



HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

6 June 2017

Subject Heading:

CEDAR ROAD, ROMFORD
Request to relocate road closure

SLT Lead:

Dipti Patel
Assistant Director of Environment

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
2017-18 Delivery Plan**

Financial summary:

**The estimated cost of £3,500 for the
permanent implementation will be met
by the Council's capital allocation for
Minor Highway Improvements.**

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

Communities making Havering	[X]
Places making Havering	[X]
Opportunities making Havering	[]
Connections making Havering	[X]

SUMMARY

This report sets out a request from businesses of Chesham Close to relocate the road closure in Cedar Road to a new position to allow the drivers of larger vehicles to reverse into Chesham Close, and seeks a recommendation from the Committee whether or not the request moves to public consultation.

The scheme is within **Brooklands** ward.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the report either;
 - (a) Rejects the request; or
 - (b) Recommends that the Assistant Director of Environment proceeds with a public consultation to relocate the existing closure from outside 15a/17a to 21/23 as shown on Drawing QQ031-OF-301.
2. That it be noted that in the event the layout is made permanent, the estimated cost of £3,500 for will be met by the Council's capital allocation for Minor Highway Improvements.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 At its meeting of 6th December 2016. The Highways Advisory Committee made a recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regulatory Services and Community Safety that an experimental traffic scheme to close Cedar Road to through motor traffic be made permanent.
- 1.2 The Cabinet Member agreed that the experimental scheme be made permanent and Executive Decision 16/137 was signed on 14th December 2016.
- 1.3 Staff wrote to residents and business owners within the original experimental scheme consultation area on 12th January 2017, advising them of the decision to make the scheme permanent. Staff also advised that due to feedback on local parking arrangements through the experimental scheme process, a review of the parking arrangements would subsequently take place.
- 1.4 Staff and the Cabinet Member subsequently received representations from some businesses from Chesham Close who asked that the position of the closure be relocated further southwest from its agreed position to assist with deliveries to Chesham Close.
- 1.5 The businesses suggested that a relocated closure position would allow the drivers of large vehicles to drive past the end of Chesham Close (arriving from North Street) and then reverse into Chesham Close.

- 1.6 A site meeting was held on 16th March 2017 with representatives from the businesses, the Cabinet Member and staff from the Street Management Service. The meeting covered a range of issues, including the position of the closure.
- 1.7 Staff undertook to refer the request to relocate the closure to a future meeting of the Highways Advisory Committee for consideration given that the committee had only recently recommended the scheme be made permanent.
- 1.8 Requests for new schemes not already on the Council's funded programme are generally added to the monthly "highway schemes requests" report schedule with a standing recommendation that they be rejected because of a lack of funding, although the committee can move a request to a "reserved" list.
- 1.9 In the case of Cedar Road, the permanent works have not yet been undertaken and therefore an opportunity exists to consult on a new closure location at relatively small additional cost (advertisements estimated at £500 and staff costs essentially).
- 1.10 If the Committee is sympathetic to the businesses' request, then the Assistant Director of Neighbourhoods is delegated to proceed with the consultation with a substantive report brought to the Committee for consideration in the usual way following formal consultation.
- 1.11 Alternatively, the Committee can reject the request as it would for an item on the "highways schemes requests" report schedule.
- 1.12 Drawing QQ031-OF-301 shows the current closure position and an alternative which would meet the aspirations of the businesses.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

This report is asking HAC to either request that the Assistant Director of Environment proceed with a consultation (estimated costs of £500) or that the HAC reject the business' request to revisit the scheme.

If the Committee recommends that the Assistant Director proceeds with a consultation, the estimated cost of £3,500 for the scheme will be met by the Council's capital allocation for Minor Highway Improvements.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs of the scheme, should all proposals be implemented following a further report to the HAC. 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.

Should the scheme not progress beyond initial consultation, the related costs (Estimated to be £500) will be met from the revenue budget.

Should the scheme progress beyond initial consultation through to implementation, a further HAC report, with financial comments will be required to ensure funding is still available.

Legal implications and risks:

The Council has powers under Section 6(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose a Traffic Order to control vehicular and other traffic, including the imposition of closures to motor vehicles. Before a decision can be taken, the Council must advertise and consult on proposals.

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.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Project file: QQ031 Cedar Road