

**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 Alverstokey 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

Highways Advisory Committee, 17 May 2011

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)