

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

7 February 2017

Subject Heading:

**THE DRILL ROUNDABOUT
Walking & Environmental
Improvements
Outcome of public consultation**

CMT Lead:

Steve Moore

Report Author and contact details:

**Mark Philpotts
Principal Engineer
01708 433751
mark.philpotts@havering.gov.uk**

Policy context:

**Havering Local Development
Framework (2008)
Havering Local Implementation Plan
2014/15 – 2016/17 Three Year Delivery
Plan (2013)**

Financial summary:

**The estimated cost of £100,000 for
implementation will be met by
Transport for London through the
2016/17 Local Implementation Plan
allocation for Local Transport.**

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

| | |
|--|-----|
| Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for | [X] |
| People will be safe, in their homes and in the community | [X] |
| Residents will be proud to live in Havering | [] |

SUMMARY

This report sets out the responses to a consultation for the provision of new zebra crossings on various arms of The Drill roundabout, together with footway widening, decluttering and landscaping works and seeks a recommendation if the scheme should be implemented or not.

The Drill Roundabout is within the **Squirrels Heath** and **Emerson Park** wards. The consultation area included these as well as the **Romford Town** and **Hylands** wards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the report and the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services and Community Safety that the proposals shown on Drawing QP017/OI/101-A be either;
 - (a) Implemented with the following changes;
 - The pedestrian refuge in Manor Avenue be retained and upgraded to modern standards,
 - The vehicle crossing to the Methodist Church in Manor Avenue be retained,
 - The pedestrian guardrail between Slewins Lane and Brentwood Road be retained, but upgraded,
 - The pedestrian guardrail between Brentwood Road and Heath Park Road be retained, but upgraded without footway widening; or
 - (b) Rejected, but the existing pedestrian refuges be upgraded to modern standards with kerbed islands and pedestrian dropped kerbs with associated tactile paving; and guardrail upgraded to “see through” type.
2. That it be noted that the estimated cost of £100,000 (for the substantive scheme) will be met by Transport for London through the 2016/17 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Local Transport.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 As part of the 2016/17 Transport for London Local Implementation Plan, funding was allocated under the Local Transport theme to implement measures at The Drill Roundabout to improve accessibility for non-car modes. This followed a review and data collection in 2015/16.
- 1.2 The Drill Roundabout is a large, kerbed roundabout forming the junction of Heath Park Road, two sections of Brentwood Road, Slewins Lane, Manor Avenue and Balgores Lane. The surrounding area is a mix of commercial/retail development on Heath Park Road and Brentwood Road (south) and residential development elsewhere.
- 1.3 Squirrels Heath primary school is round 200 metres to the south-west of the junction with access from Brentwood Road (south) and Gidea Park Station/local centre is around 400 metres to the north.
- 1.4 Balgores Lane, Brentwood Road (both arms) and Slewins Lane all carry bus routes.
- 1.5 Staff have reviewed the operation of the roundabout and concluded that although there is congestion from time to time (especially at the peaks), the roundabout operates reasonably well in capacity terms given the available capacity of the local road network. However, Staff considers the junction to perform poorly for people walking as they have to try and find gaps in the traffic (other than the Heath Park Road arm). This is especially difficult for those with reduced mobility or vision.
- 1.6 The Heath Park Road arm of the roundabout has the only controlled pedestrian crossing (a zebra) associated with the junction and elsewhere, there are pedestrian refuges/ traffic islands which are old, provide insufficient waiting space (especially for mobility scooters and people with pushchairs) and are difficult to maintain. There are other areas where the footways are narrow and there is a substantial amount of guardrail (much of it old and not of the “see through” type) and other street clutter.
- 1.7 The junction sees nearly 26,000 vehicle movements through it in 12 hours on a weekday (7am to 7pm) and around 23,500 on a Saturday. On a weekday (7am to 7pm), there are some 5,125 pedestrian crossing movements over the 6 arms and nearly 3,800 on a Saturday.
- 1.8 The injury collision history of the junction is considered to be good, given its complexity. Within 50 metres of the junction, there has been an average of one injury collision a year for the last 10 years.

- 1.9 Various drawings are in Appendix I which give the background traffic and pedestrian flow data and locations of collisions.
- 1.10 Drawing QP017-OI-101A shows a set of proposals for the junction which are summarised as follows;
- New zebra crossings on the two Brentwood Road arms and the Balgores Lane and Slewins Lane arms,
 - Existing zebra crossing on Heath Park Road moved 5 metres west to provide a longer stopping area for drivers leaving the roundabout,
 - Footway widening between Brentwood Road (south) and Heath Park Road,
 - Heath Park Road and Balgores Lane; and Balgores Lane and Brentwood Road (north),
 - Wider planted verges between Brentwood Road (north) and Manor Avenue; and Manor Avenue and Slewins Lane,
 - An overrun area between Slewins Lane and Brentwood Road,
 - Removal of all pedestrian guardrail,
 - Removal of all traffic islands/ pedestrian refuges,
 - Removal of vehicle access to Methodist church from Manor Avenue and extension of parking bay (subject to the agreement of the church).
- 1.11 The zebra crossings are proposed to improve pedestrian access around the junction. A zebra crossing is not proposed for Manor Road because traffic volumes are relatively low and crossing opportunities readily found.
- 1.12 The widened footways/ verge areas are to give people on foot more space (and feeling of space). These areas are taken from the carriageway where site observation and vehicle tracking modelling have shown there is excessive space; this will also encourage drivers to slow down as they pass through the junction (especially on the north-south movements) and will further assist people in crossing the road.
- 1.13 The removal of the traffic islands/ pedestrian refuges and pedestrian guardrail will help improve the look of the street and reduce some maintenance difficulties.
- 1.14 5,360 letters were sent on 12th December 2016 to an area of a radius 840 metres around the junction, equating to a 10 minute walk. The closing date for

comments was 6th January 2017. Consultation information was provided on the Council's website and highlighted through the email newsletter service.

- 1.15 In addition, ward councillors, HAC members and standard consultees (London Buses, emergency services, interest groups etc) were sent a set of the consultation information. Members were also sent a briefing note and plan of the proposals on 29th November 2016.
- 1.16 Zebra crossing proposal notices were published on 9th December 2016.

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 By the close of consultation, 71 responses were received as summarised in Appendix I to this report. 19 respondents were in favour of the proposals, 34 respondents were against the proposals and 13 expressed mixed/ non-committal/ other views.
- 2.2 Responses were received from Cycling UK, the London Cycling Campaign, London Travel Watch, the Metropolitan Police and the Gidea Park Methodist Church.
- 2.3 Appendix I also sets out the streets from where comments were received and the frequency with which similar comments were made, but the main themes are set out below.
- 2.4 Those supporting the proposals expressed general support and particular support for the zebra crossings. There were also comments relating to business parking and loading in the immediate area. Some comments were made in relation to retaining the pedestrian refuge on Manor Avenue and there were comments in favour of removing the guardrail for the safety of cyclists/ motorcyclists and against removing the guardrail for pedestrian safety.
- 2.5 Those not supporting the scheme were concerned about it causing more motor traffic congestion in the area and that they considered the current layout to work. Many people made comments relating to business parking and loading in the immediate area. There were also comments relating to people driving over footways, concerns the scheme would create "rat runs" and the refuges should be kept.
- 2.6 Some responses sought clarifications, did not support or object to the scheme, requested other schemes or supported the scheme but were also concerned about congestion and business-related parking/ loading.
- 2.7 Cycling UK had no comments in particular. The London Cycling Campaign provided a detailed response which also supported the local branch (Havering Cyclists). The general theme was of support, but that the proposals did not go far enough for people cycling in terms of the need for footways and zebra crossings to be shared, tighter junction radii and traffic calming on the

approaches to the junction. In the longer term LCC wished to see a broader approach to speed and traffic reduction (especially those making short journeys by car) or protected infrastructure where this was not possible.

- 2.8 Gidea Park Methodist Church broadly supported the scheme, but was concerned that the “keep clear” marking on the Brentwood Road (north) arm would be lost. The church considered this important for the safety of those accessing the site. The church also confirmed that it wished to retain its Manor Avenue vehicle crossing to allow future parking management within the site to be explored.
- 2.9 London Travel Watch supported the proposals. The Metropolitan Police Roads & Transport Policing Command had concerns with the over-run area between Slewins Lane and Brentwood Road in terms of pedestrian separation from traffic. They were also concerned with the potential for the new zebra crossings leading to shunt-collisions and that on the crossing approaches, 8 zig-zags are preferred.

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 Despite a large area being consulted around an important local junction, the response rate is considered to be very poor. In terms of the comments made, there was enthusiasm for making the area more accessible for pedestrians amongst those supporting the proposals and concerns about motor traffic congestion and rat running for those not supporting the proposals.
- 3.2 Many of those responding for and against the proposals raised concerns about business parking and loading activity in the commercial areas.
- 3.3 In relation to comments made by LCC, Staff do not consider the footways in the area to be wide enough for shared-use and therefore could not recommend it for this set of proposals. The broader comments made by LCC would require a radical review on how the streets of the much wider area operate which are far beyond the scope and funding available for this scheme.
- 3.4 In relation to the Methodist Church, the “keep clear” could not be retained within the controlled area (zig-zags) of the zebra crossing on Brentwood Road, but the zig-zags could be shortened. The existing vehicle crossing in Manor Avenue can be retained.
- 3.5 In response to the comments made by the police, the introduction of zebra crossings could lead to shunt-collisions, but the crossings are inset as far as local conditions allow (subject to vehicle crossings and parking bays etc) and the length of the zig-zags have been set to reflect the constraints as allowed for in the relevant regulations. The “PV2” of looking at traffic flow vs pedestrian flow has not been promoted for use since 1995 when current crossing design guidance was published by the Government.

- 3.6 The Committee will need to consider the aims of the project to improve accessibility for all pedestrians against the various comments received. The Recommendations are reflective of the opposing views and in the event of the substantive scheme being rejected, there exists the opportunity to improve the existing facilities as much as they can be, but recognising that they do not cater for all pedestrians and cannot be improved to do so.
- 3.7 The Committee also has the opportunity to consider the various elements on their own merits, although Staff would need to offer specific guidance during the Committee debate.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

This report is asking HAC to recommend to the Cabinet Member the implementation of the above scheme

The estimated cost of £100,000 for implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2016/17 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Local Transport. The funding will need to be spent by 31st March 2017, to ensure full access to the grant.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs of the scheme, should all proposals be implemented. It should be noted that subject to the recommendations of the committee a final decision then 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 Environment 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 overall Environment Capital budget.

Legal implications and risks:

Zebra crossings require public advertisement and consultation before a decision can be taken on their implementation.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities Implications and Risks:

The Council has a general duty under the Equality Act 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.

The provision of crossing facilities makes it easier for all sectors of the community to cross busy streets or have more confidence in crossing streets. This is especially helpful to disabled people, children (lone and accompanied), young families and older people.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project file: QP017, The Drill Study 2016/17

**APPENDIX I
CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY
SCHEME DRAWINGS**

Summary of responses from public in support of scheme

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Ardleigh Green Road | 1 |
| Brooklands Gardens | 1 |
| Fairholme Avenue | 1 |
| Haynes Road | 1 |
| Heath Park Road | 1 |
| Osborne Road | 1 |
| Pinecroft | 1 |
| Slewins Lane | 1 |
| The Railstore | 1 |
| Westmoreland Avenue | 3 |
| No address given | 7 |
| Total | 19 |

| Comment | No. respondents making similar comments |
|---|---|
| General support for the scheme indicated | 13 |
| Supports the provision of zebra crossings | 4 |
| Raises matters relating to business-related parking and loading being a local issue | 4 |
| Guardrail should be kept to protect pedestrians | 3 |
| Refuge in Manor Avenue should remain | 2 |
| Guardrail removal will be safer for cyclists and motorcyclists | 2 |
| Heath Park Road zebra crossing should not be moved | 2 |
| Slewins Lane into Brentwood Road turn for buses is tight | 2 |
| Could look at making roundabout smaller | 1 |
| Refuges should be retained (in the zebra crossings) | 1 |
| All zebra crossings should be set further into side roads | 1 |
| Raises matters not related to scheme | 1 |
| Slewins Lane crossing would be especially useful | 1 |
| Would Brentwood Road (south) crossing be better with traffic signals? | 1 |
| Agrees with scheme, but would prefer pelican crossings | 1 |
| Should also provide a crossing in Manor Avenue | 1 |

Summary of responses from public against scheme

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Balgores Lane | 2 |
| Brentwood Road | 5 |
| Catherine Road | 1 |
| Cavenham Gardens | 1 |
| Haynes Road | 1 |
| Hazelmere Gardens | 1 |
| Heath Park Road | 1 |
| Osborne Road | 1 |
| Northumberland Avenue | 2 |
| Slewins Lane | 1 |
| Stanley Avenue | 1 |
| Warrington Gardens | 1 |
| Westmoreland Avenue | 2 |
| No address given | 14 |
| Total | 34 |

| Comment | No. respondents making similar comments |
|---|---|
| Scheme will cause more motor traffic congestion | 15 |
| Current layout works and should be kept | 10 |
| Raises matters relating to business-related parking and loading being a local issue | 10 |
| Raises matters not related to scheme | 10 |
| Existing refuges should be kept | 6 |
| Should deal with people driving over footways to park | 5 |
| Guardrail should be left to protect pedestrians | 5 |
| Roundabout is congested at peak times caused by pedestrians using Heath Park Road zebra crossing. | 3 |
| Scheme will create rat runs in other streets | 3 |
| Refuges should be kept as they help people cross in the traffic | 3 |
| Zebra crossings would urbanise area | 2 |
| Should provide pelican crossings further into side roads | 2 |
| Existing refuges should be enlarged | 1 |
| Additional zebra crossings not needed | 1 |
| Refuge in Manor Avenue should be kept | 1 |
| There aren't many pedestrians to need zebra crossings | 1 |
| Pedestrians taking priority on zebra crossings will cause collisions | 1 |
| Parking should be improved for the shops | 1 |
| Local area needs more parking restrictions | 1 |
| Might be acceptable if crossings further down side roads | 1 |
| Zebra crossings might be useful set further back from junction | 1 |

Summary of responses from public giving mixed or other views

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Cavenham Gardens | 2 |
| Cobil Close | 1 |
| Great Gardens Road | 1 |
| Manor Avenue | 1 |
| Osborne Road | 1 |
| Slewins Lane | 1 |
| No address given | 6 |
| Total | 13 |

| Comment | No. respondents making similar comments |
|---|--|
| Enquiry seeking clarifications | 2 |
| Supports idea of scheme but also concerned about congestion | 2 |
| Doesn't express support or objection, but comments on parking issues | 2 |
| Manor Road rather than Manor Avenue stated on consultation letter | 1 |
| Vegetation should be changed to improve visibility | 1 |
| Should be bollards and barriers on The Drill pub corner to stop vehicle incursion | 1 |
| Needs to be more parking restrictions approaching junction | 1 |
| Supports scheme but concerned it will lead to rat running in other streets | 1 |
| No comment on scheme as presented but comments about local parking issues | 1 |
| No comment on scheme as presented but comments on need for traffic calming | 1 |
| Raises matters relating to business-related parking and loading being a local issue | 1 |
| The two busiest roads should have pelican crossings | 1 |

Responses from standard consultees

PC Deeming, Metropolitan Police Roads & Transport Policing Command

Having had the opportunity to look at the basic idea it has raised some concerns. I could not find the plans on the website. Please could you send them to me. Can you also send me the collision history.

The bus overrun area on Brentwood Road. This is on approach to a crossing facility where pedestrians are approaching or waiting to cross with the obvious implications this could have for anyone waiting. Is there a kerb graded separation here to the footway?

This roundabout is very busy as noted in the 26,000 vehicle movements & 5,125 pedestrian crossing movements. The interruption of the high volume of circulating traffic makes me wonder if the Zebra could start a pattern of rear end shunt collisions, a vehicle being shunted forward into a pedestrian is another thought. The difficulty here is if you move the crossing further along the road does it remove the desire line, have any counts or PV2 calculations been made here?

The ideal approach zig zags number should be eight rather than the minimum four/two/six that are shown.

Vehicle crossing movements where pedestrians are invited to cross has risks, especially Tesco which I imagine is busy.

The loading bay outside Tesco. LGV loading could block the view of pedestrians waiting to cross however it does appear to be a little distance further back.

Vincent Stops, London Travel Watch

London Travel Watch is the statutory body that represents all the users of all London's transport networks. We and the passengers we represent will welcome these proposals.

David Garfield, Cycling UK

A cursory inspection suggests that there are no negative implications for Cycle-users. Consequently, I have no further comments to submit. Please keep me informed of the progress of the application.

Simon Munk, London Cycling Campaign

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on plans. The response is in support of the response from Havering Cyclists, the borough group, and was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group.

The proposals are designed to improve access and safety for those walking around the roundabout. LCC supports the proposals but they do not go far enough to

encourage walking or cycling. Specific points listed in the section below must be addressed in the near term.

In the medium term a comprehensive area-based approach should be adopted to reducing motor traffic speeds to 20mph and motor traffic volumes to below 2,000 PCUs daily on quieter streets in the area, as well as potentially adding physically-protected space for cycling on those roads that will remain above 2,000 PCUs etc. Particular emphasis should be placed on developing safe, comfortable routes to key destinations such as Gidea Park, Romford, Upminster and Hornchurch Stations and the commercial area around The Drill. This will encourage larger numbers and a wider range of people to cycle and walk. Such a scheme would likely include “modal filter cells” and may also include segregated cycle tracks.

Specific points about the scheme:

- The proposed and relocated crossings on each arm excluding Manor Avenue are welcome, however they must be “tiger” rather than zebra crossings to also support safe navigation of the roundabout by people cycling.
- The additional footway space and increased planted areas are welcome. The footways linking the crossings, including at Manor Avenue, again should be signed and designated shared cycle/pedestrian use to support use of the tiger crossings by those cycling, and reduce conflict between the crossings.
- The radii of each road adjoining the roundabout should be tightened to reduce speed of motor traffic entering and exiting it.
- Each of the arms of the roundabout is relatively straight for distances of up to 1km, which is sufficient to encourage excess speed by some drivers. In addition to radii reduction, speed must be controlled at and beyond the roundabout. Placing the crossings on each arm of the roundabout on raised tables is recommended. Further traffic calming including sinusoidal humps should be considered along the length of each arm also. This is particularly important for the north south routes where, as noted in the consultation documentation, speed is a potential issue.

General points about cycling schemes:

- LCC requires schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.
- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with

links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.

- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport mode for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL's "Healthy Streets" checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with an aim for a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all "Critical Fails" eliminated.

Gidea Park Methodist Church

We recognise and are aware of the difficulties and dangers for pedestrians moving around the roundabout as several members here have had minor accidents, mostly falls while rushing to the centre refuge. Also that it isolates the facilities provided for the area to 3 sections and improvements would be welcomed by all.

We note your information on traffic accidents and would like to add that we have had a car through our fence in a police chase and that members and users of our premises have had several minor collisions exiting and entering our car park before the keep clear square was added to the road outside our premises about two years ago at our request. Accidents were mostly as people exited the roundabout and had to stop and wait for a gap in the traffic to turn right into the car park and so were hit up the rear or people exiting the car park through there line of traffic and turning right again getting struck.

The keep clear box has considerably lowered the risk to users and members and we have had no accidents since but we are concerned looking at the plan enclosed with your letter, as to whether this would be removed due to the proximity of the crossing or whether it would remain and allow cars to be between the keep clear box and the crossing? We do not want to increase the danger entering or exiting the car park.

We note the reference to ourselves in your letter for the removal of our Manor Rd access crossover but are confused as to how this affects the overall scheme. We were asked if it could be removed in 2014 but objected.

Our concern is that due to the increased parking management and restrictions in the area we are having to deal with more and more people (illegally) parking on our premises by school users, shop staff and shoppers and commuters. As stated before, we do not have a staff presence at all times but are called out when our users find they cannot park.

We are proposing to install a lockable barrier instead of our rickety gate shortly but again stopping to open a barrier in the gateway has its own hazards.

We do not wish to lose our ability to gain access from Manor Avenue because if conditions become such, as traffic increases, that entering the car park has a very high risk then we would have to consider using a safer access via Manor Avenue.

We do have access/gates onto Manor Avenue as this was the old church entrance until 1958 but it has no crossover. We would be open to discussion on you repositioning the crossover outside our gate if that enabled the project to go forward and would still give us the ability to alter our entrance should it be necessary.