highway schemes requests in order for a decision to be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources were expended on detailed design and consultation.

The Committee would either make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to progress the scheme or the Committee would reject the request.

The Committee considered and agreed in principle the schedule that detailed the applications received by the service.

The Committee's decisions were noted as follows against each request:

SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals without funding available			
Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
H1	Wennington Road/ Ingrebourne Road/ Brook Way/ Lambs Lane South, Rainham	Request for Mini-roundabout	REJECTED

H2	North Hill Drive, Harold Hill	Provide speed humps to deal with speeding traffic	REJECTED
H3	Douglas Road	Request for speed humps to deal with speeding traffic	REJECTED
H4	Station Road, Upminster	Replace Puffin Crossing with zebra crossing as it currently causes congestion and means resident cannot get to school on time.	7 REJECTED 1 AGREED
H5	Squirrels Heath Lane	Remove speed table within zebra crossing as vehicles driving over is causing disturbance to residents	REJECTED
H6	Upper Rainham Road	Provide zebra crossing between Shelley Avenue and Milton Avenue	REJECTED
H7	Albert Road	Request for road calming measures	REJECTED

17 **TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES REQUEST WORK PROGRAMME**

The report before the Committee detailed all Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme application requests in order for a decision to be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources were expended on detailed design and consultation.

The Committee would either make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to progress the scheme or the Committee would reject the request.

The Committee considered and agreed in principle the schedule that detailed the applications received by the service.

The Committee's decisions were noted as follows against each scheme:

Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Applications Schedule

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION A – Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests			
TPC51	Heather Glen, Rise Park	Extend double yellow lines of evens side of street between double yellow lines at junction with Heather Avenue and inside of bend o/s No. 14 to provide full access	7 AGREED 1 REJECTED
TPC52	Little Gaynes Lane	Implement double yellow line restriction on 'evens' side of carriageway to deter commuter parking	REJECTED
TPC53	Thorncroft, Hornchurch	Implement double yellow lines on the left hand side of the entrance to Thorncroft	1 AGREED 7 REJECTED
TPC54	Cecil Avenue, Hornchurch	Request for double yellow line on the junction of Cecil Avenue in to Ardleigh Green Road	1 AGREED 7 REJECTED
TPC55	Clockhouse Lane, Collier Row	Request to bridge existing single yellow line restriction by 12-13 metres outside North Romford Community Centre, current gap is being utilised and causing an obstruction	DEFERRAL (pending Collier Row Review)
TPC56	Bonnington Road, Hornchurch	Request for junction protection at entry in to Bonnington Road from Swanbourne Drive due to dangerous double parking near the entrance to Scotts Primary School	REJECTED
TPC57	Lingfield Avenue, Upminster	Request for footway parking bays and junction	1 ABSTAINED 7 REJECTED

Highways Advisory Committee, 12 July 2011

		protection due to parking of large vans at junction with Doncaster Way	
TPC58	The Glade, Upminster	Request for footway parking bays at entrance to road	1 AGREED 7 REJECTED
TPC59	Tangent Link/Ashton Road, Harold Hill	Request for restrictions on one side of road as area is being blocked by parkers and large delivery lorries are unable to get through	REJECTED
TPC60	West Close/East Close/Ingrebourne Road/Upminster Road South	Request for junction protection at junctions with Ingrebourne Road for West and East Closes plus junction of Ingrebourne Road and Upminster Road South	1 AGREED 7 REJECTED
TPC61	Worcester Avenue, Upminster	Request for footway parking bays as the carriageway is narrow	REJECTED
TPC62	Bridge Avenue, Hornchurch	Extend existing restrictions to cover whole length of street whilst retaining an on-street parking area for the Havering flats (approx. 300m extension)	REJECTED
TPC63	Firham Park Avenue, Harold Wood	Request for restrictions to deter commuter parking causing obstruction to vehicles entering and exiting the road	3 AGREED 5 REJECTED
TPC64	Gelsthorpe Road, Collier Row	Request for double yellow line restrictions on apex of bend outside number 86 and neighbouring properties	DEFERRAL (pending Collier Row Review)
TPC65	North Hill Drive, Harold Hill	Request for removal of single yellow line in North Hill Drive at the top of Ashbourne Road	DELETED FROM LIST, PREVIOUSLY AGREED AT HAC IN 2010
TPC66	Wennington Road (between Ferro Close and Ellis Avenue),	Request for bus stop clearway	2 AGREED 6 REJECTED

Highways Advisory Committee, 12 July 2011

	Rainham		
TPC67	Dagnam Park Drive, Harold Hill	Request for double yellow lines opposite number 273 where works have been undertaken to the grass verge but parking is taking place on the verge	REJECTED
TPC68	Rise Park Parade, Rise Park	Request for two hour maximum parking stay due to long term parking taking place along the parade	1 AGREED 1 ABSTAINED 6 REJECTED
TPC69	Sydenham Close, Romford	Request for double yellow lines along the Close to deter parking from Harefield Manor Hotel visitors	REJECTED
Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION B – Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests on hold for future discussion or funding issues			
TPC2	Short term parking for shops around Main Road commercial area	Provision of meter style parking in area as not everyone has a disc and some areas have long term parking after 10am	NOTED
TPC6	20 Tudor Avenue	Extend existing restrictions to prevent obstructive parking by parents of Gidea Park College with concern about safety	NOTED
TPC7	22 Tudor Avenue	Extend existing restrictions to prevent obstructive parking by parents of Gidea Park College with concern that resident cannot leave property to pick up own child	NOTED
TPC13	18 Tudor Avenue	Request to extend existing restrictions to numbers 18-24 Tudor Avenue to deter inconsiderate parental parking for Gidea Park College and Gidea Park	NOTED

		Primary School	
TPC18	A1306/Wentworth Way	Request for junction protection at A1306 junction with Wentworth Way	MOVE BACK TO REQUEST LIST
TPC19	Anchor Drive, Rainham	Request for restrictions to ensure emergency access to the sheltered accommodation after the ambulance services could not attend an emergency on 8th March 2011	MOVE BACK TO REQUEST LIST
TPC27	Durham/Elvet Avenues	Request for CPZ extension due to the impact of the redevelopment of the Snowdon Court site	NOTED
TPC34	Weald Way (off London Road)	Request for residential parking due to Nissan employees utilising the road to park, blocking driveways and access to resident visitors	INFORMAL CONSULTATION AGREED
TPC45	25 Tudor Avenue	Request for short-term restrictions to deter increasing amount of 'all day' commuter parking	NOTED

18 SUSPENSION OF COMMITTEE PROCEDURE RULES

During the discussion of remaining items on the agenda the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Council Procedure Rule 9 to allow the conclusion of consideration of the remaining items on the agenda.

19 URGENT BUSINESS

The Committee agreed to consider a report that proposed electronic voting in order for meeting records to be accurate and undisputed.

Chairman