

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
14 June 2011 (7.30 - 9.15 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group Billy Taylor (Chairman), Frederick Thompson (Vice-Chair), Steven Kelly, Damian White and Barry Oddy

Residents' Group Brian Eagling and John Wood

Labour Group Denis Breading

Independent Residents Group David Durant

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Lynden Thorpe.

Substitute Members: Councillor Barry Oddy (for Lynden Thorpe).

Councillors Benham, Dervish, Bull, Hawthorn, Tebbutt, and Trew were present for part of the meeting.

One member of the public was 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.

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 May 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2 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:

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION A - Scheme proposals with funding in place			
H1	Rainham Village - Viking Way Extension	(previously on hold) Various parking and one-way working changes in support for Viking Way extension & Upminster Road South improvements.	AGREED
SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals without funding available			
H2	Shepherd's Hill, Harold Wood	Request for speed restraint measures following a number of accidents	8 REJECT, 1 ABSTENSION
H3	Globe Road	Humps were installed before 1999 Regulations and are higher, but the change in the law is not retrospective. Reduction in height would effectively mean partial reconstruction which is not funded.	8 REJECT, 1 ABSTENSION
H4	Swindon Lane, Harold Hill	Road humps. (last considered by HAC July 2010, Item 33)	REJECT
H5	Hornchurch Road/ St Leonards Road	Provide a mini-roundabout	REJECT
SECTION C - Highway scheme proposals on hold for future discussion			
H6	Junction Road	Pedestrian refuge near Western Road Medical Centre	Moved to LIP 2012/13. Can be removed from the list. NOTED

3 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:

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION A – Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests			
TPC37	Woodfield Drive, Stanley Avenue & Repton Avenue Gidea Park	Restrict the maximum stay of the free parking bays near Balgores Lane to four hours (currently being utilised all day by commuters)	8 REJECT, 1 ABSTENSION
TPC38	Bellevue Road, Hornchurch	Introduction of restrictions to deter Havering College students from parking on both sides of the carriageway causing obstruction, particularly to one resident who has a disability	REJECTED
TPC39	Vincent Road, Rainham	Request to remove footway parking bays and replace with restrictions to stop large vehicles parking in the bays and obstructing access to Vincent Road for refuse vehicles	REJECTED
TPC40	Brookdale Avenue, Upminster	Request to extend junction protection from Bridge Avenue in to Brookdale Avenue following resident being involved in vehicle accident	REJECTED
TPC41	Burntwood Avenue,	Request to extend single yellow line restriction from	REJECTED

	Hornchurch	Butts Green Road to 2a Burntwood Avenue (as is the case on the opposite side of the road, 1a Burntwood Avenue)	
TPC42	Burleigh Close, Romford	Request for junction protection at junction with Essex Road	AGREED (10 metre junction protection) (8 votes)
TPC43	Repton Avenue, Gidea Park	Request for Repton Avenue to be included in Gidea Park CPZ area due to increased amount of 'all day' commuter parking	8 REJECT, 1 ABSTENSION
TPC44	Ethleburga Road/King Alfred Road, Harold Wood	Request for additional residential parking bays	REJECTED
TPC45	25 Tudor Avenue, Gidea Park	Request for short-term restrictions to deter increasing amount of 'all day' commuter parking	DEFERRED (review with other requests from residents of Tudor Avenue)
TPC46	Ockendon Road, near South Essex Crematorium	Request for bus stop clearways at bus stops adjacent to South Essex Crematorium	REJECTED
TPC47	Tyne Close, Upminster	Request for footway parking bays	REJECTED
TPC48	Petersfield Avenue, Harold Hill	Request for footway parking bays and double yellow lines opposite shopping parade as lorries and other large vehicles are struggling to move along the carriageway due to parked vehicles on both sides of the highway	8 REJECT, 1 ABSTENSION
TPC49	21a Eastern Road, Romford	Request for access markings in front of club due to access being blocked by parkers, thereby blocking access to Dial-a-Ride vehicles - 'T'-Bar	REJECTED
TPC50	Collier Row Road, Hampden Road, Carter Drive	Introduction of Pay and Display on slip road in front of shops on Collier Row Road and replacement of Disc	AGREED

		Parking Bays with Pay and Display in Carter Drive and Hampden Road	
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 Primary School	NOTED
TPC18	A1306/Wentworth Way	Request for junction protection at A1306 junction with Wentworth Way	NOTED
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	NOTED

Further to an approval by the Committee for the Head of Streetcare to proceed with a design and consultation of suitable measures (HAC July 2010, Request No.8). on a request from a Councillor for a yellow box to be considered at the junction of A125 Upper Rainham Road and Elm Park Avenue following complaints from residents that south-bound traffic queues are preventing right turns from Elm Park Avenue at peak times.

The report outlined that the use of yellow box markings does not require any traffic orders, but are subject to rules of use. A yellow box may be placed across the side arm of a traffic signal-controlled junction, such as Upper Rainham Road and Elm Park Avenue. Such a junction would become known as a “yellow box junction”.

The report informed the Committee that officers had visited the site at different times and concluded that at peak times, some drivers were blocking the Elm Park Avenue arm of the junction and that a yellow box would assist with traffic flow.

The report stated that before a Highway Authority made a decision on the implementation of a yellow box junction, they were required to consult with the police because the contravention of the marking was an offence. In London, there were civil enforcement powers available for Councils to enforce such “moving traffic” offences, but Havering had not taken these on. Therefore, the enforcement of yellow box junctions remained with the Metropolitan Police.

The report detailed that the Metropolitan Police had been consulted on the proposal and had made the following comments:

- That they would support the proposed as outlined. The original complaint mentioned southbound traffic so this proposal would suit.
- That they would remind the consultee that this road marking was one of the decriminalised signs and they do not normally enforce those signs now covered as a civil offence.
- That they acknowledged, for the time being Havering Police are still enforcing the civil signs until such time that Havering undertook that responsibility.

In summary, the Police stated that, any offence would not routinely be enforced by the local police. That if a pattern of offending did occur any enforcement would be undertaken after balancing the needs of the local community with other policing responsibilities.

During the debate of the proposals, a member of the Committee stated that he did not feel there was a problem and so spending the proposed money would be a waste. He questioned the set back stop line and felt the signals should simply be rephrased.

The Principal Engineer explained that the set back was to allow buses to make the left turn into Elm Park Avenue. In addition it was mentioned that there were plans for a widening scheme which thus far had not been funded.

The Committee was informed that for any given situation, a junction would have an optimum cycle time within which each arm gets some green time. To favour one arm over the other would create congestion on the other arm. To increase the cycle time means that the junction is not optimised and all arms end up with increasing queues – perhaps I need to give a presentation on how signals work.

A member asked when it was thought the worst congestion occurred. In reply the Committee was informed that it was felt that the am peak period created the issue.

Cllr S Kelly proposed a refusal on the grounds that there was no compelling evidence that the proposed measures would be effective and that they were not cost effective, this was seconded by Cllr Oddy.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to reject the scheme.

Chairman