



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

31 July 2018

Subject Heading:

**BRENTWOOD ROAD ACCIDENT
REDUCTION PROGRAMME –
PROPOSED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS
(The Outcome of public consultation)**

CMT Lead:

Dipti Patel

Report Author and contact details:

**Velup Siva
Senior Engineer
01708 433142
velup.siva@havering.gov.uk**

Policy context:

**Havering Local Development
Framework (2008)
Havering Local Implementation Plan
2018/19 Delivery Plan**

Financial summary:

**The estimated cost of £0.090m for
implementation will be met by
Transport for London through the
2018/19 Local Implementation Plan
allocation for Accident Reduction
Programme.**

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

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People will be safe, in their homes and in the community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Residents will be proud to live in Havering	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

Brentwood Road – Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes

approved by Transport for London for funding. A feasibility study has recently been carried out to identify safety improvements and humped zebra crossings, pedestrian refuges, wider kerb build-outs, speed cushions, road markings and road signs are proposed to minimise accidents. A public consultation has been carried out and this report details the finding of the feasibility study, public consultation and recommends that the safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation be approved.

The scheme is within **Romford Town, Squirrels Heath, Emerson Park and Hylands** wards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment that the safety improvements as detailed below and shown on the relevant drawings be implemented as follows:
 - (a) Brentwood Road between Wheatsheaf Road and Albert Road (Plan No:QR003-1)
 - Speed cushions west of Wheatsheaf Road
 - Pedestrian refuge with speed cushions west of Kyme Road
 - Speed cushions east of Craigdale Road
 - Speed cushions east of Douglas Road
 - (b) Brentwood Road / Albert Road / Park Lane Mini Roundabout (Plan No.QR003-2)
 - Wider kerb build-outs (as shown)
 - (c) Brentwood Road between Manor Road and Osborne Road (Plan No:QR003-3)
 - Speed cushions west of Manor Road
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos.212 and 214
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos. 219a/224
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property Nos.227 and 229
 - (d) Brentwood Road between Osborne Road and Clive Road (Plan No:QR003-4)
 - Speed cushions east of Osborne Road
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property Nos. 263/265/267
2. That the committee notes, as a result of public consultation results, the pedestrian refuge proposal along Brentwood Road north of Cavenham Gardens will be omitted from the original advertised scheme.
- (3) That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £0.090m, can be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Accident Reduction Programme.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In October 2017, Transport for London approved funding for a number of Accident Reduction Programmes as part of 2018/19 Havering Borough Spending Plan settlement. Brentwood Road Accident Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study has been carried out to identify accident remedial measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing accidents and recommended safety improvements. Following completion of the study, the safety improvements, as set out in this report, are recommended for implementation as they will improve road safety.
- 1.2 The Government and Transport for London have set targets for 2020 to reduce Killed or Serious injury accidents (KSI) by 40%; Child KSIs by 50%; pedestrian, cyclist KSI's by 50% and slight injuries by 25% from the baseline of the average number of casualties for 2005-09. The Brentwood Road Accident Reduction Programme will help to meet these targets.

Survey Results

- 1.3 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 1500 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Brentwood Road west of Francombe Gardens and between Clive Road and Cranham Road.

A speed survey was carried out and the results are as follows.

Location	85 th ile Speed (mph)		Highest Speed (mph)	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Brentwood Road west of Francombe Gardens (Off peak periods)	35	36	45	45
Brentwood Road west of Francombe Gardens (Peak periods)	33	33	40	40
Brentwood Road between Clive Road and Cranham Road (Off peak periods)	36	35	45	45
Brentwood Road between Clive Road and Cranham Road (Peak periods)	33	31	40	40

The 85th percentile traffic speed (the speed at which 85% of vehicles are travelling at or below) along Brentwood Road exceeds the 30mph speed limit. Staff considers these speeds to be undesirable and a contributory factor to

accidents.

Accidents

- 1.4 In the five-year period to February 2017, **fifty one** personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Brentwood Road. Of these fifty one PIAs, 1 was fatal (2%), three (6%) were serious; fifteen (29%) involved pedestrians; twelve (24%) involved child; seven (14%) involved motorcyclists and eight (16%) occurred during the hours of darkness.

Details of PIAs are as follows:

Location	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total PIAs
Brentwood Road between South Street and Lennox Close	0	0	1 (1-Dark)	1
Brentwood Road / Wheatsheaf Road Junction	0	0	1	1
Brentwood Road / Kyme Road Junction	0	1 (1-Speed)	0	1
Brentwood Road / Craigdale Road Junction	0	0	1 (1-Child)	1
Brentwood Road / George Street Junction	0	0	1	1
Brentwood Road / Douglas Road Junction	0	0	1	1
Brentwood Road between Douglas Road and Albert Road	0	0	2 (1-Ped)	2
Brentwood Road / Albert Road / Park Lane Mini roundabout	1 (1-Ped) (1-Dark)	0	7 (1-Ped) (2-Dark) (1-Speed)	8

Brentwood Road between Park Lane and Boundary Road	0	0	1 (1-Ped) (1-Dark)	1
Brentwood Road / Boundary Road Junction	0	0	1 (1-Speed)	1
Brentwood Road / Granger Way Junction	0	0	2	2
Brentwood Road / Manor Road Junction	0	1 (1-Dark) (1-Speed)	1 (1-Ped) (1-Child)	2
Brentwood Road / Marwell Close Junction	0	0	1	1
Brentwood Road / Francombe Gardens Junction	0	0	2 (1-Dark)	2
Brentwood Road between Francombe Gardens and Osborne Road	0	1 (1-Dark)	2 (3-Ped) (2-Child)	3
Brentwood Road / Osborne Road Junction	0	0	5 (1-Ped) (2-Child)	5
Brentwood Road / Lawrence Road Junction	0	0	2 (1-Ped) (1-Child)	2
Brentwood Road between Lawrence Road and Clive Road	0	0	1	1
Brentwood Road / Clive Road / Cranham Road Junctions	0	0	4 (1-Ped) (1-Speed)	4

			(1-Child)	
Brentwood Road / Cavenham Gardens Junction	0	0	2 (2-Ped) (1-Child)	2
Brentwood Road between Cavenham Gardens and Drill Roundabout	0	0	4 (1-Ped) (2-Child)	4
Drill Roundabout	0	0	5 (1-Ped) (1-Child)	5
Total	1	3	47	51

Proposals

1.5 The following safety improvements are proposed along Brentwood Road to reduce vehicle speeds and minimise accidents.

- (a) Brentwood Road between Wheatsheaf Road and Albert Road (Plan No:QR003-1)
 - Speed cushions west of Wheatsheaf Road
 - Pedestrian refuge with speed cushions west of Kyme Road
 - Speed cushions east of Craigdale Road
 - Speed cushions east of Douglas Road
- (b) Brentwood Road / Albert Road / Park Lane Mini Roundabout (Plan No:QR003-2)
 - Wider kerb build-outs (as shown)
- (c) Brentwood Road between Manor Road and Osborne Road (Plan No:QR003-3)
 - Speed cushions west of Manor Road
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos.212 and 214
 - Speed cushions outside property Nos. 219a/224
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property Nos.227 and 229
- (d) Brentwood Road between Osborne Road and Clive Road (Plan No:QR003-4)
 - Speed cushions east of Osborne Road
 - Humped zebra crossing outside property Nos. 263/265/267
- (e) Brentwood Road north of Cavenham Gardens (Plan No:QR003-5)
 - Pedestrian refuge

2.0 Outcome of public consultation

2.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 350 letters were delivered by hand and via post to the area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Seven written responses from Local Members, Metropolitan Police, Fire brigade, cycling representatives and residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix.

3.0 Staff comments and conclusions

3.1 The accident analysis indicated that **fifty one** personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Brentwood Road. Of these fifty one PIAs, 1 was fatal (2%), three (6%) were serious; fifteen (29%) involved pedestrians; twelve (24%) involved child; seven (14%) involved motorcyclists and eight (16%) occurred during the hours of darkness.

3.2 The proposed safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation would minimise accidents along Brentwood Road. It is therefore recommended that the proposed safety improvements in the recommendation should be recommended for implementation.

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 original Transport for London allocation was £0.090m initial feasibility and consultation costs have reduced the available funding to c£0.080m.

The estimated cost of 0.090m for implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Straight Road Accident Reduction Programme (A2909). The funding will need to be spent by 31st March 2019, 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:

The Council's power to construct and maintain places of refuges for the protection of pedestrians in the maintained highway is set out in Part V of the Highways Act 1980 ('HA1980')

The Council's power to construct road humps in highway maintainable at public expense is set out in Part V of the HA 1980. Before making an order under this provision the Council should ensure that the statutory procedures set out in section 90C, Part V of the HA 1980 and the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 are complied with. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 govern road traffic signs and road markings.

The Council's power to create a pedestrian crossing on roads is set out in Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA 1984"). Before making an order under this provision the Council should ensure that the statutory procedures set out in Part III of the RTRA 1984 and the Zebra, Pelican and Puffin Pedestrian Crossing Regulations and General Directions 1997 are complied with. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 govern road traffic signs and road markings.

Section 122 RTRA 1984 imposes a general duty on local authorities when exercising functions under the RTRA. It provides, insofar as is material, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. This statutory duty must be balanced with any concerns received over the implementation of the proposals.

In considering any responses received during consultation, the Council must ensure that full consideration of all representations is given including those which do not accord with the officer's recommendation. The Council must be satisfied that any objections to the proposals were taken into account.

In considering any consultation responses, the Council must balance the concerns of any objectors with the statutory duty under section 122 RTRA 1984.

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.

There would be some visual impact from the proposals; however these proposals would generally improve safety for both pedestrians and vehicles.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

RESPONSE REF:	COMMENTS	STAFF COMMENTS
QR003/1 (Local Member 1)	I am quite happy with the improvements, especially the zebra crossing near the medical centre.	-
QR003/2 (Local Member 2)	I am happy with the new proposals	-
QR003/3 (Local Member 3)	I see no issues with the current proposal.	-
QR003/4 (Local Member 4)	Looks fine to me, as long as residents are content at consultation	-
QR003/5 (Local Member 5)	I am content too.	-
QR003/6 (Local Member 6)	<p>Strategically-placed reservations and zebra crossings are good idea as they do make crossing the road far safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>My concerns with speed cushions are the amount of bump they can give vehicles and importantly, the passengers within.</p> <p>Also, although Brentwood Road is undeniably busy, that very fact means traffic rarely drives along it at more than 30mph. The roads which do have a problem with speed cars are those like Manor Road, Princes Road and Albert Road, which run parallel between Brentwood Road and Victoria Road, are already used as cut-through and stand to become worse if traffic is slowed down by speed humps on the main roads.</p>	<p>Staff considered that the current proposals are adequate to reduce speeds and accidents along this road. Majority of larger vehicles and buses can straddle the speed cushions with minimum discomfort for drivers and passengers.</p> <p>Emergency services prefer speed cushions as opposed to speed tables.</p> <p>As the funding ring-fenced to Brentwood Road Accident Reduction Programme, it is unlikely carry out any traffic calming on the surrounding roads. Further measures could be considered on residential roads at a later date if funding being available in future.</p>
QR003/7 (HAC Member)	I have noticed a proliferation of speed humps/tables/cushions throughout Havering. Do we have evidence that installing these actually overall traffic speed and reduces the amount of incidents?	There are several TfL studies showed that these traffic calming measures reduce vehicles speeds and incidents. They also

	<p>Do we have any indication of the increase in CO2 emissions at these sites as people tend to speed up and brake between these installations?</p> <p>I understand that paramedics in ambulances do not like the speed humps as it can interfere with treatment of a patient on the way back to a hospital. Is any consideration given to this when it is decided that speed reduction methods are required in an area.</p>	<p>reduce the severity of incidents. With reference to CO2 emissions, no studies showed that `speed humps cause a significant level increase in CO2 emissions.</p> <p>With reference to the patient treatment, the proposed speed cushions would not cause discomfort to patients as the ambulance services can pass these speed cushions with no discomfort to patients. The wheel base of ambulance service vehicles is wider which would not cause discomfort when they go over speed cushions.</p>
QR003/8 (London Fire brigade)	I can see no issue with these as the appliance should pass over without having to reduce speed.	-
QR003/9 (Metropolitan Police)	Overall I feel they will have a positive effect in reducing speeds and consequently reduce collisions.	-
QR003/10 (Local Representative: Cycling UK)	It is essential that all ramps and humps should be installed in sinusoidal profile. It is not acceptable to have speed cushions positioned immediately adjacent to pedestrian refuges, as this practice effectively precludes cycle-users from adopting the recommended 'primary position' so as to discourage inappropriate unsafe passing by motor vehicles through the pinch-point. Instead the cushions should be positioned some metres before the pinch-point is encountered. Two metre wide advisory lanes should be included in the proposals to provide guidance to other road-users.	Recent installation of speed tables included sinusoidal profile. In the vicinity of pedestrian refuges, we will try and position the speed cushion away from pedestrian refuges as much we can. It is considered that gaps between the speed cushions are adequate for cyclists to pass through and 2 metre advisory cycle lanes are not necessary near the pedestrian refuges.

<p>QR003/11 (Brentwood Road - resident 1)</p>	<p>The section between Albert Road until Princes Road does not have any proposed speed cushions, allowing vehicles to accelerate from Park Lane mini roundabout to Princes Road. There is a pedestrian crossing just before Globe Road that is regularly used by kids attending to Hylands Primary School. Many cars very often approach the crossing at high speed, sometimes struggling to stop on time. It would be convenient to install adequate measures to mitigate the risk of an accident involving pedestrians</p>	<p>With the limited funding, it is not possible to proposed measures for whole length of Brentwood Road. The traffic calming measures are proposed where the most accidents occurred along Brentwood Road.</p>
<p>QR003/12 (Brentwood Road - Havering Building Specialist 2)</p>	<p>Your proposed safety improvements are very welcome indeed and you have our whole hearted support</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>QR003/13 (Brentwood Road - Resident 3)</p>	<p>We would like the opportunity to add our comments, ideas and further suggestions to the already comprehensive list. - Stop traffic entering onto the roundabout from Albert Road - More speed cushions placed between Manor Road and Douglas Road - No overtaking restrictions to avoid a head on crash happening at the bus stop east of Albert Road</p>	<p>Stopping traffic entering onto the roundabout is an enforcement which will investigate. Due to limited funding availability, it is not possible to proposed further traffic calming measures. Staff considered that no overtaking restrictions are necessary at present. It could be considered at a later date.</p>
<p>QR003/14 (Brentwood Road – Resident 4)</p>	<p>I feel a combination of up to five or six improvements spaced out along the entire road would be most useful and practicable. However, I would certainly not wish to see anywhere near the full lot as described in the letter.</p>	<p>Staff considered that the proposed measures are necessary to reduce vehicle speeds and accidents along Brentwood Road.</p>
<p>QR003/15 (Brentwood Road – Resident 5)</p>	<p>As a pedestrian, a user of public transport and a local resident, I am happy to see central funding going towards our road safety. Although I firmly support traffic calming, I oppose the installation of a humped zebra crossing outside Nos. 263/265/267. The existing crossing with a central reservation outside No. 265 serves its</p>	<p>Staff considered that the proposed humped zebra crossing at this location would reduce vehicle speeds and accidents at this location. This proposal would provide more protection for</p>

	<p>purpose for both able and disabled pedestrians. During the day, an elderly gentleman with a disability scooter uses the crossing without difficulty, as do parents with full size prams. School girls use the crossing twice a day. There is room for two adults to stand in the central refuge. I would query why the size of the central refuge, or the type of crossing, is thought to be a problem.</p> <p>The siting of a zebra crossing at 265 is not practical for vehicles. It is too near to the railway bridge for vehicles coming down the slope to react appropriately.</p> <p>There is no way to encourage pedestrians to cross here. Majority of bus passengers of all ages wait until the road is clear and cross in exactly the same place they got off the buses. The proposed humped zebra crossing is said to be uncomfortable for bus passengers.</p> <p>The zigzag markings either side of the proposed zebra crossing will restrict deliveries to and collections from the medical centre. Their car park generally full.</p> <p>There seems to be no place for the proposed beacon on the pavement outside 265 without causing an obstruction.</p>	<p>pedestrians at this location than the existing pedestrian refuge. The medical centre requested the formal crossing at this location. The proposal would not restrict the deliveries as they will still be place to unload and load for Medical Centre. With reference to beacon post, the beacon post would not cause any obstruction for pedestrians as it can be sited at the back of the footway.</p>
<p>QR003/16 (Brentwood Road – Resident 6)</p>	<p>I would like to put forward my strong objection to the proposed site for a pedestrian refuge. Anyone living along Brentwood Road will agree that it is an excellent idea to try and reduce some of the speeds along the road at night.</p> <p>I feel that speed cushions or speed cameras would be far more effective in slowing down these cars than a pedestrian will merely serve to further narrow an already congested road.</p> <p>The width of the road is barely adequate as it is at the busiest times of the day, with people parking to use the local shops, drop off and pick up from the school and to go to the Drill Pub. Often traffic is already restricted to more or less one way with quite some difficulty manoeuvring if a bus, coach or van is also trying to pass.</p> <p>Many of us along the road already</p>	<p>Although pedestrian refuge is a speed reducing feature, main purpose of providing pedestrian refuge at this location is to minimise pedestrian accidents and provide crossing facilities for pedestrians including for school children. At this location there were two pedestrians accidents occurred over five year period.</p>

	<p>experience problems with people parking across our driveways. Since they need to get to the school or pop into Tesco, it seems that pedestrian refuge may well only exacerbate these difficulties.</p>	
<p>QR003/17 (Brentwood Road – Resident 7)</p>	<p>I would like to voice my strong opposition to the plan for a pedestrian refuge north of Cavenham Gardens. It is unnecessary and heavy handed approach to the problem of speeding traffic and is likely to cause further congestion and problem than it solves. Surely and pedestrian refuge is more for pedestrian protection than a traffic calming tool? If traffic calming is your aim, surely a speed camera or speed humps would be much more effective. As a resident of more than 30years standing, I have witnessed the increase in traffic along this route and whilst there are incidences of speeding especially late at night, overwhelming issue along the road is congestion. I regularly cross the road along this particular stretch without walking up to one of the crossing as the traffic is regularly at a standstill enabling me to cross the road with ease.</p>	<p>Although pedestrian refuge is a speed reducing feature, main purpose of providing pedestrian refuge at this location is to minimise pedestrian accidents and provide crossing facilities for pedestrians including for school children. At this location there were two pedestrians accidents occurred over five year period.</p>
<p>QR003/18 (Brentwood Road – Resident 8)</p>	<p>I feel unable to comment about a number of the suggestion but as I live only a few yards away from the proposed site for a 'Pedestrian Refuge' North of Cavenham Gardens. I feel valid criticism. I do not feel a 'Pedestrian Refuge' will deter people from speeding and may cause further accidents. I am surprised only speeds of 45mph were recorded. These excessive speeds seem to mainly occur from 9.00pm onwards and particularly late at night at the weekend. I feel speed cushions or speed cameras will be far more effective in slowing these cars down rather than a 'Pedestrian Refuge'. Narrowing an already busy road will only lead to further congestion and drivers driving more recklessly due to impatience.</p> <p>It was only today about 9.00 am that 3 coaches were parked where this 'Refuge' is planned as they were waiting for the school children from Squirrels Heath School to board. If there had been a</p>	<p>Although pedestrian refuge is a speed reducing feature, main purpose of providing pedestrian refuge at this location is to minimise pedestrian accidents and provide crossing facilities for pedestrians including for school children. At this location there were two pedestrians accidents occurred over five year period.</p>

	'Refuge' narrowing the road even further and none of the cars behind the coaches would have been able to move.	
QR003/19 (Brentwood Road – Resident 9)	From a personal point of view, I would definitely not want speed cushions outside my house. I feel undoubtedly cause even more noise and create more pollution than the levels which currently exist due to traffic breaking and accelerating constantly. Apart from stating obvious, I feel that Brentwood Road has been dug up and had temporary traffic lights enough times over the last few years, please give residents a break. On a less personal note, I would think that after going over a speed restriction outside my house the traffic would then be accelerating past Frances Bardsley school creating more danger. I trust that if you go ahead with this scheme then a reduction in Council tax will be offered due to the poorer living conditions that will ensure.	Staff considered that the proposed measures would not cause a significant problem in term of noise and pollution. The proposals include humped zebra crossing outside Frances Bardsley School which would reduce vehicle speeds and would not cause any danger outside the school.
QR003/20 (Upper Brentwood Road – Resident 1)	I refer to the proposal to install speed tables in Brentwood Road and would object for the following reasons. (1) Havering has numerous roads in need of urgent repair due to potholes and poor road conditions. Some potholes are so deep that if a car catches one it could do serious damage and possibly put the car out of control with other road users and pedestrians in danger. (2)The pavement in Brentwood Road is a disgrace. For example, outside number 449 every time it rains there is a deep puddle covering the whole pavement which necessitates walking in the road to avoid it. (3) The drains opposite my property in Upper Brentwood Road are completely blocked and need clearing. (4) Brentwood Road is on a bus route served by 3 buses. When buses go over these humps anyone who suffers from back complaints are in danger of aggravating their problem. (5) These speed tables cost a considerable amount of money and at a time of austerity and when council tax has increased this year, it is a large amount to	With reference to issues 1, 2, & 3, these requests will be passed them to our highways team to investigate. With reference to issue 4, it is considered that the proposed speed cushions and humped zebra crossing would not cause significant problems as buses can straddle through the speed cushions. With reference to issue 5, the TfL funding for Brentwood Road Accident Reduction programme ring-fenced to this particular scheme. It is not possible to spend it on other projects.

	pay when these resources are desperately needed for other projects.	
--	---	--