



HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

**Tuesday
14 June 2011**

**Town Hall, Main Road,
Romford**

Members 9: Quorum 4

COUNCILLORS:

**Conservative Group
(5)**

**Residents' Group
(2)**

**Labour Group
(1)**

**Independent
Residents' Group
(1)**

Billy Taylor
(Chairman)
Frederick Thompson
(Vice-Chair)
Steven Kelly
Lynden Thorpe
Damian White

Brian Eagling
John Wood

Denis Breading

David Durant

**Ian Buckmaster
Committee Administration & Member Support Manager**

**For information about the meeting please contact:
Taiwo Adeoye 01708 433079
taiwo.adeoye@haverling.gov.uk**

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.

The Chairman will also announce the following:

The Committee is reminded that the design work undertaken by Staff falls under the requirements of the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations 2007. Those Staff undertaking design work are appropriately trained, experienced and qualified to do so and can demonstrate competence under the Regulations. They also have specific legal duties associated with their work.

For the purposes of the Regulations, a Designer can include anyone who specifies or alters a design, or who specifies the use of a particular method of work or material. Whilst the Committee is of course free to make suggestions for Staff to review, it should not make design decisions as this would mean that the Committee takes on part or all of the Designer's responsibilities under the Regulations.

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 (Pages 1 - 10)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 May 2011, and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 11 - 16)

The Committee is requested to consider the report relating to work in progress and applications.

6 TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES REQUEST WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 17 - 28)

The Committee is requested to consider the report relating to minor traffic and parking schemes.

7 URGENT BUSINESS

Highways Advisory Committee, 14 June 2011

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall
17 May 2011 (7.30pm – 9.45pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group Frederick Thompson (in the Chair), Steven Kelly, Billy Taylor, Lynden Thorpe and Damian White

Residents' Group Linda Hawthorn and John Mylod

Labour Group Denis Breading

Independent Local Residents' Group David Durant

Councillor Brice-Thompson was 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.

101 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 April 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Following the agreement of the minutes Councillor Thompson allowed Councillor Taylor chair the meeting.

The Committee commended Councillor Thompson for his work as the first Chairman of the Committee.

102 CEDAR ROAD, ROMFORD, COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC RESTRAINT OPTION

The report before the Committee provided background information, options and details of the impact of installing measures to prevent commercial vehicles using Cedar Road and also offered officer comments on the proposals. .

This report followed the agreement by the Committee for a report to be

submitted dealing with commercial traffic using Cedar Road, Romford to travel between Mawney Road and North Street.

The report outlined that Cedar Road was a predominantly residential street, but with some commercial activity at its north eastern end by North Street with access to an industrial estate on Chesham Close.

The junction with Mawney Road was a basic urban priority T junction which could be accessed by larger vehicles, certainly during the day when parking restrictions were in force.

The junction with North Street was a more complicated priority junction with a banned right turn from North Street. There was a large traffic island to deter right turns. Residents of Cedar Road had complained that when traffic was congested in North Street and Mawney Road, traffic used the street to “rat run”, often at speed.

There had also been complaints that commercial traffic including vans and lorries used the street to access commercial premises and also for generally avoiding local traffic build up.

The report informed the Committee of the following calming measures options that might be effective:

- The street had a great deal of on-street parking and so speed humps or tables would be appropriate rather than features such as pinch points.
- A set of speed humps in the street at reasonable spacing would require a budget of around £35k.
- In the 3 years to December 2010, 3 casualties had been recorded in the street. Two of the collisions involved vehicles at the junction of Cedar Road with North Street where poor driver judgement or behaviour was the issue. The third collision occurred near the junction of Cedar Road and Maple Street where a drunk car driver deliberately hit a cyclist.
- Speed humps might reduce traffic flow, but if “rat running” was taking place because of congestion, the features may be less effective, although speeds should be lower.
- That in terms of targeting commercial traffic, it would be possible to provide a width restriction. To deal with all but the lightest vans, a 6 foot, 6 inch (2 metre) restriction would be possible. Such a restriction would be provided by Order and indicated with traffic signs, but it was most common to build a physical width restriction so that the feature was self-enforcing.
- That in terms of location, a physical width restriction could be provided in several locations, but staff suggested that it would need to be near junctions which could be used as turning facilities for refuse, delivery and emergency vehicles, with such facilities being protected from

parking with restrictions.

- A location near Cedar Close might be practical for a width restriction in terms of space for the physical measures, somewhere to turn vehicles around and a location easily observed on leaving Chesham Close. A width restriction could create operational issues for the emergency services, particularly fire and ambulance because of the size of vehicles used.
- A width restriction would require a budget in the region of Twenty thousand pounds and would require signage in North Street and Mawney Road to prevent larger vehicles from becoming trapped in the road.
- A weight limit of 7.5 tonnes (environmental weight limit) could be placed on the street and this would be the least costly to implement at around Eight thousand pounds. Such a limit would be covered by Order and consist of the appropriate lit regulatory signage and advanced signage. Such a limit would need to be “except access” to allow commercial traffic to deliver to premises within the area. Such a limit could be put in place between Chesham Close and Mawney Road.

The major disadvantage with a weight limit would be one of enforcement. This was undertaken by the police and would be a very low priority for that service.

It would be possible to close the road at a point to traffic completely, although the location would need similar consideration as with a width restriction and emergency services would be similarly affected.

The location of a closure would disadvantage some residents who would normally pass to their regular destinations, thus having to divert elsewhere. In terms of cost, a road closure would cost slightly less than a width restriction.

There may have been other options available, but staff had set out the suggestions based on the usual type of treatments available.

The report outlined the following officer comments:

That the treatments which provided a restriction by Order alone relied on the use of traffic signs to deter traffic. In order to be effective, the signage either needed to be obeyed or enforcement was required.

That traffic calming might not necessarily reduce traffic flow, especially where there was a strong trip attractor, but traffic speeds may be more acceptable within residential areas. The level of casualties in the street did not provide a significant reason for traffic calming in comparison with other locations in the borough.

That pinch points and road closures would reduce traffic flow locally, but could create diversions for regular users which would put pressure on other streets and junctions.

That any physical restriction would mean that all larger commercial vehicles would have to access the industrial area at Chesham Close from North Street. Given the banned right turn, all of this traffic would have to turn left into Cedar Road.

Staff had reviewed the left turn into Cedar Road from North Street and noted that it was possible for articulated and large commercial vehicles to pass through the junction but space was extremely limited and unless driving was accurate, overrunning of the footways was an issue.

That if access for commercial vehicles was forced to be from North Street, then it was likely that adjustments to kerb lines would be required and certainly some on-street parking between North Street and Chesham Close would need to be removed.

In addition, the existing part-time restrictions would need to be changed to “at any time” restrictions, possibly with some loading controls so that access to Chesham Close would be maintained. This work would be at an additional cost.

The report informed that Committee that in order to take these works further forward, funding would need to be identified so that further design and construction works would take place, an indicative budget of between £15,000 and £30,000 or more was quoted. However, works to the North Street junction would be costlier if changes to kerb lines required diversions to buried utilities.

The Committee stated that external funding for a scheme was not available for 2011/12 through the Transport for London Local Implementation Plan and no Council capital budgets were provided for traffic schemes.

The Committee debated the options and sought clarification on some of the technical points which included the number of complaints received. In reply the Principal Engineer informed the Committee that three complaints were received, but two residents had taken it on themselves to act as spokesmen for the street and had been lobbying the Cabinet Member for StreetCare which had led to the report being produced.

A Member was of the opinion that there was no justification to proceed given the relatively low level of complaints and proposed a motion that the report should be not progressed and all of the possible solutions rejected. Councillor Thorpe seconded the motion.

The Committee **RESOLVED** not to progress the report any further.

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:

H3 Junction road – Request for crossing

Councillor Brice-Thompson addressed the Committee in support of the proposal to assist pedestrians and most especially for elderly accessing the Western Road Medical Centre. She noted the lack of funding, but asked if a facility could be put forward at part of the coming year's Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

The Principal Engineer explained that if that was the Committee's view, the item could be moved to Part C of the highways scheme list in order for officers to put the matter forward on the list for 2011/12.

The Principal Engineer further explained that a refuge would help, but would need road widening, which might be feasible and would allow people to cross in two halves. He added that a zebra crossing was possible and would allow people to get priority over traffic. The Committee was also informed that a speed table would reduce speeds, but might not give enough confidence to cross the road.

The Committee agreed to include this request on section C (Highways scheme proposals on hold for future decisions).

H7 Globe Road – Removal of Speed Humps

The Committee was informed that a number of local residents would like to attend. The proposal was to have the humps reduced in height.

The Principal Engineer informed the Committee that a competing idea to simply reduce the height of the humps was on the applications list for the next meeting (June 2011), he suggested that the whole issue be considered as one matter.

The Committee agreed to defer the matter until June 2011.

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Decision
SECTION A - Scheme proposals with funding in place			
None to report - NOTED			
SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals without funding available			
H1	Lee Gardens Avenue/ Benets Road	Measures to reduce accidents on bend at two roads	REJECTED 7 TO 2
H2	Grove Park Road, South Hornchurch	Traffic calming do deal with high traffic speeds	REJECTED
H3	Junction Road	Pedestrian refuge near Western Road Medical Centre	MOVE TO SECTION C
H4	Trustons Gardens	Request to widen road	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H5	Hornchurch High Street	One-way system for Hornchurch Town centre, through the High Street as a way of solving congestion, as well as widening Appleton Way.	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H6	Congestion problems	Request for study into congestion reducing measures at junctions of Brentwood Road with Osborne Road and Suttons Avenue with Abbs Cross Lane.	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H7	Globe Road	Remove speed humps	DEFERRED TO JUNE 2011
H8	Northdown Road, Hornchurch	Provide speed humps to tackle speeding traffic	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H9	Betterton Road, South Hornchurch	Request for additional speed humps in street	REJECTED
H10	Osborne Road	Changes speed cushions to speed humps. Request made on behalf of 2 residents in local area.	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H12	Rainsford Way, Roneo Corner	Speed restraint	REJECTED 8 TO 1
H13	Weald Way, Romford	Speed restraint such as speed humps to stop traffic rat-running between London Road and Jutsums Lane	REJECTED

SECTION C - Highway scheme proposals on hold for future discussion			
H14	Rainham Village Parking Review	Consider parking needs for village in parallel with Viking Way extension, perhaps look at residents' permits as well - commence work with local parking questionnaire. Review likely to start in January 2011 to coincide with Viking Way scheme.	NOTED and on HOLD
H15	South End Road	Request for Zebra Crossing near Condor Walk	NOTED will be reviewed as part of 2011/12 scheme in area

104 TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES – Schemes Progress and Applications, May 2011

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			
TPC22	Little Gaynes Road	Request for parking controls to deal with on-street parking related to doctor's surgery and access being blocked. Yellow lines at the top of Little Gaynes Road	REJECTED
TPC23	Thorncroft	A petition had been received from all residents of Thorncroft. This had previously gone to HAC, was designed and went out for	REJECTED (Cllr D White to submit new request for SYL)

Highways Advisory Committee, 17 May 2011

		consultation. Following a poor return on responses, HAC advised that the scheme not proceed any further	to Traffic & Parking Control)
TPC24	Crowlands/Ainsley Avenue	Request for double yellow lines at the apex of the bend between Crowlands and Ainsley Avenues	REJECTED
TPC25	Elm Park Avenue	Request for bus stop clearway to improve accessibility for bus passengers on both sides of the carriageway	REJECTED
TPC26	Marks Road (off Mawney Road)	Request for use of voucher bay for resident permit holders	REJECTED
TPC27	Durham/Elvet Avenues	Request for CPZ extension due to the impact of the redevelopment of the Snowdon Court site	DEFERRED (incorporate in Gidea Park CPZ review)
TPC28	Shaftesbury Road	Request to remove School Keep Clear signs and lines at the Old Manor School site	APPROVED
TPC29	St Andrews Avenue	Request to remove School Keep Clear signs and lines at the entrance to Dunningford/Elm Park Primary School	APPROVED
TPC30	Holt Road	Request for junction protection at junction with Alverstoake Road	REJECTED
TPC31	Melton Gardens	Request for parking restrictions due to access concerns for the emergency services	REJECTED
TPC32	7 Eastern Road	Request to extend double yellow line across dropped kerb and garage access	REJECTED
TPC33	South Lodge, South Drive	Request from new owner of property to remove the current parking restrictions or allow on-street parking for residents	REJECTED
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	DEFERRED (Glyn Hopkins to be consulted on staff parking issues and residents surveyed on the parking issues)
TPC35	Woburn Avenue/Elm Park Avenue/Carfax Road/Woburn Avenue	Request for junction protection at the junction of Woburn Avenue and Elm Park Avenue and at junction of Carfax Road and Elm Park Avenue	REJECTED

TPC36	29 Hill Grove	Request for restrictions in Hill Grove due to increased number of vehicles parked in the road following the implementation of restrictions in Cedric Avenue	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 Primary School	NOTED
TPC18	A1306/Wentworth Way	Request for junction protection at A1306 junction with Wentworth Way	DEFER (proposed design to be prepared)
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	DEFER (proposed design to be prepared and shared with Met Police and Randall Court for comment)

Chairman
14 June 2011

This page is intentionally left blank



5

REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

14 June 2011

Subject Heading:

**HIGHWAY SCHEMES APPLICATIONS
June 2011**

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Excellence in education and learning | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Value and enhance the life of every individual | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY

This report presents applications for new highway schemes for which the Committee will make recommendations to the Head of StreetCare to either progress or the Committee will reject.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee considers that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement (where required) of the highway schemes applications set out the Schedule, Section A – Scheme Proposals with Funding in Place.
2. That the Committee considers the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the highway schemes applications set out in the Schedule, Section B - Scheme proposals without funding available.
3. That the Committee notes the contents of the Schedule, Section C – Scheme proposals on hold for future discussion.
4. That it be noted that any schemes taken forward to public consultation and advertisement (where required) will be subject to a further report to the Committee and a decision by the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment if a recommendation for implementation is made.
5. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing each scheme is set out in the Schedule along with the funding source. In the case of Section B - Scheme proposals without funding available, that it be noted that there is no funding available to progress the schemes.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Highways Advisory Committee receives all highway scheme requests; so that a decision will be made on whether the scheme should progress or not before resources are expended on detailed design and consultation.
- 1.2 Several schemes are funded through the Transport for London Local Implementation Programme and generally the full list of schemes will be presented to the Committee at the first meeting after Annual Council, although some items will be presented during the year as programmes develop.
- 1.3 There is also a need for schemes funded by other parties or programmes (developments with planning consent for example) to be captured through this process.

- 1.4 Where any scheme is to be progressed, then the Head of StreetCare will proceed with the detailed design, consultation and public advertisement (where required). The outcome of consultations will then be reported to the Committee which will make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment. Where a scheme is not to be progressed, then the Head of StreetCare will not undertake further work.
- 1.5 In order to manage this workload, a schedule has been prepared to deal with applications for new schemes and is split as follows;
- (i) Section A - Scheme Proposals with Funding in Place. These are projects which are fully funded and it is recommended that the Head of StreetCare proceeds with detailed design and consultation.
 - (ii) Section B - Scheme proposals without funding available. These are requests for works to be undertaken where no funding from any source is identified. The recommendation of Staff to the Committee can only be one of rejection in the absence of funding. The Committee can ask that the request be held in Section C for future discussion should funding become available in the future.
 - (iii) Section C - Scheme proposals on hold for future discussion. These are projects or requests where a decision is not yet required (because of timing issues) or the matter is being held pending further discussion should funding become available in the future.
- 1.6 The schedule contains information on funding source, likely budget (as a self-contained scheme, including staff design costs), the request originator, date placed on the schedule and a contact point so that Staff may inform the person requesting the scheme the outcome of the Committee decision.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

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

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

Legal implications and risks:

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

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

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

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

London Borough of Havering

Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare

Highways Advisory Committee

Highway Schemes Applications Schedule

14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Funding Source	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
SECTION A - Highway 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.	Revised planning application due soon, but Orders need to be developed early to ensure scheme delivery. Full report to HAC following consultation and advertisement.	Variety of external funders	£10k	LBH Regeneration	03/11/2010 (updated 23/5/11)	Mark Philipotts LBH StreetCare
SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals without funding available								
H2	Shepherd's Hill, Harold Wood	Request for speed restraint measures following a number of accidents	Recent collisions have not had injury outcomes. Measures might be feasible subject to detailed review, but unfunded.	None	£30k	Residents	10/05/2011	Cllr Eagling
H3	Globe Road	Reduce height of speed humps to bring them within current Regulations.	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.	None	£14k	Residents	11/05/2011	1101160, 1101762 & Cllr D White
H4	Swindon Lane, Harold Hill	Road humps. (last considered by HAC July 2010, Item 33)	No casualties in 3 years to December 2010. Any scheme would have to include Redruth Road and Redcar Road	None	£60k	Resident	11/05/2011	1101508

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Engineering - StreetCare
Highway Schemes Applications Schedule

Highways Advisory Committee
14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Funding Source	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
H5	Hornchurch Road/ St Leonards Road	Provide a mini-roundabout	Would require detailed design, but the junction is on the inside of a bend which means that the Give Way point would be further back into the street, thus reducing visibility. Development of acceptable scheme likely to involve utility diversions.	None	£30k+	Resident	23/05/2011	Cllr D White
SECTION C - Highway scheme proposals on hold for future discussion (for Noting)								
H6	Junction Road	Pedestrian refuge near Western Road Medical Centre	Zebra crossing possible, pedestrian refuge would require road widening. To be considered for 2012/13 TfL LIP allocation.	None	£15k to £20k (plus utility diversion costs)	Cllr Brice-Thompson	11/04/2011	Cllr Brice-Thompson



6

REPORT

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

14 June 2011

Subject Heading:

**TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEME
REQUESTS
June 2011**

Report Author and contact details:

Alexandra Watson
Business Unit Manager (Schemes &
Challenges)
01708 432603
alexandra.watson@havering.gov.uk

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

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

SUMMARY

This report presents applications for on-street minor traffic and parking schemes for which the Committee will make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment who will then recommend a course of action to the Head of StreetCare to either progress, reject or hold pending further review.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee considers the on-street minor traffic and parking scheme requests set out in the Schedule, Section A – Minor Traffic and Parking scheme requests for prioritisation and for each application the Committee either;
 - (a) Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment advise that the Head of StreetCare should proceed with the detailed design and advertisement (where required) of the minor traffic and parking scheme; or
 - (b) Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment advise that the Head of StreetCare should not proceed further with the minor traffic and parking scheme.
2. That the Committee notes the contents of the Schedule, Section B – Minor Traffic and Parking scheme requests on hold for future discussion.
3. That it be noted that any schemes taken forward to public consultation and advertisement (where required) will be subject to a further report to the Committee and a decision by the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment should recommendation for implementation is made and accepted by the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.
4. That it be noted that the estimated cost of implementing each scheme is set out in the Schedule along with the funding source and that the budget available in 2011/12 is £90K.
5. At Period 2 £80K is uncommitted.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Highways Advisory Committee receives all on-street minor traffic and parking scheme requests. The Committee advises whether a scheme should progress or not before resources are expended on detailed design and consultation.
- 1.2 Approved Schemes are generally funded through a revenue budget (A24650). Other sources may be available from time to time and the Committee will be advised if an alternative source of funding is potentially available and the mechanism for releasing such funding.

- 1.3 Where the Committee recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that it's approved a scheme to be progressed, then subject to the approval of the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment the Head of StreetCare will proceed with the detailed design, consultation and public advertisement (where required). The outcome of consultations will then be reported to the Committee, which will make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.
- 1.4 Where the Committee recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that a scheme should not be progressed subject to the approval of the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment the Head of StreetCare will not undertake further work and the proposed scheme will be removed from the Schemes application list. Schemes removed from the list will not be eligible for re-presentation for a period of six months commencing on the date of the Highways Advisory Committee rejection.
- 1.5 In order to manage and prioritise this workload, a schedule has been prepared to deal with applications for schemes and is split as follows;
- (i) Section A – Minor Traffic and Parking requests. These requests may be funded through the Council's revenue budget (A24650) for Minor Traffic and Parking Schemes or an alternative source of funding (which is identified) and the Committee advises the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment to recommend to the Head of StreetCare whether each request is taken forward to detailed design and consultation or not.
 - (ii) Section B – Minor Traffic and Parking scheme requests on hold for future discussion. These are projects or requests where a decision is not yet required (because of timing issues) or the matter is being held pending further discussion or funding issues.
- 1.6 The schedule contains information on funding source, likely budget (as a self-contained scheme, including design costs), the request originator, date placed on the schedule and a contact point so that Staff may inform the person requesting the scheme the outcome of the Committee advice to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

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

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

Overall costs will need to be contained within the overall revenue budget.

Legal implications and risks:

Many aspects of on-street minor traffic and parking schemes require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

When the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment approves a request, then such advertisement would take place and then be reported in detail to the Committee who will then advise the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment to approve the Scheme for implementation.

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

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Decisions need to be made which are in accordance with various equality and diversity considerations, the advice of which will be reported in detail to the Committee so that they may advise the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule
14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
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)		LBH Revenue	1,200	Resident	10/05/2011	1102822
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		LBH Revenue	1,000	Resident	16/05/2011	1102808
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		LBH Revenue	1,500	Resident	13/05/2011	1102750

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule
14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
TPC40	Brookdale Avenue, Upminster	Request to extend junction protection from Bridge Avenue in to Brookdale Avenue following resident being involved in vehicle accident	15 metre junction protection already in place	LBH Revenue	500	Resident	10/05/2011	1102102
TPC41	Burntwood Avenue, Hornchurch	Request to extend single yellow line restriction from Butts Green Road to 2a Burntwood Avenue (as is the case on the opposite side of the road, 1a Burntwood Avenue)		LBH Revenue	500	Resident	11/04/2011	1101290
TPC42	Burleigh Close, Romford	Request for junction protection at junction with Essex Road		LBH Revenue	500	Resident	05/05/2011	1101192

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule
14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
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	Request previously rejected by HAC on 14th December 2010	LBH Revenue	1,000	Resident	21/05/2011	Resident
TPC44	Ethleburga Road/King Alfred Road, Harold Wood	Request for additional residential parking bays		LBH Revenue	2,000	Residents	17/05/2011	Residents
TPC45	25 Tudor Avenue, Gidea Park	Request for short-term restrictions to deter increasing amount of 'all day' commuter parking	A further request from a resident of Tudor Avenue in response to recent article in Romford Town Newsletter	LBH Revenue	1,000	Resident	30/05/2011	Resident

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
14th June 2011
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
TPC46	Ockendon Road, near South Essex Crematorium	Request for bus stop clearways at bus stops adjacent to South Essex Crematorium		LBH Revenue	500	Cllr Hawthorn	29/05/2011	Cllr Hawthorn
TPC47	Tyne Close, Upminster	Request for footway parking bays		LBH Revenue	500	Resident	03/05/2011	Resident
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		LBH Revenue	1,000	Resident/Clerk of Works (Highways)	09/05/2011	Resident/Clerk of Works (Highways)

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule
14th June 2011

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
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		LBH Revenue	50	Romford War Memorial Hall	25/05/2011	Romford War Memorial Hall
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 Parking Bays with Pay and Display in Carter Drive and Hampden Road		Invest to Save Bid	30,000	Re-submitted scheme following comments to original consultation and the decision making process not being completed	2009/10	Re-submitted scheme following comments to original consultation and the decision making process not being completed
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	Defer to be included as part of Gidea Park Review (Ref QJ059)	LBH Revenue	TBC	Gidea Park & District Civil Society	14/03/2011	1067214

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
14th June 2011
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
TPC6	20 Tudor Avenue, Gidea Park	Extend existing restrictions to prevent obstructive parking by parents of Gidea Park College with concern about safety	<p>Three individual requests received from residents. Cllr Kelly suggested implementing a short stay 'kiss and ride' bay for parents to utilise but, following advice from the Principal Engineer, we would have to seek approval for this from the DFT, which we may not receive. In light of a number of other proposals for the Gidea Park area, it may be timely to review the current CPZ arrangements in the area.</p> <p>Further representations have been received from No. 22 Tudor Avenue to progress the matter urgently as the parking problems are increasing, particularly from parents of Gidea Park College. The resident has reported being blocked in their driveway to our enforcement office on xx occasions.</p>	LBH Revenue	1,000	Resident	30/03/2011	1082424
TPC7	22 Tudor Avenue, Gidea Park	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		LBH Revenue		Resident	30/03/2011	1082430
TPC13	18 Tudor Avenue, Gidea Park	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		LBH Revenue		Resident	27/11/2011	1088748

London Borough of Havering
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare
Highways Advisory Committee
14th June 2011
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule

Item Ref	Scheme	Description	Officer Advice	Potential Funder	Likely Budget	Scheme Origin/ Request from	Date Requested/ Placed on List	CRM / Contact
TPC18	A1306/Wentworth Way	Request for junction protection at A1306 junction with Wentworth Way	Incorporate requests as one scheme proposal - deferred at April HAC to obtain further information from Metropolitan Police and to undertake a site check of the A1306/Wentworth Way junction	LBH Revenue	750	Cllr Tucker	Telephone request in March 2011	Cllr Tucker
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		LBH Revenue		Metropolitan Police	08/03/2011	Metropolitan Police

This page is intentionally left blank