

# Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Council Chamber - Town Hall  
7 July 2015 (7.00 - 9.00 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS**

<b>Conservative Group</b>	Jason Frost (Chairman), Dilip Patel, Frederick Thompson, +Robby Misir and +Carol Smith
<b>Residents' Group</b>	Barry Mugglestone and John Mylod
<b>East Havering Residents' Group UKIP</b>	Darren Wise (Vice-Chair) and Linda Hawthorn John Glanville
<b>Independent Residents Group</b>	David Durant

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Joshua Chapman and John Crowder. Councillor Carol Smith substituted for Councillor Chapman while Councillor Robby Misir substituted for Councillor John Crowder.

Councillors Ray Morgon, Ron Ower and Roger Ramsey were also present for part of the meeting.

There were 20 members of the public present at the meeting

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

**11 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**12 TPC 595 - BERTHER ROAD PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

The Committee considered a report that outlined the responses received to the proposals to introduce various waiting restrictions along Berther Road.

The report informed the Committee that following a request from Ward Councillors and a petition received from residents of Berther Road to deal with the increasing level of parking and its duration. Members agreed in principle for officers to undertake an informal consultation in the area, to gauge residents feeling about the parking situation

Following an informal consultation, a scheme was designed consisting of 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the northern side of the road, that extended to the southern side of the road to cover residential accesses, while the remainder of the southern side of the road would remain restricted by the existing Monday to Friday 8:30am to 9:30am waiting restrictions. The proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions also extended into Nelmes Road, on its western side, for 10 metres either side of the junction.

The report informed the Committee that by the close of the consultation on 19 June 2015, eight responses were received to the advertised proposals, of which six were from residents who outlined their support for the scheme, one respondent was concerned about displaced parking and a petition signed by 38 residents of Berther Road requested for a residents parking scheme to be operational twice a day. All of the responses were summarised and appended to the report.

In officer's view, the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions were designed to deal with the increasing levels of parking taking place in the road that was related to a local successful restaurant, pub and bar, which operated late into the evening. The 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the northern side of the road would ensure traffic flowed, while on the southern side it would ensure that residents' driveways were not blocked. The Monday to Friday 8:30am to 9:30am waiting restrictions on the southern side of the road would continue to limit all day commuter parking, while providing valuable parking for the local residents and businesses but would have a limited traffic calming effect.

The report detailed that any agreed restrictions would be implemented as soon as possible in order for an efficient improvement to the current parking situation in the area. It was also agreed to extend the hours of enforcement operations, with enforcement officers undertaking specific late evening patrols.

With its agreement Councillors Roger Ramsey and Ron Ower addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ramsey stated that there were problems in the area caused primarily by commuters and patrons of a local restaurant. He stated that action was required but there was no obvious that would suit everyone. Councillor Ramsey acknowledged that the purpose of the proposed scheme was to bring immediate relief to the road but noted the concerns raised by many residents over the effect of the scheme. Councillor Ramsey questioned whether a wider review of the area would, in itself, have the necessary focus to adequately deal with the issues faced by the residents of

Berther Road. He stated that it would be beneficial for further dialogue to take place between residents and Council officers to find the best solution for the road and to enable residents to fully understand the implications that the scheme would have.

Councillor Ower acknowledged the problems faced by the residents of Berther Road commenting that at times the road resembled a car park. Councillor Ower stated that the level of parking, particularly at weekends, had made the road particularly dangerous. Councillor Ower identified the popularity of a local restaurant as being one of the contributory factors in the increased demand for parking in the area. Councillor Ower noted that the day time restrictions being proposed would resolve only part of the problem. He stated that he was in agreement with Councillor Ramsey in that officers should meet with residents in order to consider all available options again. .

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by two members of the public one of whom spoke in favour of the scheme and the other who spoke against the scheme.

A resident speaking against the scheme stated that residents of Berther road had been suffering for some time because of increased parking in the road as a result of extended hours of operation of the local railway station and the increasing popularity and size of a local restaurant. The speaker commented on existing ventilation problems at the restaurant and the adverse effect that the parking issues was having on the road. The speaker went on to state that during the consultation process residents had made alternative proposals to deal with the parking issues but these had not been taken into account. The speaker concluded by stating that the general consensus in the road was that double yellow lines don't work.

A resident speaking in favour of the proposals stated that he lived at Tilia Court and had parking on site. The resident stated that he was in favour of double yellow lines on one side of Berther Road with parking bays provided on the opposite side. He raised concerns that if a permit parking scheme were to be implemented, this would just move the parking problem to other roads in the area.

During a brief debate, a Member raised concerns that the implementation of the scheme would result in the displacement of vehicles to neighbouring roads. The Member suggested that a wider review of the area was necessary in order to deal with the issue properly.

Another Member stated that he was in support of the proposal in the report. The Member stated that he recognised the need to resolve the conflict over parking in the road.

Another Member supported the concerns raised by Councillors Ower and Ramsey. He stated that customers for the restaurant should be encouraged to use taxis and other forms of public transport.

Officers clarified that the recommendation in the report had been amended to recommend deferral of (a) the implementation of proposed waiting restrictions in Berther Road for two months to afford officers and residents further time to consider alternative schemes.

The Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. To recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment that;
  - (a) the implementation of waiting restrictions in Berther Road be deferred for two months; and
  - (b) a further review of the wider area around Emerson Park Station be undertaken with residents and businesses of the area being given the option of having a permit parking scheme

**13 PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY FOR OAKFIELD MONTESSORI SCHOOL**

The report before the Committee detailed the outcome of a consultation for the provision of pedestrian crossing improvements, a 20 mph zone and traffic calming in Harwood Hall Lane outside the Montessori School, Upminster.

The report informed Members that the Montessori School was the only school in the borough not served by a footway up to its pedestrian entrance.

Harwood Hall Lane started at its junction with Corbets Tey Road and ran south west for 630m to Aveley Road. The road was subjected to a 30 mph speed limit and a 7.5 tonne weight restriction along its entire length. The only substantial footway ran on the north side from the junction with Corbets Tey Road up to the Corbets Tey School for children with complex learning needs, which was opposite the Montessori School.

The report detailed that a vehicular entrance to the school was 100 metres south west of the entrance to Corbets Tey School. It was mentioned that for a number of years the school had a strong desire from parents for a dedicated pedestrian access to the school, something which the school had placed in its travel plan and had been campaigning this to be implemented.

The report informed the Committee that the current proposal sought the removal of the pinch point west of Corbets Tey School. The installation of a build-out outside the proposed Oakfield School pedestrian entrance as in previous schemes. Officers were of the view that without this build-out, no uncontrolled pedestrian crossing was possible.

The proposal also included plans for Harwood Hall Lane to become a 20 mph zone road from the junction with Corbets Tey Road and just west of Oakfield School vehicular entrance. Three speed humps were proposed

west of Bear Block Cottages, and between Corbets Tey School and Oakfield School entrances.

Four responses to the consultation were appended to the report.

In officers' view, the school had done everything to facilitate active travel within its school travel plan and the only way to develop this further was with physical changes to Harwood Hall Lane. A pedestrian access to the school would enable pupils to lead more active lives and learn to become independent before their transition to secondary school, as well as reducing traffic impact on Harwood Hall Lane at school travel times.

A resident of Corbets Tey Road had raised concern that the scheme would cause a queue of traffic up to Corbets Tey Road, affecting commuters' journeys but officers did not consider that the scheme would have a significant impact on commuters driving through Harwood Hall Lane and also felt it would have a positive effect on driver behaviour in a location fronted by two schools and residential properties.

The report detailed concerns about visibility being impeded by pedestrians waiting to cross. In officers' view the visibility required when travelling at 20mph was less than at 30mph and should visibility be limited, the onus was on the driver to proceed according to the prevailing road conditions.

The Committee noted that Ward Councillors and parents of Oakfield Montessori School were in favour of the revised scheme.

With its agreement Councillor Ron Ower addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ower spoke in support of the proposal citing that this was the only school without a footpath to its entrance. Councillor Ower stated that the matter had originally been raised ten to twelve years ago when Oakfields School wrote to the Council requesting support for a scheme. Councillor Ower noted that the scheme was also supported by Corbets Tey School. Councillor Ower stated that the road is extremely busy recounting a visit to the site that he had made with the Police he stated that at the time of his attendance a significant number of vehicles were travelling along the road in excess of the speed limit. Councillor Ower asked the committee to agree the scheme.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by a resident who spoke against the scheme and the School's Business Manager who spoke in support of the scheme.

The resident, who spoke against the scheme, informed the Committee that he had lived on Corbets Tey Road for over 40 years and travelled along Harwood Hall Lane approximately ten times a week. He stated that Harwood Hall Lane was well used by pedestrians and that pedestrians did not currently have a right of way when crossing the road which would remain the case under the proposed scheme. The resident suggested the

installation of a zebra crossing or traffic lights with the upgrading of footways. The resident raised concerns that the proposed scheme would invite unaccompanied children to cross the road without the protection of a right of way. The resident advised that a high volume of traffic used the road; approximately seven hundred vehicles per hour travel along the road equating to one every 5 seconds. Should a 20mph be implemented this would impact on traffic flow and congestion creating the potential for gridlock over a wide area. He was of the view that traffic should be allowed to flow along the road.

In response, the School's Business Manager spoke in support of the scheme. He stated that he had been a resident of the area for over thirty years. He informed the Committee that the school, its owners, parents and residents would benefit from the scheme and were all in support of the proposal. He added that the school had a joint emergency arrangement with Corbets Tey School, which allowed each school to evacuate its pupils across to the other premises in case of an emergency. The Committee was also informed that the school was seeking funding to improve wheelchair access and expand an unused entrance that would open out to the proposed build-out point.

During general debate, Members acknowledged the need to support a pedestrian safety scheme in Harwood Hall Lane and that the Montessori School was the only school in the borough not served by a footway up to its pedestrian entrance. A member stated that approximately half of the schools pupils lived within walking distance of the school and should be encouraged to walk.

A Member commented that the traffic calming measures and road build out represented a hazard on the road and could be a recipe for disaster if it were to be hit by a vehicle while children were congregating. The member cited examples of newly installed kerb build outs being hit by vehicles, in other parts of the borough. The Member stated that this was a real danger while drivers were getting used to the new road layout. It was suggested that the school entrance could be widened to accommodate a crossing point.

A member commented that that the needs of the pupils were of priority over motorists. Other Members welcomed the revised proposal to meet the school's and residents' requirement while others were concerned about the build-out stating that it could represent a safety concern when pupils congregated on it. Another Member stated that the ward councillors were supportive of the revised scheme.

A Member sought clarification on the differences between the previous design and the current proposal and a response to the objector's comments. Officers provided clarification on the detail of the scheme design. Officers confirmed that there was limited scope for the creation of new footways as the Council did not have control of the necessary land; and a

controlled crossing, in use at limited times of the day, could represent a safety concern as drivers would not be used to having to stop.

In support of the scheme another member stated that the onus should be on the driver to drive in an appropriate manner along the road.

In response to a member who asked whether the build out would contain guard rails Officers confirmed that it would not but the kerb design would nudge vehicles away from the build out and back into the road, if hit.

By a majority of 9 votes for to 2 against the Committee **RESOVLED:**

1. To recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment that the pedestrian crossing improvements on Harwood Hall Lane as detailed in the report and shown on drawing QM021/OB/02.E be implemented.
2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £40,000 for implementation would be met by Transport for London through the 2015/16 School Travel Plan Engineering Measures budget.

14 **BRENTWOOD ROAD, THE DRILL PUBLIC HOUSE - PROPOSED 'AT ANY TIME' WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

The report before Members detailed the proposals to introduce 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in Brentwood Road, in the vicinity of The Drill Public House.

The report stated that following reports of obstructive parking taking place in Brentwood Road around The Drill Public House, Tesco and Ginger Spice, the Committee agreed at its meeting in April 2015 in principle to introduce 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in the area to prevent obstructive parking and improve traffic flow.

The proposals were subsequently designed and publicly advertised to all those perceived to be affected by the proposals. Eighteen statutory bodies were also consulted and site notices were placed at the location.

At the close of the consultation on 15 May 2015, seventeen responses were received. The report summarised all the responses in the table appended to as the report Appendix B.

The respondents had raised the following points:

- Concern about parking being displaced to outside their property or further down Brentwood Road. It was suggested that double yellow lines be extended to Slewins Lane from the roundabout to the bus stop outside No. 11.

- A resident from Hazelmere Gardens was concerned about enforcing the longer duration restrictions, making the layby area into individual spaces and make it into a short term parking bay. The resident suggested the installation of bollards to prevent vehicle parking on the footway, reducing the width of the layby to prevent echelon style parking in the bay, or removing the layby and install bike racks.
- A business which was situated in the immediate area of the proposals had suggested a number of changes to the proposals, which were outlined on their amended plan that was appended to the report as Appendix C.
- All comments from residents of Brentwood Road stated they were in favour of the proposals but were concerned about displacement, enforcement of any new restrictions and the suggested further extension of the double yellow lines. These varied from up to Squirrels Heath School entrance, on the odd numbered side, to Salisbury Road on one side
- There were also requests for the layby outside Tesco to be made into a short term parking facility. Other parking issues related to the parade of shops between Nos. 364 and 376 Brentwood Road.

In officers' view, due to the amount of obstructive parking in the Brentwood Road area, it was considered that the proposals should be implemented as advertised. The report informed the Committee that the layby fronting Tesco, was created as part of the planning conditions for the site and was intended for loading. A member of staff from Tesco had advised that deliveries could take place at any time between 8:00am and 5:00pm Monday to Saturday. The entire frontage of the Tesco and Ginger Spice site was covered by the layby and vehicle crossovers which led to an off-street parking provision for the flats above Tesco and the forecourt to Ginger Spice. It noted that it would not be possible to provide any form of parking provisions on or in front of the vehicle crossovers, as this would condone obstructive parking. This section of road, including the layby, was currently restricted with parking not allowed from 8:00am to 6:30 pm Monday to Saturday inclusive. The crossovers formed part of the footway, which was subject to the footway parking ban.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by a local resident who spoke on behalf of other residents in support of the scheme.

The resident stated that she lived on the North West side of the road and on many occasions had her driveway blocked by parked vehicles. She informed the Committee that Ginger Spice had three parking spaces which were not being made available for customer use; one space was used by a member of staff. The resident suggested that the layby be converted in to a 20 minutes short term parking bay. The resident informed the committee



that Tesco was proactive in attempting to keep the loading bay clear for receipt of deliveries.

During a brief debate, a Member stated that following a site visit, he had sympathy for the resident at No. 393 as a result of the current obstructive parking. He was of the opinion that the double yellow lines should be extended to Cavenham Gardens. He was also of the view that the loading bay worked well for shoppers presently.

Another member questioned the rationale of restricting use of the loading bay. The member stated that the bay should also accommodate short term parking.

A Member supported the suggestion to extend double yellow lines up to the Squirrels Heath School entrance.

The Committee noted that the loading bay in front of Tesco was part of a planning condition and could be converted to a short term parking spaces.

The Committee **RESOLVED**:

1. To recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment that:
  - a. the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in Brentwood Road, around The Drill Public House, shown on the drawing (Ref: Brentwood Road – The Drill) be implemented as advertised;
  - b. further proposals be advertised to extend the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions on the north-western side of Brentwood Road, from the north-eastern boundary of No.393 to the common boundary of Nos.369 and 371;
  - c. further proposals be advertised to make the layby a loading bay operational 8:00am to 5:00pm Monday to Saturday;
  - d. further proposals be designed and advertised to implement short term parking facilities for the shops on the south-western side of Brentwood Road;
  - e. the effect of any agreed proposals be monitored.
2. Members note that the estimated cost for the current proposals in Brentwood Road, as set out in the report was £1,500, this would be met from the 2015/16 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

15 **TPC594 - MINSTER WAY, HIGHFIELD CRESCENT UPMINSTER ROAD - CONVERSION OF DISC PARKING TO PAY & DISPLAY**

Following clarification that the out of Town Centre parking bays provided for free parking for the first ninety minutes, the Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED:**

1. To recommend to the Cabinet Member for the Environment that:
  - a. The proposals to convert the existing Disc Parking Bays to Pay and Display parking bays in Minster Way, Highfield Crescent and Upminster Road, as shown on the plan (ref: Upminster Bridge – Disc to P&D) be implemented as advertised;
  - b. The effect of the scheme be monitored.
2. The estimated cost of this scheme as set in the report was £7000 which would be funded from the capital allocation and the remaining £1500 would be met from the 2015/16 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

16 **PROPOSED LOADING BAY FRONTING NO. 39 HIGH STREET**

Following clarification that the cost of the proposal was mainly to cover the statutory arrangements and would be funded by Transport for London, the Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED:**

1. To recommend to the Cabinet Member for the Environment that:
  - a. The proposals to implement the loading bay in High Street, (as shown on plan QN010\_HSTMO\_001) be implemented as advertised;
  - b. The effect of any agreed proposals be monitored.
2. The estimated cost of the scheme in High Street as set out in the report was £1,000 and would be met by Transport for London through the 2015/16 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Freight Loading Facilities.

17 **HIGHWAYS SCHEMES APPLICATION - WORKS PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a report with all the new highway scheme 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 had considered and agreed in principle the schedule that detailed the applications received by the service.

The Committee's decisions were noted as against each request and appended to the minutes.

**18 TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES REQUEST**

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

The Committee's decisions were noted as against each request and appended to the minutes.

**19 URGENT BUSINESS**

At the June meeting of the Highways Advisory Committee Members raised concerns over the quality of road lining on the boroughs roads. Members had requested and officers had agreed to produce a schedule detailing the programme of works for the relining (white lines) of road markings on the boroughs roads. The schedule was to be presented to Members during the July meeting of the Highways Advisory Committee. As the schedule had not been presented to Members within the agreed timescale Members requested an update from officers on the likely timescale for receipt of the requested information.

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**London Borough of Havering**  
**Engineering Services, Highways - Streetcare**  
**Highway Schemes Applications Schedule**

Item Ref	Location	Ward	Description	Officer Advice	Funding Source	Likely Budget
<b>SECTION A - Highway scheme proposals with funding in place</b>						
None to report this month						
<b>SECTION B - Highway scheme proposals without funding available</b>						
None to report this month						
<b>SECTION C - Highway scheme proposals on hold for future discussion (for Noting)</b>						
H1	Broxhill Road, Havering-atte-Bower	Havering Park	Widening of existing and extension of footway from junction with North Road to Bedfords Park plus creation of bridleway behind.	Feasible, but not funded. Improved footway would improve subjective safety of pedestrians walking from Village core to park. (H4, August 2014)	None.	c£80k
H2	Finucane Gardens, near junction with Penrith Crescent	Elm Park	Width restriction and road humps to reduce traffic speeds of rat-running between Wood Lane and Mungo Park Road.	Feasible, but not funded.	None	£18k

**London Borough of Havering**  
**Engineering Services, Highways - Streetcare**  
**Highway Schemes Applications Schedule**

Item Ref	Location	Ward	Description	Officer Advice	Funding Source	Likely Budget
H3 Page 2	A124/ Hacton Lane/ Wingletye Lane junction	Cranham, Emerson Park, St Andrews	Provision of "green man" crossing stage on all 4 arms of the junction.	Feasible, but not funded. Additional stage would lead to extended vehicle queues on approaches to junction. Current layout is difficult for pedestrians to cross and is subjectively unsafe. Pedestrian demand would only trigger if demand called and would give priority to pedestrians.	None	N/A
H4	Havering Road/ Mashiters Hill/ Pettits Lane North junction	Havering Park, Mawneys, Pettits	Provide pedestrian refuges on Havering Road arms, potentially improve existing refuges on other two arms	Feasible, but not funded. Would require carriageway widening to achieve. Would make crossing the road easier for pedestrians.	None	£30k+

**London Borough of Havering**  
**Engineering Services, Highways - Streetcare**  
**Highway Schemes Applications Schedule**

Item Ref	Location	Ward	Description	Officer Advice	Funding Source	Likely Budget
H5 Page 3	Ockendon Road, near Sunnings Lane	Upminster	Pedestrian refuge	Feasible, but not funded. In the 3-years to July 2014, 2 injury collisions were recorded in the local vicinity. 21/5/12 5 cars involved, 1 slight injury. Junction with Sunnings Lane caused by U-turning driver. 2/9/13 1 car, 1 motorcycle, serious injury to motorcyclist. 50m east of Sunnings Lane caused by U-turning driver failed to see motorcyclist overtaking.	None	£8k
H6	Dagnam Park Drive, near Brookside School		In response to serious concerns for pupils safety, crossing the road to attend Brookside Infant & Junior School, request to reduce speed limit from 30mph to 20mph.	Feasible but not funded. Speed limit change alone unlikely to significantly reduce speed and traffic calming will be required, but such that is compatible with a bus and feeder route. Adjacent side roads may need similar treatment for local limit to be logical.	None	£50k

This page is intentionally left blank



**London Borough of Havering  
Traffic & Parking Control - StreetCare  
Minor Traffic & Parking Schemes Applications Schedule**

Item Ref	Location	Comments/Description	Decision
<b>SECTION A - Minor Traffic and Parking Scheme Requests</b>			
TPC728	Kings Road, Romford	Request to remove the existing disc parking bay by St Albans Church and replace with Pay and Display parking bays.	Agreed
TPC729	Wingletye Lane Service Road, Hornchurch	Request to remove the existing disc parking bay from opposite nos.15/ 17 and install a Pay and Display parking bays at the Upminster Road end of the road.	Agreed
TPC730	Willow Street, Romford	Request to change the Disc parking bays to Dual use Resident and Business parking bay.	Agreed
TPC731	20 David Drive, Harold Wood	Request to remove residents parking bay across dropped kerb and extend existing yellow line across drop to prevent obstructive parking. Resident disabled and requires frequent visits from carers.	Agreed
TPC732	Tangmere Crescent	Request to install a school keep clear on the opposite side of the school	Agreed
TPC733	Cumberland Avenue, Hornchurch	Request to change Pay & Display to Residents Parking bay	Rejected
TPC734	Station Lane, Hornchurch	Request to include residents above the shops in Station Lane into Cumberland/Matlock residents parking scheme	Agreed

TPC735	Pretoria Road	Request to include Nos. 165 -173 odds and No.126 in the Sector 2B Residents Parking scheme	Agreed
--------	---------------	--	--------