

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REPORT

16 September 2014

Subject Heading:	BROOKLANDS ACCIDENT REDUCTION PROGRAMME - CROW LANE PROPOSED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (THE OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION)		
CMT Lead:	Cynthia Griffin		
Report Author and contact details:	SIVA Velup Senior Engineer 01708 433142 velup.siva@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 [X]

SUMMARY

Crow Lane – Brooklands Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by Transport for London for funding. A feasibility study has recently been carried out to identify safety improvements in the area and speed tables, speed cushions, pedestrian refuges with speed cushions, mini roundabout improvements including dome alteration, kerb build-out and approach speed cushions, road signs and road markings are proposed.

A public consultation has been carried out and this report details the finding of the feasibility study, public consultation and recommends that the above safety improvements be approved.

The scheme is within **Brooklands** ward.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the safety improvements as detailed below and shown on the relevant drawings be implemented as follows:
 - (a) Crow Lane east of Warley Avenue (Outside property Nos. 352/354) (Plan No:QN001/1)
 - Speed Table.
 - (b) Crow Lane / Alan Garden Junction (Plan No:QN001/1)
 - Speed Table
 - (c) Crow Lane in the vicinity of Property No. 139 (Plan No:QN001/2)
 - Speed Table
 - (d) Crow Lane / Jutsums Lane Mini Roundabout (Plan No:QN001/3)
 - Kerb build-out with hazard markers
 - Alteration to the dome section
 - (e) Crow Lane west of Bernard Road (Plan No:QN001/4)
 - Speed Table
 - (f) Crow Lane / Sandgate Close (Plan No:QN001/5)
 - Alteration to existing kerb build-out
 - Dome section alteration
- 2. That, the Committee having considered the representations made in response to the public consultation process, recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the pedestrian refuges with speed cushions at the Crow Lane/Jutsums Lane mini roundabout; approach speed cushions at the Crow Lane/Sandgate Close mini roundabout and speed cushions along Crow Lane between Sandgate Close and Dagenham Road will be omitted from the original proposals as shown on Appendix 2. A further report will be submitted to the future Committee meeting with amendments to these proposals.
- 3. That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £85,000, can be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2014/15 financial year allocation to Havering for Accident Reduction Programme.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

1.1 In October 2013, Transport for London approved funding for a number of Accident Reduction Programmes as part of 2014/15 Havering Borough Spending Plan settlement. Crow Lane – Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study has been carried out to identify accident remedial measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing accidents and recommended safety

- improvements. Following completion of the study, the safety improvements, as set out in this report, are recommended for implementation as they will improve road safety. In February 2014, the Highways Advisory Committee approved this scheme in principle for public consultation.
- 1.2 The Government and Transport for London have set targets for 2020 to reduce Killed or Serious injury accidents (KSI) by 40%; Child KSIs by 50%; pedestrian and cyclist KSI's by 50% from the baseline of the average number of casualties for 2005-09. The Crow Lane Accident Reduction Programme will help to meet these targets.

Survey Results

1.3 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 900 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Crow Lane.

A speed survey was carried out and the results are as follows.

Location	85%ile Speed (mph)		Highest Speed (mph)	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Crow Lane between Sandgate Close and Dagenham Road	37	36	55	55
Crow Lane by Bernard Road	37	37	45	48
Crow Lane by Alan Gardens	35	36	42	44

The 85th percentile traffic speed (the speed at which 85% of vehicles are travelling at or below) along Crow Lane exceeds the 30mph speed limit. Staff consider these speeds to be undesirable and a contributory factor to accidents.

Accidents

1.4 In the five-year period to November 2013, twenty three personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Crow Lane. Of the twenty three PIAs in Crow Lane, three were fatal; one was serious; five were speed related, seven occurred during the hours of darkness and two involved pedestrians. The three fatal PIAs resulted in five fatal casualties; two serious casualties and one slight casualty.

Location	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total PIAs
Crow Lane between Whalebone Lane south and Alan Gardens	1 (1-Ped) (1-Speed) (1-Dark)	0	1 (1-Speed)	2
Crow Lane / Alan Gardens Junction	0	0	2 (1-Dark)	2

Crow Lane / Braithwaite Avenue Junction	0	0	2 (1-Ped) (1-Dark)	2
Crow Lane / Seabrook Gardens Junction	0	0	2	2
Crow Lane between Seabrook Gardens and Jutsums Lane	1 (1-Speed) (1-Dark)	0	4 (1-Speed)	5
Crow Lane / Jutsums Lane mini roundabout	0	0	3 (1-Dark)	3
Crow Lane between Jutsums Lane and Maldon Road	0	0	1	1
Crow Lane / Bernard Road Junction	0	0	1 (1-Speed)	1
Crow Lane / Sandgate Close mini roundabout	1	1	2 (1-Dark)	4
Crow Lane between Sandgate Close and Dagenham Road	0	0	1	1
Total	3	1	19	23

Proposals

- 1.5 The following safety improvements are proposed along Crow Lane to reduce vehicle speeds and minimise accidents.
 - (a) Crow Lane east of Warley Avenue (Outside property Nos. 352/354) (Plan No:QN001/1)
 - Speed Table.
 - (b) Crow Lane / Alan Garden Junction (Plan No:QN001/1)
 - Speed Table
 - (c) Crow Lane in the vicinity of Property No. 139 (Plan No:QN001/2)
 - Speed Table
 - (d) Crow Lane / Jutsums Lane Mini Roundabout (Plan No:QN001/3)
 - Pedestrian refuges with speed cushions
 - Kerb build-out with hazard markers
 - Alteration to the dome section
 - (e) Crow Lane west of Bernard Road (Plan No:QN001/4)
 - Speed Table
 - (f) Crow Lane / Sandgate Close (Plan No:QN001/5)
 - Alteration to existing kerb build-out
 - Dome section alteration
 - Speed cushions at the approaches
 - (g) Crow Lane between Sandgate Close and Dagenham Road (Plan No:QN001/6)
 - Speed cushions

2.0 Outcome of public consultation

2.1 Following Highways Advisory Committee approval for a public consultation in February 2014, letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Twelve written responses from Local Member, London Buses and residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix 1.

3.0 Staff comments and conclusions

- 3.1 The accident analysis indicated that twenty three personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded over five year period along Crow Lane. Of the twenty three PIAs in Crow Lane, three were fatal; one was serious; five were speed related, seven occurred during the hours of darkness and two involved pedestrians. The three fatal PIAs resulted in five fatal casualties; two serious casualties and one slight casualty. Speed surveys showed that vehicles are, on average, travelling above the speed limits along Crow Lane.
- 3.2 Following the fatal accident along Crow Lane near Whalebone Lane South, the Coroner requested London Borough of Havering to take necessary action to prevent further deaths. The proposed measures would help to reduce further fatal accidents in the area. The above fatal accident occurred within the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham boundary.
- 3.3 The proposed safety improvements would minimise accidents along Crow Lane. It is therefore recommended that the proposed safety improvements in the recommendation should be recommended for implementation.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The estimated cost of implementing the proposals is £85,000. This cost can be met from the 2014/15 Transport for London's LIP allocation to Havering for School Travel Plan Programme. Spend will need to complete by 31st March 2015 to maximise access to TFL funding.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs of the scheme, should it be implemented. A final decision would be made by the Lead Member – as regards actual implementation and scheme detail. Therefore, final costs are subject to change.

This is a standard project for Streetcare and there is no expectation that the works cannot be contained within the cost estimate. There is an element of contingency built into the financial estimate. In the unlikely event of an overspend, the balance would need to be contained within the Streetcare Capital Budget.

Legal Implications and Risks

None of the proposals require a traffic order. They can all be implemented using the Council's highway management powers.

Human Resource Implications and Risks

The proposals can be delivered within the standard resourcing within Streetcare and has no specific impact on staffing/HR issues.

Equalities and Social Inclusion

The Council has a general duty under the Equality Act of 2010 to ensure that its highway network is accessible to all users. Where infrastructure is provided or substantially upgraded, reasonable adjustments should be made to improve access. In considering the impacts and making improvements for people with protected characteristics (mainly, but not limited to disabled people, the young and older people), this will assist the Council in meeting its duty under the Act.

There would be some visual impact from the proposals, however these proposals would generally improve safety for both pedestrians and vehicles.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1. Public consultation Letter.
- 2. Public consultation responses.
- 3. Drawing Nos. QN001/L, QN001/1, QN001/2, QN001/3, QN001/4 and QN001/5.

APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

RESPONSE REF:	COMMENTS	STAFF COMMENTS
QN001/1 (Member 1)	Inquiry about dome section height.	Information provided.
QN001/2 (London buses)	Have no issues with the scheme provided all tables and cushions are 'bus friendly' conforming to the Traffic Calming for Bus Routes booklet.	All speed tables and speed cushions designed in accordance with the booklet.
QN001/3 (E-Mail-No address detail available)	I am writing in support of the safety measures which are proposed for the vicinity in which I live. Main points of safety should be a designated crossing.	The crossing facilities will be considered in the vicinity of proposed speed tables at the detail design stage. The pedestrian refuges at the Crow Lane/Jutsums Lane mini roundabout will be provided at a later date.
QN001/4 (E-Mail - Seabrook Gardens resident, no number detail)	I am a resident of Seabrook Gardens and can't tell you how pleased I am that these measures are being considered. Please do all you can get these road calming measures put into place before another life is lost.	-
QN001/5 (E-Mail – Crow Lane resident)	I live at the Dagenham end of Crow Lane, the location of the tragic accidents. I welcome Havering LA investigating the dangerous driving on my road. I agree with some of the proposed safety improvements, but I am concerned that your plans are overly expensive with little need.	Staff considered that the proposed measures are necessary to reduce vehicle speeds and accidents along Crow Lane.
QN001/6 (Crow Metals Ltd)	Our depot entrance is in Jutsums Lane, just as you turn from Crow Lane. We have articulated lorries visiting our site on a daily basis and want assurances that the pedestrian refuges will not impede their access.	Staff used 'Auto Track' computer aided system to assess the path of articulated vehicles. Assessment showed that the proposed pedestrian refuges would not affect the articulated vehicles' path. Further check will be made to check the path on site before the installation. Following the public consultation results, the pedestrian refuges will be omitted from the original proposals at this stage.
QN001/7 (E-Mail – No address detail)	I am just enquiring whether or not it would be possible to put speed cushions in between the 2 speed tables. The one that is already existing at Seabrook Gardens and the proposed one outside of No. 139 Crow Lane.	Staff considered that the proposed measures are adequate to reduce vehicle speeds and accidents along Crow Lane. Further

-		7
	In between Alan Gardens and the other proposed speed table near Warley Avenue. I fear for my child's safety down Crow Lane. People drive too fast, are very in considerate.	measures could be considered at a later date, if necessary.
QN001/8 (E-Mail – No address detail)	I have the following issues. (1)Crow Lane Metals park their large lorries by the roundabout in Jutsums Lane waiting until there is space in the yard, so any islands you install would be more obstacles for the ordinary mororists to overcome. (2) The roundabout at Jutsums Lane is not in the correct position. The vehicles are coming from Jutsums Lane nearly collide with the Crow Lane eastbound vehicles. (3) The speed table erected by Seabrook Gardens doesn't really work. A lot of vehicles still speed and just bang their cars or vans lorries up and down the ramps. (4) 900 vehicles are not accurate figure.	Staff will consider further measures if any obstruction takes place at the proposed pedestrian refuges at a later date. The re-positioning of mini roundabout will be considered during the detail design stage if necessary. The proposed measures will reduce vehicle speeds and help to minimise the effect at this location. In accordance with our surveys, up to 900 vehicles use Crow Lane during peak hours in both directions. Staff considered that the proposed measures would not affect significantly if the vehicles travel at 30mph or below.
QN001/9 (22 Goldsmith Avenue)	I am generally in agreement with these proposed plans. I drive along Crow Lane daily and I welcome any measures to reduce the speed of some of the traffic that use this road as a rat-run. There has been a speed table installed at the Seabrook Gardens junction and additional tables along Crow Lane would be a good thing. The speed cushions need to be of a sufficient width to be effective. Bad parking can contribute to a lot of accidents and there needs to be more control and enforcement. There is a problem parking outside the off licence on the corner of Seabrook Gardens into Crow Lane.	Any parking problem will be dealt by the relevant team to improve the situation.
QN001/10 (Vignoles Road resident, no number detail)	I believe this to be a good idea although, I would like to comment on the roundabout at Jutsums Lane. Due to visibility, the vehicles from Jutsums Lane are edging to see the vehicles along Crow Lane and it is not the best situation. The proposed kerb build out would lead to move the stop line even further. It could cause accident.	These problems will be considered at the detail design stage to minimise the effect.
QN001/11 (E-Mail-Cycling Representative)	Comments are: (1) Use the TFL's consultation cycling guidelines for the design.	

- (2) Speed tables, humps, cushions need to be built to an appropriate standard such that cyclists suffer minimum discomfort as they cross them.
- (3) I am not a supporter of speed cushions. In general, these do not slow down vehicles as they are designed to be less than the width of the wheel span. They are more dangerous than having nothing at all as they create pinch points and cause vehicles to swerve around the cushions. All the speed cushions are replaced by speed tables along the length of the road.
- (4) Two refuge islands and speed cushions on either side of Jutsums Lane can lead confusion and danger rather than safety for anyone.
- (5) The best solution, to reduce danger for all road users including cyclists and pedestrians is to have full speed tables at each crossing.
- (6) As this road is also used as a rat run at various times, you could make the speed limit 20mph and include compulsory cycle lanes along each side of the road as there is more than enough room.

Speed cushions are omitted from the original proposals at this stage.

Pedestrian refuges with speed cushions are omitted from the original proposals at this stage.

Due to lack of funding and London buses criteria, further speed tables are not proposed at this stage

20mph and compulsory cycle lanes are not necessary at this stage. These could be considered at a later date.

Further cycle friendly measures will be considered at a later date.

QN001/12 (CTC ' Right to Ride' Network)

I have several detailed comments to submit.

- (1) It shall be necessary to construct the speed tables' entry and exit ramps in sinusoidal profile as to provide a smooth transition between road surface and the Table Ramp.
- (2) The pedestrian refuges with speed cushions arrangement is very unsatisfactory in terms of Cycle-friendly infrastructure. It effectively prevents Riders from adopting the 'primary position' when passing through the pinch point occasioned by the pedestrian refuge.
- (3) Another problem arises with speed cushions is that many commercial vehicles can straddle the humps with the front axle, whereas the rear axle strikes the hump at speed and is elevated to a considerable extent. Subsequently it returns to the road surface with a bang. This can be annoying and stressful for local residents or traders in the vicinity, whereas the Driver may suffer no discomfort at all.

These will be considered at a detail design stage if possible.

Pedestrian refuges with speed cushions are omitted from the original proposals at this stage.

Speed cushions are omitted from the original proposals at this stage.

(4) The design proposed at the Jutsums Lane mini roundabout is of a poor standard. There is already limited space available, but the proposed design proposes to reduce it even further. Personal experience of other mini roundabouts of this kind shows that the great majority of road-users at best, pay only lipservice to the roundabout and at worst, ignore it utterly. Alternative arrangement for mini roundabout shall provide a more sensible solution, and allow the installation of a larger central dome for the roundabout. This arrangement increases the diameter of the roundabout so as to facilitate negotiation by larger vehicles. I support the use of a raised centre dome to discourage shortcutting of the roundabout.

Further check will be made at the detail design stage to minimise the effect.