



HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

20 March 2012

REPORT

Subject Heading:

**SUSTRANS CONNECT 2
Phases 2 & 3 Highway Works
Pages Wood to Rainham Village
Outcome of public consultation**

Report Author and contact details:

Mark Philpotts
Principal Engineer
01708 433751
mark.philpotts@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	[]

SUMMARY

This report recommends that various highway improvement works between Pages Wood (Harold Wood) and Rainham Village are approved for implementation to support the Sustrans Connect 2 scheme, following the completion of public consultation.

The scheme is within **Harold Wood, Cranham, Upminster, South Hornchurch and Rainham & Wennington Wards.**

This report was deferred by the Highways Advisory Committee at its meeting of 21st February 2012.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that the highway improvement works between Pages Wood (Harold Wood) and Rainham Village are approved for implementation as detailed in this report and shown on the following Drawings;

QK042-OI-101A, QK042-OI-102A, QK042-OI-103A, QK042-OI-104A, QK042-OI-105A, QK042-OI-106A, QK042-OI-107A, QK042-OI-108A, QK042-OI-109A, QK042-OI-110A, QK042-OI-111A, QK042-OI-112A, QK042-OI-113A, QK042-OI-114A, QK042-OI-115A, QK042-OI-116A, QK042-OI-117A, QK042-OI-118A, QK042-OI-119A, QK042-OI-120A, QK042-OI-121A, QK042-OI-123A, QK042-OI-124A, QK042-OI-125A
2. That the proposals for relocating a bus stop on Hall Lane to the vicinity of 50/52 be rejected and the Head of StreetCare reviews the design with the residents concerned to see if agreement can be reached, subject to a future report to HAC.
3. That Staff amended the cycle track detail at the northern entrance to the Hall Lane Service Road so that the trees and vegetation screening the residential properties are not removed.
4. That the Head of StreetCare reviews the comments made by the CTC and Havering Cyclists representatives to incorporate minor adjustments to the scheme during the detailed design process (such as minor alignments/ extensions to the advisory cycle lanes, guardrail opposite park entrances and signage strategy).
5. That the Head of StreetCare reviews the requests to amend the positions of start of the 40mph speed limit at Hall Lane and 30mph speed limit at Hall Lane; and the suitability (including physical measures which might be required) for a 20mph speed limit within the Hall Lane Service Road, Branfill Road and Champion Road with detailed design and advertisement, subject to funding and a further report to HAC.
6. That the Head of StreetCare reviews the issues with taxis at Hall Lane with amendments to the design if required, with detailed design and advertisement, subject to funding and a further report to HAC.
7. That it be noted that the estimated cost of the whole Sustrans Connect2 scheme is estimated to be £1,558,000.

8. That it be noted that the estimated cost of the highway elements of the scheme set out within this report is £550,000 and can be funded through the 2012/13 Transport for London Local Implementation Plan allocations for the Ingrebourne Valley Sustrans Connect 2 project and the Big Lottery Sustrans Connect 2 allocation. Management procedures will be put in place to ensure completion within the financial year.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 At its meeting of 15th July 2009, the Council's Cabinet approved the Sustrans Connect2 scheme for the Ingrebourne Valley in principle. This approval is subject to funding (with Cabinet Member for Regeneration approvals for each phase) and various consents being in place.
- 1.2 The Council is working with Sustrans, the sustainable transport charity on the Connect2 Scheme in Havering. The scheme is supported with £880,000 of Big Lottery grant funding provided through Sustrans and additional Council capital funding, grants via the Transport for London Local Implementation Plan and Veolia Havering Riverside Trust.
- 1.3 The scheme's overarching aim is to improve local travel in 79 communities around the UK by creating new walking and cycling networks for everyday journeys.
- 1.4 By means of bridges, tunnels and other crossings, barriers such as busy roads, rivers and railways can be overcome to make travelling on foot or bike easier and more direct. With each new crossing linking to a local network of walking and cycling routes, there will be direct access to local schools, shops and workplaces, as well as green spaces.
- 1.5 In terms of design, the route is being designed for pedestrians, both the experienced and inexperienced cyclist and equestrian riders where possible.
- 1.6 Sustrans and the Council are promoting a scheme for the Ingrebourne Valley which will build on, connect to and improve existing routes, some of which have been in place for some time.
- 1.7 The 13 mile route, called the "Ingrebourne Way" and forming the new National Cycle Route No.136, starts in Noak Hill and ends at Rainham Marshes, running through Harold Hill, Harold Wood, Harold Park, Cranham, Upminster, Hornchurch, Elm Park and South Hornchurch.
- 1.8 The project was split into three phases with Phase 1 (Noak Hill to Pages Wood) being completed in recent years.

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

- 1.9 The current focus of activity is now Phases 2 & 3 (being progressed together), which will complete the scheme between Pages Wood and Rainham Marshes by March 2013.
- 1.10 There are several locations along the where existing roads need to be crossed, where existing crossing facilities need improvement, where shared-use cycle tracks are required and where on-street cycling provision needs to be supported.
- 1.11 As well as any statutory consultation processes, the project is overseen by the Connect 2 Steering Group which seeks to engage various stakeholders in the development of the route. The group includes Council Staff, Sustrans, local walking and cycling groups, Forestry Commission, Environment Agency, biodiversity groups and others as required.
- 1.12 The route and design of the various features have also been reviewed by Sustrans both from a network planning and engineering point of view and fully acceptable to the organisation.

2.0 Proposals for Phases 2 & 3 and Consultation

- 2.1 The general route for Phases 2 & 3 has been agreed with Sustrans and consulted within the Sustrans Connect 2 Steering Group and is as follows;
- Commences in Pages Wood in Harold Wood,
 - Follows Hall Lane into Upminster (with works to the bridge over the A127 to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians),
 - Enters Upminster at Station Road and then to Upminster Park via Branfill Road and Champion Road,
 - From Upminster Park to Gaynes Parkway via Brookdale Close, Bridge Avenue and South View Drive and a new foot/ cycle bridge behind Branfill School,
 - Along Hacton Parkway and through Hornchurch Country Park and then on to Dover's Corner,
 - Dover's Corner to Rainham Village and then across the C2C and High Speed 1 railway lines to the Rainham Trackway Bridge and then Rainham Marshes.

2.2 In terms of highway improvements, the following table sets out the various sections and locations, a description of the proposals and the relevant Drawing References.

Section/ Location	Description	Drawing Reference
Hall Lane Pages Wood to Masefield Drive	<p>Creation of shared-use cycle track (off road) generally on the eastern side of Hall Lane, except the Hall Lane Service Road (running between 124 and 140; and 142 to 194 Hall Lane), where the route will be on carriageway with a new pedestrian/ cyclist refuge on Avon road.</p> <p>Also Includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A pedestrian/ cyclist refuge between Pages Wood and the eastern side of Hall Lane to access the new shared us cycle track, ● Shared use cycle track over eastern side of bridge over A127, ● A pedestrian/ cyclist refuge over A127 westbound off slip, ● Raised table in entry of Hall Lane Service Road outside no.194 Hall Lane ● Improved pedestrian refuge across Hall Lane just south of mini-roundabout junction with Hall Lane with a shared use cycle track link to the southern end of the service road. ● A pedestrian/ cyclist refuge about 30m north of 131 Hall Lane to allow north-bound cyclists to leave the carriageway and continue north on the new shared-us cycle track. 	<p>QK042-OI-101A QK042-OI-102A QK042-OI-103A QK042-OI-104A QK042-OI-105A QK042-OI-106A QK042-OI-107A QK042-OI-108A QK042-OI-109A QK042-OI-110A</p>

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

Section/ Location	Description	Drawing Reference
Hall Lane and short section of Station Road Masefield Drive to Branfill Road	On carriageway cycle route with advisory lane markings and on-carriageway cycle logos connecting with Toucan crossing on Station Road (near Branfill Road), including removal of sections of hatched centre of road other than at existing pedestrian refuges and the right turn areas at Deyncourt Gardens and Waldegrave Gardens. Includes a new zebra crossing on Hall Lane between Deyncourt Gardens and Waldegrave Gardens.	QK042-OI-110A QK042-OI-111A QK042-OI-112A QK042-OI-113A QK042-OI-114A QK042-OI-115A
Branfill Road/ Champion Road	From Station Lane to Branfill Road via an existing Toucan Crossing. On carriageway cycle route with on-carriageway cycle logos.	QK042-OI-115A QK042-OI-116A QK042-OI-117A
St Mary's Lane, near Champion Road	Conversion of Puffin crossing to Toucan crossing with sections of footway converted to shared use cycle track to allow cycle access between Champion Road, St Mary's Lane and Upminster Park.	QK042-OI-117A QK042-OI-118A
Brookdale Close, Bridge Avenue (part) and South View Drive (part)	On carriageway cycle route with some advisory lane markings and on-carriageway cycle logos to connect Upminster Park with Gaynes Parkway.	QK042-OI-119A QK042-OI-120A QK042-OI-121A QK042-OI-123A

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

Section/ Location	Description	Drawing Reference
Bridge Road/ Viking Way/ Lamson Road roundabout	Creation of shared use cycle tracks on various arms of roundabout to connect to existing on-carriageway cycle route in Rainham Village, includes; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pedestrian/ cyclist refuges in entrance to Viking Way, Lamson Road and Bridge Road (south), just off roundabout• New shared use cycle track on northwest side of Bridge Road (north)• Conversion of Puffin Crossing to Toucan Crossing on bridge road, north of roundabout	QK042-OI-124A QK042-OI-125A

- 2.3 In terms of public consultation, 450 letters were hand delivered to residents potentially affected by the scheme along or adjacent to the route. Letters were hand-delivered on or just after 20th December 2011, with a closing date of 20th January 2012 for any comments. The statutory elements of the scheme were advertised on 23rd December 2011.
- 2.4 Additionally, consultation information were sent to Councillors where the route passes through their wards, members of the Highways Advisory Committee, members of the Council's Cycling Liaison Group, the emergency services, London Buses and a number of other local and national organisations.
- 2.5 By the close of consultation 20 written responses were received and are set out in Appendix I to this report, but in summary, the general comments were;
- Concerns raised about the impact on taxi parking near Upminster Station on cyclists passing (Hall Lane),
 - Suggestions that the route should go through Hornchurch Stadium, rather than Bridge Avenue and concern about interface with South View Drive,
 - Concern that funding is being used for a scheme without justification,
 - Concerns raised about the safety of using the Hall Lane Service Road as part of the route and suggestions to move the route elsewhere,
 - Objections to relocation of a bus stop in the vicinity of 50/52 Hall Lane,

- Concern about the use of Hall Lane for an on-carriageway cycle route citing congestion and parallels with a Cycle Super Highway route in Tower Hamlets,
- Requests for speed limit changes,
- No requirement for the route,
- Criticism of various design principles (CTC Representative),
- Support for proposals, with various suggestions (Havering Cyclists)
- Clarification on compatibility of the design at Bridge Road roundabout with HGVs,
- Non-related requests for additional parking controls and minor works (Hall Lane Service Road especially)

3.0 Staff Comments

- 3.1 The response rate from residents was low, with particular localised concerns. No comments were received by the emergency services or London Buses. The CTC Right to Ride Network and Havering Cyclists (part of the London Cycling Campaign) both responded. Two Councillors responded with questions during the consultation period which were responded to.
- 3.2 Some residents raised comments about the behaviour of taxis near Upminster Station and the potential impact to cyclists passing. Staff suggest that the layout at that location be reviewed to see if additional protection or management is required.
- 3.3 With regard to Hornchurch Stadium versus Bridge Avenue, Staff would respond by stating that a route through Hornchurch Stadium is possible, but land gradients going into the Parkway would require substantial engineering works to accommodate all users and therefore costly and beyond the current time frame. The Bridge Avenue route is considered by Staff to be an acceptable alternative.
- 3.4 In terms of the use of the Hall Lane Service Road, Staff are of the view that this represents a relatively quiet route compared to Hall Lane and appropriate for cycle use. Similar roads were used for Phase 1 which is now in operation.
- 3.5 The bus stop relocation near 50 Hall Lane was in response to a previous deferral of a bus stop accessibility scheme where Staff were asked to look at an alternative. Given the objection, Staff will need to revisit the matter as it does not impact on this current scheme.
- 3.6 The use of part of Hall Lane as an on-carriageway cycle route is a product of a lack of highway space to continue an off-carriageway shared-use cycle track. The on-carriageway section commences in the built up part of Hall

Lane (giving a indication to drivers that behaviour should change) and has been designed in accordance with the advice within the London Cycle Design Guide.

- 3.7 There have been requests to move the 40mph speed limit at the A127/ Hall Lane junction further towards the A127 to help influence driver speed leaving the trunk Road; the 30mph speed limit slightly further away from the Hall Lane/ Avon Road area to help influence driver speed before the Hall Lane Service Road and 20mph speed limits in the Hall Lane Service Road, Branfill Road and Champion Road.
- 3.8 Staff are of the view that these requests are worthy of investigation and subject to funding and design considerations, could assist with the operation of the route for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.9 During the detailed design process, Staff would be looking at appropriate directional and warning signage which may address some of the concerns.
- 3.10 In terms of the principles of creating this new route and the costs, the matter is dealt with in detail within the Cabinet Report of 15th July 2009 (Item 6). However, the vast majority of the funding of the scheme is externally provided (Big Lottery, Transport for London & Veolia Trust etc). In addition, the scheme provides new and improved infrastructure along various parts of the route which will be of local use.
- 3.11 CTC Ride to Ride Network have made a number of comments for minor amendments which can be easily accommodated during the detailed design process, as well as seeking some clarifications which were responded to during the consultation process. However, several comments were made criticising the design principles of the scheme and a section of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges was cited (all in Appendix I).
- 3.12 The criticisms were as follows;
- The advisory cycle lane widths should be 2m and not 1.5m;
 - Advisory cycle lanes should be continued through pedestrian refuges;
 - Shared use cycle track facilities are not favoured by pedestrians and cyclists;
 - A 0.5m buffer should be provided on cyclist tracks next to the road;
- 3.13 With regard to the width of the advisory cycle lanes, Staff have designed the layout using the London Cycle Design Standards where 1.5m is recommended as a minimum. There is debate on lane widths (especially with the work that the now abolished Cycling England was doing) in that although cycle lanes provide information to drivers on the space a cyclist requires, when dividing up road space, motorised traffic still needs to be accommodated (even in narrow traffic lanes, depending on make up of flows). In other words, provide for cyclists, but minimum motorised lane widths are still required.

- 3.14 To provide a layout within which motorised traffic cannot fit means that such traffic would be forced to drive continuously in the cycle lane devaluing its point in trying to keep some separation; it also has the added problem whereby traffic continually running on the road markings will wear them out more quickly which also reduces their impact. In general, if the component of buses and HGVs are a smaller element, then the lane widths would be aimed as car drivers so they can keep out of the cycle facility. Some suggestions are being made that where motorised lane widths cannot be maintained at all, then the centre line should be removed and in quieter situations, this may be appropriate (but not in Hall Lane).
- 3.15 Allied to the debate on lane widths for cyclists is the decision whether or not advisory lanes should be continued through pedestrian refuge areas. Where the cycle lane and a minimum traffic lane can be provided, then Staff are of the view that the lane should continue (the facilities on Main Road, Romford demonstrates this).
- 3.16 Where the lane width is less, then Staff are concerned that the continuance of a cycle lane may give a false impression to motorists that there is space to overtake which creates a safety issue. Bikeability training seeks to encourage cyclists to “take the lane” in such situations which would mean leaving the cycle lane. To be compatible with this idea, Staff are proposing the use of large cycle logos on the carriageway surface immediately before such locations, but are happy to review once in operation.
- 3.17 In response to the comments about shared-use facilities, Staff have looked at providing an off carriageway route between Pages Wood and Hall Lane where there is space to provide a width of 3m (occasionally 2.5m), including the new track across the A127 bridge. This general 3m standard has been agreed with Sustrans and is provided along sections of the route where we have off carriageway space - in some areas there is not the highway land or physical space.
- 3.18 The whole Connect 2 route is off-carriageway where possible and in many cases away from highways all together as the scheme is primarily aimed at leisure cycling. With Hall Lane, the off-carriageway route continues along the 40mph section of Hall Lane and the first part of the 30mph section where space allows, before using the carriageway as there is no other reasonable way in which to provide this route into Upminster.
- 3.19 With regard to a 0.5m separation, there is not the space to provide a 3m wide track plus 0.5m.
- 3.20 In response to the comments about shared use not being favoured by cycle users or pedestrians, Staff are aware that this is the position of some campaign groups, but not something shared by Sustrans in terms of Connect 2. The new and operational routes through areas such as Central Park, Hatters Wood and some of the Harold Hill Greenways are between

2.5m and 3m in width and these operate (as far as Staff are aware) without problem.

- 3.21 Havering Cyclists support the principle of the scheme, but have made a number of comments. Minor issues such as provision of guardrail opposite park entrances can be easily accommodated at detailed design stage as well as directional and shared-use signage for the route which will be designed in due course.
- 3.22 The speed limit issues are dealt with above, but with regard to a 20mph Zone in Bridge Avenue, this would require physical traffic calming measures and would therefore be costly. The use of part of the Hall Lane Service Road versus a shared-use cycle track would reduce some of the scheme costs, but Staff feel both options should be retained to maximise accessibility of the route.
- 3.23 In summary, there are some issues raised by residents and cycling group representatives which can be reviewed and incorporated. The position of the representative from the Cyclists Touring Club Right to Ride Network in terms of advisory lane width, extending advisory lanes past pedestrian refuges with minimum running lane width, shared-use facilities (with 0.5m buffer zone) is not shared by Staff who have designed the route using current guidance.
- 3.24 The scheme is a Council priority and in terms of the highway sections, Staff have been able to design a route which provides links between the off-highway areas to provide continuity. Some adjustments can be made to the scheme to allay some of the concerns of residents and some additional work can be undertaken as set out in the report.
- 3.25 CTC Ride to Ride Network has taken a critical position with scheme design principles, whilst Havering Cyclists supports the scheme with suggestions. If the scheme proceeds, Staff will offer to meet both organisations to see where comments can be incorporated, but the decision on shared facilities, cycle lane widths etc. must be for the Council alone and Staff consider the design to be reasonable given the space and funding constraints.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The costs of implementing the whole scheme is estimated to be £1,558,000 delivered in three phases as set out in the Cabinet Report of 15th July 2009.

The estimated cost of the highway elements of the scheme set out within this report is £550,000 and can be funded through the 2012/13 Transport for London Local Implementation Plan allocations for the Ingrebourne Valley Sustrans Connect 2 project and the Big Lottery Sustrans Connect 2 allocation.

Legal implications and risks:

Waiting restrictions, controlled pedestrian crossing facilities, speed tables, speed limits and cycle tracks require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

The Council may convert existing footways into cycle tracks, by technically “removing” the footway under Section 66(4) of the Highways Act 1980 as amended and “constructing” the cycle track under Section 65(1) of the Highways Act 1980 as amended.

The Council may create new cycle tracks using its powers under Section 65(1) of the Highways Act 1980 as amended.

Other issues are set out in the Cabinet Report of 15th July 2009.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Safer road crossings within the scheme will allow all sections of the community to access the Connect2 route over existing roads.

Shared pedestrian and cycle facilities are not always seen by some interest groups as desirable, but given the highway and land space available and the more leisure route it serves, it is appropriate to allow cyclists to legally use off-carriageway sections of the highway to more safely access the Connect2 route.

Parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may be detrimental to others, but those proposed for this scheme are in the interests of maintaining the safety of those using the Connect2 route.

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

Blue-badge holders are able to park for up to three hours on restricted areas (unless a loading ban is in force).

Other issues are set out in the Cabinet Report of 15th July 2009.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Cabinet agenda and minutes of 15th July 2009
2. Project Scheme File Ref: QF103 Sustrans Connect 2 – Phase 1
QK042 Sustrans Connect 2 – Phases 2 & 3

**APPENDIX I
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

Ref:	Responder	Comments
1	L Harris, 84 Bridge Avenue	<p>Thank you for your circular dated 20th inst. Unfortunately on the reverse (p2) you appear to have omitted something. "The agenda for the meeting, including the" ????? "will be available at the meeting and also on the"</p> <p>A visit to the Sustrans site shows my local route coming from the Park along Brookdale Avenue and crossing Bridge Avenue presumably on the proposed uncontrolled crossings and then going via the stadium car park and joining the already present and posted London Loop. Thus presumably avoiding the use of Bridge Avenue except for the crossing.</p>

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

2	Mr Stuart Morris, 20 Hall Lane	<p>Resident agrees with the cycle route, but has VERY SERIOUS concerns about the safety of the cyclists and pedestrians along the route, due to the fact that the Black Taxis park all the way up Hall Lane OUTSIDE the Taxi Bay. There are often up to 15 Taxis parked up the road, sometimes with 2 wheels on the kerb, which currently makes it very dangerous when residents are trying to pull off their drive onto Hall Lane, as they cannot see up the road for cars coming down let alone Cyclists!!!</p> <p>The residents family have nearly been hit by cars on several occasions coming down Hall Lane towards the Station, as we have tried to edge out to see what is coming. I have also witnessed pedestrians nearly run over after getting off the bus opposite me and crossing the road, as cars try to drive past the bus because the road then is narrowed significantly with both the bus and the taxis parked on opposite sides of the road.</p> <p>I would therefore request and urge that you make serious consideration to extending the double yellow lines and therefore NO PARKING at any time all the way up Hall Lane, or at least as far as Upminster Golf Course. I strongly believe that there is an accident waiting to happen, which is borne out by the fatality of the motorcyclist last year, when he hit a broken down car left in Hall Lane just up the road to me, the Taxis currently cause the same hazard.</p>
3	Greg Pavitt, 26 Hall Lane	<p>Firstly I would say I think dedicated road space for cycles is a “good thing”. One query. I live at 26 Hall Lane, Upminster RM14 1AF further towards Upminster Station are some dedicated taxi rank parking spaces on the East side of Hall Lane. At night as there are now so many Taxis they need to park almost up to Ingrebourne Gardens.</p> <p>How does the cycle lane work with the taxi rank or is it shared space?</p>

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

4	B Taffs, 90 Bridge Road	The resident recommends a revision to the plans which will overcome the problem caused by the existing parking restrictions. The residents recommends the route be changed through Hornchurch Sport Stadium.
5	D Rivers, 8 Champion Road	What requirement is there for this additional spend – i.e. how many requests for this cycle route have been received I am struggling to see justification for such a spend and therefore cannot support this request – it appears a pure “statistical requirement” and a waste of tax payers money
6	E.Gretton, 152 Hall Lane	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The junction where Hall Lane slip road meets Avon Road is very dangerous in that vehicles do not stop at the roundabout and turn left into Avon Road at Speed.....is it possible to erect signs at the roundabout or for signs for cyclists to stop or look left at the junction.2. When traffic at the roundabout is held up the service road becomes a "rat run" (not frequent) is it possible to erect signs at the new raised entry to warn cyclists or prevent traffic other than residents entering.3. As road signs will be "white lined ?" on the road with this scheme is it possible while they are on site to either double yellow line the "layby" opposite 160 approx or mark "no waiting" this will assist traffic in the slip road and prevent parking.4. I would again draw your attention to the pavement at the junction service road/Avon Rd which due to the lack of a flat surface ,pedestrians/walkers tend to walk in the roadway

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

7	Mrs F. Foxon, 52 Hall Lane	<p>I am in agreement with a cycling lane but ABSOLUTELY NOT with you moving the bus stop. I live at 52 Hall Lane, Upminster and strongly object to the plan you have to relocate the existing bus stop to a new one outside my property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- At the moment, the bus stop is two doors down. We often get a build up of cars behind a bus as it is, blocking our drives. <p>Bringing it further up towards the pedestrian refuge island is total folly as the traffic will build up there and at the junction of Ingrebourne Gdns to Hall Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- There is also a lamp post at the very spot where you intend to put the new bus stop.- May I query the reason WHY you need to change the existing one at great cost? Getting funds back from Iceland shouldn't mean you have to squander OUR money!!!- My husband having died in June and now living in my house on my own, the last thing I want or need is to have strangers hovering near my house. It didn't have a bus stop outside it when we bought it and there shouldn't be one now.
---	-------------------------------	---

8	Kevin Harding, 17 Hurstwood Court, Hall Lane	<p>Resident is concerned about the proposal to install an on-carriageway cycle lane along parts of Hall Lane.</p> <p>Having had direct experience of CS3 in Tower Hamlets, I can categorically state that this will cause extreme danger to road users and pedestrians - not to mention the cyclists themselves.</p> <p>The road is already heavily congested at many times of the day - both during the week and during the weekend. As your drawing QK042 - 01- 114 clearly shows, there is an existing taxi bay and an existing bus stop which are to remain. This necessitates the cyclists either switching to the other side of the road or "pulling-out" into the carriageway (please do not suggest for one minute that they will patiently wait in the line of traffic). This is ridiculous for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the road is already heavily congested. To have cyclists switching from one side of the road to the other or pulling out into the carriageway/traffic will add to the congestion- with cyclists switching across/into the carriageway, there will inevitably be accidents - fatal or otherwise - as has been the experience with CS3- the proposed pedestrian crossing will further add to traffic delay and congestion- the combination of the on-carriageway cycle path coupled with the pedestrian crossing will inevitably add to congestion and increase air pollution- reducing the width of the remaining carriageway for other traffic - be it the east side or the west side - will again increase the risk of collision and accidents <p>While I understand the Government and local council's desire to increase cycling, the ONLY way this will be successful (that is without addition injury, congestion and pollution) will be for the cycle paths to be fully off-road.</p>
---	--	--

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

		<p>I therefore strongly recommend that these plans are NOT implemented in their current state and be revised such that either an alternative route is used OR the cycle path along Hall Lane is taken FULLY off-road.</p> <p>Having had similar discussions with the Mayor of Tower Hamlets, the Tower Hamlets council, TfL and the local MP relating to CS3 last year, similar concerns were addressed. Consequently, it was agreed by all parties that, in one controversial area (Narrow Street, E14) the cycle path be relocated to Commercial road and be off-carriageway. While waiting for this to be implemented, there have been several accidents and, I believe, one fatality. It would be unfortunate, to say the least, if this were to be repeated here.</p>
9	David Pears, 105 Hall Lane	The resident has no reason to object but has two supplementary issues - the remove the puddle issue near to his property, and to realign the footpath as golfers are wearing the green away with their trolleys.
10	R Harman, 3 Hurstwood Court, Hall Lane	The resident suggest that the taxi rank is being misused by drivers and speeding vehicles cause a constant problem but the introduction of the zebra crossing will be most welcomed. Requests VA signs to encourage drivers to slow down.

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

11	J L Graves, 172 Hall Lane	<p>1. The ramp outside Nos 192 & 194 should be avoided due to the possibility of skidding on the rising inclines (both sides) when wet or icy. Vehicles will have front wheels turned significantly from the straight ahead position when approaching from either direction and will lead to additional tyre wear.</p> <p>2. The existing 30 mph speed limit on Hall Lane should be extended north beyond the entrance to the Night Vets. This is to avoid excessive deceleration for southbound traffic before negotiating the raised table. There is a risk of southbound traffic running into the back of vehicles entering the Service Road particularly if a cyclist is crossing the raised table at the same time. What about priority? I assume cyclists have priority not being mechanically powered.</p> <p>3. For the benefit of cyclists, the Service Road running between 142 & 194 Hall Lane should be limited to 20 mph (and enforced), particularly due to obscured vision on the bend outside No. 172 Hall Lane. Also, this service road is used as a race track by vehicles being held up on Hall Lane. This frequently occurs when there are issues on the westbound A127, A12, & M25.</p> <p>4. An increase in street furniture will inevitably follow in inverse proportion to the number of cyclists.</p>
12	50 Hall Lane	The resident objects to the relocation of the bus stop.

13	Sue French, 166 Hall Lane	<p>I do applaud any efforts for increased cycle routes and to make cycling safer. I would just like to comment on the proposed lane concerning the service road. I live in the middle just before the bend. This is a very narrow road and cars do speed down it with very many near misses. There has been head on bumps in the past between two vehicles. There are three bends of which one is blind (the entrance at 194 Hall Lane), the one in the middle (only blind if cars approach at a reasonably high speed and the one at the entrance at 142 which can be blind if you take it wide.</p> <p>There is also the problem of a lack of parking (only one cut out bay for two cars) and many cars/delivery vans/service vans park on two wheels on the kerb on the (only) pavement side where the cycle route would run along. Whilst risking a parking ticket, the alternative which a few cars are now doing is to park flush with the pavement making it very difficult to negotiate around in a car. These cars too would block the cycle route.</p> <p>An alternative to the safety aspect regarding speeding cars would be to make the service road one way (entering from 142). When there is a volume of build up traffic (which is reasonably often when there is trouble on the M23, the A12 or in Hornchurch) very, very many cars use the service road as a cut through and speed (to a point you would not believe) to the end. This is extremely dangerous especially as we often have horse riders also using the road quite early in the morning. By making the road one way from the Avon Road end (although it is more difficult to exit from the 194 end), this would reduce the risk of the blind bend at 194 entrance and also stop the "cut through in traffic problem). This cut through is not used from the opposite end during traffic.</p> <p>It does seem to me that the best and safest route would be to continue along the Hall Lane Carriageway. There is plenty of grass verges which could be cut back allowing for the lane and then cyclists would just carry on in a straight manner without dipping into the service road.</p>
----	------------------------------	--

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

14	James Gibbons , 165 Corbets Tey Road	The resident objects to the proposals as he feels there are already many ways to get from Harold Hill to Rainham by cycle on foot or using transport, therefore no reason to create this artificial route. We are disadvantaging pedestrians by forcing them to share walking areas with cyclist. If cyclist wish to use lanes on roads marked by white lines I would not object but there is however no need to paint cycle symbols on roads.
15	B G Fisher, 192 Hall Lane	<p>Thank you for arranging an on site visit by Raj Padam in connection with the above project. This was most helpful and allowed us to understand the construction of the network in better detail. However, there were several observations made which we would like to put on record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The structure of the raised entry into the Service Road is considered quite dangerous in view of the speed cars turn off the main Road into this area and there will be two houses directly affected when backing out of their driveways.• The siting of the entrance/exit for the cycle path onto the service Road from the island should not be opposite a driveway.• The removal of any trees or shrubs from the island which separates the service Road from the main Road would be totally unacceptable. <p>From the second on site visit by Mark Philpotts accompanied by Raj Padam it is understood some alterations are to be made which will encompass the above points and we look forward to receiving the new plans showing the alterations as discussed.</p>

16	D Garfield - Cyclists Touring Club Right to Ride Network	<p>QK042-OI-125-A Bridge Road /Viking Way Cycle Lane on southbound carriageway from Viking Way Roundabout should reach the Roundabout as it does on northbound carriageway. Footway widening is welcome, especially on SE sector of Roundabout.</p> <p>QK042-OI-124-A Dover's Cnr / Bridge Road 'Proposed Start of Advisory Lane' already starts at this point. Lanes have been repainted at same insufficient width. This was queried at Cycle Liaison Group, but still no response has been received (MK.) Width of Lane must be increased to better ensure Cyclist Safety, and should be extended to Toucan Crossing.</p> <p>There is already shared-use path between Tesco Compound entrance and Viking Way, but this is not marked. Is it intended to retain this element?</p> <p>QK042-OI-119-A Upminster Park Proposal There doesn't appear to be any reason for the short length of Cycle Lane in Brookdale Close. Would Cycle-Riders be expected to dismount through the Park? No information is given.</p> <p>QK042-OI-117-A Branfil Rd / Champion Rd Proposal The broken yellow lines are not represented in the key: presumably they are no-parking lines.</p> <p>QK042-OI-115-A Hall Lane Proposal Proposed Cycle advisory Lane at 1.5m is too narrow for a busy road such as Hall Lane. Desired width is 2m. There is no good reason not to install Lanes at this dimension; the available carriageway width for other road users is undiminished.</p> <p>If Riders travel at the recommended distance of 1m from kerb, 1.5m brings vehicles too close for safety, comfort and confidence of less experienced Riders.</p>
----	--	---

		<p>QK042-OI-114-A Hall Lane Proposal As QK042-OI-115-A above.</p> <p>QK042-OI-113-A Hall Lane Proposal As QK042-OI-115-A above.</p> <p>QK042-OI-112-A Hall Lane Proposal As QK042-OI-115-A above. In addition, 2m wide advisory Lane should be continuous, and not stop before the Pedestrian Refuge and junction with Ingrebourne Gardens. It is at locations such as this that advisory Lanes are most needed. [See my response to Velup Siva, Ref: QK001/R, dated 29 August 2011 — to which I have still had no reply.]</p> <p>QK042-OI-111-A Hall Lane Proposal As QK042-OI-115-A above.</p> <p>QK042-OI-110-A Hall Lane Proposal As QK042-OI-115-A above. It is not made clear why the 'shared-use' Footway is considered necessary. Shared-use is the least desired option. As you know, shared-use Paths are favoured by neither Cycle users nor Pedestrians. Pedestrians can alter pace and direction suddenly and without warning; Riders can approach from behind in virtual silence and at considerable speed. Consequently, the arrangement is potentially hazardous for either mode. The 2m Cycle advisory Lane should be continued for those who opt to remain on the Carriageway and not use the shared-use Footway.</p> <p>The shared-use Footway should have its surface finished to carriageway standards and be separated from the kerb edge by at least 0.5m.</p> <p>Further to my previous submission regarding the above scheme, I have further observations to make.</p> <p>This project is a fairly prestigious scheme that has been under way for several years.</p> <p>Nevertheless, once again, with the proposals as set out, the Highways Staff are squandering an opportunity to offer first-class Cycle Facilities and, by implication, squandering hard-won funding resources.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>I refer in particular to the perplexing choice of advisory Lanes of only 1.5 metres — the minimum recommended dimension — especially in Hall Lane.</p> <p>This is a heavily-trafficked route, and using Lanes of insufficient width tends to bring Motor Vehicles closer to the Rider than is desirable. Moreover, at ‘pinch points’ and narrowings, at precisely the locations where they are most needed, it is proposed to discontinue the advisory Lanes!</p> <p>Presumably, the Connect 2 Project is primarily a leisure route, so is likely to be used by Families with Children. This being the case, it is even more imperative to provide the best possible facilities.</p> <p>As any competent Engineer understands, advisory Lanes have no effect whatever on the available carriageway width: it remains precisely as if the Lanes had not been added.</p> <p>From Cycle Route Design Principles:</p> <p>5.7 Cycle Lanes may be mandatory or advisory, although mandatory Cycle Lanes are often preferable.</p> <p>Mandatory Cycle Lanes may only be used by Cyclists, with all other Vehicles prohibited from entry.</p> <p>Advisory Cycle Lanes may be entered by Motor Vehicles when encroachment is unavoidable.</p> <p>Consequently, I can see no good reason not to use a more suitable measure of, or much closer to, 2 metres, which is the desired dimension for facilities of this kind.</p> <p>There is no:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Legal impediment• Safety impediment• Engineering impediment• Traffic Management impediment• Cost impediment
--	--	---

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

		<p>— to using the wider dimension, so what explanation is there for repeatedly using the minimum dimension?</p> <p>I have my own theories, but I shall await your response before propounding them. By habitually repeating the mistakes of the past, you and your team are continuing to let down Cyclists. After so many years of suffering substandard work, we deserve better.</p>
17	David Summerfield	<p>Concerned about the safety of the cycle entrance to Gaynes Parkway from Southview Drive, Upminster. The present entrance for cyclist into Gaynes Parkway is from the pedestrian footpath which is a down hill stretch of pavement which cyclists tend to speed down.</p> <p>There is an infants and junior school very close by and a lot of these children walk to school through the parkway also play in the parkway and gather on the pavement by the entrance on the pedestrian pavement. It would be a much safer option to make the new cycle entrance from the road not from the pavement. Another possible consideration would be to bring a new entrance into the parkway from alongside the Hornchurch Football Stadium from Bridge Avenue.</p> <p>I am not against the added use of cyclists using the parkway but living in the last bungalow in Southview Drive I have seen the danger between the children on the pavement and the cyclist travelling fast down this downhill stretch of pavement.</p>

18	Havering Cyclists - Terry Hughes	<p>I am responding to the plans for the Harold Wood to Rainham section of route 136 on behalf of Havering Cyclists which is the local section of the London Cycling Campaign.</p> <p>We very much welcome the plan in principle but have the following comments. I also attach drawings for your reference.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Now that we will be using the Hall Lane bridge as a designated cycling and walking route then the vehicle speed of approach from the A127 become more important. We would suggest moving the speed delimeter signs on the Eastbound carriage way to just after the Upminster Junction thus slowing traffic approach to the bridge.2. Consideration should be given to adding safety barriers on the edge of the road to prevent cyclists riding straight into the road, especially younger cyclists at the exits from the park. See attachment for page 1 amendment.3. On bridge over A127 consideration to be given to improved signposting as a shared path and perhaps to make it the same colour as the widened pathways.4. On page 8 has consideration been given to using the side road as the cycle way rather than widen the pavement. This would save money on the pathway widening and remove a conflict with a bus stop. It would need the southern exit/entrance to the side road to be widened. See attachment for page 8 amendment.5. On turn into Branfill Road need cycleway signage put up to make the turn clear. See attachment.6. Consider making Branfill and Champion Roads 20 mph speed limits to cater for increased on road cyclists.7. Need clear signage at junction of Champion Road and St Marys Lane as to what cyclists are
----	-------------------------------------	---

Highways Advisory Committee, 20 March 2012

		<p>expected to do. Consider changing go left sign to one which allows cyclists to go straight on. See attachment.</p> <p>8. Need signage at end of Brookdale avenue otherwise cyclists will continue to enter via football ground. In fact they still will.</p> <p>9. Consider making bridge avenue a 20mph zone as it's a rat run and include traffic calming measures.</p> <p>10. Junction of Bridge Road with Viking Road is confusing. Going South on Bridge road appears to be an advisory cycle lane on the road yet to go round the island there are proposed expanded pathways. There needs to be a shared path south of the toucan crossing.</p> <p>11. A decision needs to be made as to the best route to get to Rainham Marshes. Going via the village is not cyclists friendly as you have to cross the railway once via a crossing and then twice via a bridge. It would be better to route people along Langdon road and extend the cycleway to go all along the footpath until it gets to the start of the marshes cycle footpath system.</p>
19	Cllr Ford	Clarification of proposals to relocate bus stop outside No.50 Hall Lane.
20	Cllr Durant	Clarification on HGV compatibility with the Bridge Road roundabout proposals.