



**Havering**  
LONDON BOROUGH

# **HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**11 February 2020**

**Subject Heading:**

**ST CLEMENTS AVENUE – PROPOSED  
ZEBRA CROSSING  
(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 £0.020m for  
implementation will be met by  
Transport for London through the  
2019/20 Local Implementation Plan  
allocation for St Clements Avenue  
(A3074).**

**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**

St Clements Avenue safety improvements was one of the schemes approved by Transport for London for funding for 2019/20.

A feasibility study was undertaken to identify safety improvements including zebra crossing with wider traffic island and road markings to improve pedestrian facilities along St Clements Avenue by Gubbins Lane. A public consultation was carried out and this report details the findings of this consultation and recommends that the safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation be approved.

The scheme is within Harold Wood ward.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee having considered the representations and information set out in this report recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment in consultation with the Leader of the Council that a zebra crossing with wider centre island and road markings as shown on the drawing No. QS019 be implemented.
2. That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £0.020m, will be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2019/20 Local Implementation Plan allocation for St Clements Avenue.

## **REPORT DETAIL**

### **1.0 Background**

- 1.1 In November 2018, Transport for London ("TfL") approved funding for a number of safety Schemes as part of the 2019/20 Local Implementation Plan. The 'St Clements Avenue' safety improvements was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study was carried out to identify improve pedestrian facilities. The feasibility study looked at ways of improving pedestrian facilities along St Clements Avenue by Gubbins Lane. A zebra crossing with wider centre traffic island and road markings are the recommended options. Following completion of the study, the safety improvements, as set out in this report were taken forward to a formal public consultation.

#### **Proposals**

- 1.2 A zebra crossing with wider centre island and road markings are proposed along St Clements Avenue by Gubbins Lane to improve pedestrian safety in the area.

### **2.0 Outcome of public consultation**

- 2.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 100 letters were delivered via post and by hand to the area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Ten written responses from Local Member, the Metropolitan Police and residents were received and the comments are summarised in Appendix 1. A

local member is in favour of the scheme. Metropolitan Police advised on the visibility. One resident is in favour and seven residents were not in favour of the scheme.

- 2.2 Details of some of the operational Casualty Reduction Schemes implemented within Havering, TfL's targets, Mayor's vision zero Strategy and traffic calming techniques are summarised in Appendix 2.

### **3.0 Officers' comments and conclusions**

- 3.1 Appendix 2 provides commentary/analysis of the effectiveness of implemented Casualty Reduction Schemes, traffic calming measures and other features used in the Council's Casualty Reduction Programme, TfL's targets, Mayor's Vision Zero Strategy, UK Traffic calming techniques and their effect.
- 3.3 Officers prepared a set of proposals for St Clements Avenue. These measures should influence driver behaviour and reduce the risk exposure of vulnerable road users to collisions. Officers recommend that all suggested measures be implemented to reduce the aforementioned risk.
- 3.4 The proposed safety improvements as detailed in the recommendation would improve pedestrian safety along St Clements Avenue by Gubbins Lane.

## **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 £0.020m for feasibility, consultation and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2019/20 Local Implementation Plan allocations for Upper Brentwood Road Casualty Reduction Programme (A3071). The funding will need to be spent by 31st March 2020, 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 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 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 2016 govern road traffic signs and road markings.

The Council's power to make an Order regulating or controlling vehicular traffic on roads is set out in section 6 of Part 1 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 ("RTRA"1984). Schedule 1 of the RTRA 1984 lists those matters as to which Orders can be made under section 6. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 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:**

The recommendations made in this report do not give rise to any identifiable HR risks or implications that would affect either the Council or its workforce.

### **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.

Havering has a diverse community made up of many different groups and individuals. The council values diversity and believes it essential to understand and include the different contributions, perspectives and experience that people from different backgrounds bring.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the council, when exercising its functions, to have due regard to:

- (i) the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- (ii) the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not, and;
- (iii) foster good relations between those who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

Note: 'Protected characteristics' are: age, sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnerships, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and gender reassignment.

The council demonstrates its commitment to the Equality Act in its decision-making processes, the provision, procurement and commissioning of its services, and employment practices concerning its workforce. In addition, the council is also committed to improving the quality of life and wellbeing of all Havering residents in respect of socio-economics and health determinants.

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

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>
--------------------------

**None.**

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

RESPONSE REF:	COMMENTS	STAFF COMMENTS
QS019/1 (Local Member )	I am fine with this proposal.	-
QS019/2 (Metropolitan Police )	Please ensure that consideration is given to ensure that there is sufficient vision for traffic turning right onto Gubbins Lane from St Clements Avenue. This is a main consideration if there is a bus in the stand on Gubbins Lane at the time of the turn.	Staff believe that there is a sufficient visibility for the turning traffic.
QS019/3 (St Clements Avenue resident 1)	<p>As a home owner on the estate I feel that the crossing where it is proposed in the map isn't a very good idea.</p> <p>It is hard enough coming in and out of the road as it is at busy times especially with the other crossings so close together.</p> <p>I feel it would be more suitable to have it further up the road otherwise we will not only be battling traffic but also pedestrians.</p> <p>I'd appreciate if you could consider this when finalising.</p>	This location is the desire line for pedestrians to cross, it would be the suitable location for a zebra crossing. It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.
QS019/4 (St Clements Avenue resident 2)	We support the proposed zebra crossing with a wider centre island in St Clements Avenue. Request for additional 20mph signs in St Clements Avenue.	Additional signs could be considered at a later date if necessary.
QS019/5 (St Clements Avenue resident 3)	<p>This is a waste of money and the council should instead consider installing CCTV facing the intersection of St Clements Avenue and Gubbins lane - this will reduce dangerous driving and other criminal activities taking place in the area, such as numerous residents getting mugged by youths on bikes.</p> <p>As a matter of fact I along with a number of home owners at the kings park development would be willing to make a contribution towards this.</p> <p>I ask that the council reconsider the proposal and prioritise accordingly.</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>Additional measures could be considered at a later date if necessary.</p>

<p>QS019/6 (St Clements Avenue resident 4)</p>	<p>I am writing this email on behalf of my partner Joanna Johnstone and myself with regards to the absurd idea of a proposed zebra crossing on St Clements Avenue by Gubbins Lane. Please find below the impractical reasons do not have one.</p> <p>1) There are not enough constant footfalls during the day to warrant a zebra crossing there. Only during peak hours for commuters does the frequency of pedestrians increase for a limited time, therefore this will cause unnecessary congestion for traffic turning outbound from St Clements Avenue.</p> <p>2) Placing a zebra crossing there will impede traffic on Gubbins Lane, as vehicles turning inbound into St Clements Avenue will have to stop short for pedestrians and therefore cause a potential for a tailback on the main road, more so the case if there are 2 or more consecutive vehicles wanting to turn into St Clements Avenue. This will be a major inconvenience to drivers and impede more road users than it would to pedestrians.</p> <p>3) Furthermore adding to point number 2 above, there is a safety issue associated with a zebra crossing as vehicles coming northbound from Colchester road A12 that are turning into St Clements Ave will turn in and impede traffic travelling northbound, therefore decreasing safety margins as northbound drivers may attempt (as many impatient drivers do on this particular road) to go around the traffic turning into St Clements Avenue and therefore placing themselves into oncoming traffic from the inbound contra flow from Colchester road A12.</p> <p>4) An additional safety concern is that a very high proportion of commuters are oblivious to their surroundings by either having earphones in or on preoccupied on their phones, leading to a lack of situational awareness. Therefore putting a zebra crossing can worsen this by creating a confirmation bias and</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>presuming that drivers will stop. At night in reduced visibility there is an increased chance of an incident. Having no zebra crossing increases the chances of the pedestrian looking both ways. Introducing one will reduce this.</p> <p>5) Most zebra crossings are strategically placed to be comfortably in the line of sight of a driver. This proposal will lead to the driver not only having to contend with a busy road turning into St Clements Ave, but also may cause the driver to break heavily if someone runs or crosses the road on the presumption the driver has already seen them, even though the driver is checking the traffic. This zebra crossing is on a blind curve.</p> <p>The above points are not exhaustive. I hope that all the above which are predominantly safety concerns, be considered and taken on board.</p>	
<p>QS019/7 (St Clements Avenue resident 5)</p>	<p>I object to the plans as the junction is already a hot spot for traffic. The cars turning into St Clements would form a queue onto Gubbins lane, particularly if turning left into the road - this would the cause traffic for all other road users. For those turning right, they would form a queue and block traffic in both directions on Gubbins lane.</p> <p>It would make more sense to put another zebra crossing further down Gubbins lane towards the bus shelter if you feel the need for another crossing.</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.</p> <p>Additional measures could be considered at a later date if necessary.</p>
<p>QS019/8 (Wildcary Lane resident 1)</p>	<p>My concern is that the traffic at rush hour around that area of the other zebra crossing is already quite bad. There is often a line of traffic in both directions as a lot of pedestrians cross the road to get to the train station. My worry is that this will get much worse with cars having to wait to turn left and right into St Clements Avenue, with cars potentially getting stuck and blocking the road. The exhaust fumes in that area are also already really</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.</p>



		<p>bad with cars accelerating after stopping for pedestrians.</p> <p>I don't feel that the zebra crossing is necessary as cars already have to slow down to exist St Clements Avenue, and are often going at a slower speed when turning into the road too.</p>	
<p>QS019/9 (Gubbins resident 1)</p>	Lane	<p>I don't think it's a good idea to create another Zebra crossing at the proposed site.</p> <p>From pedestrians point of view it does pose a risk because of low level of lighting and rapidly turning cars onto Clements Avenue.</p> <p>For the drivers it'll be very difficult as it won't allow the cars to make a complete turn and might stop the traffic on Gubbins Lane. It would make situation worse as that area is already extremely congested and a nightmare for drivers during office hours.</p> <p>Two zebra crossings there doesn't seem a sensible option.</p> <p>In my opinion, a better solution to this would be to make a zebra crossing slightly higher up on the Clements Avenue to accommodate at least 2-3 cars clearly between Gubbins Lane and the proposed Zebra crossing.</p> <p>On a separate note, with the new Haroldwood station entrance, there is a need for a Zebra crossing near the bridge for the people coming/going to Kings Park.</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.</p> <p>Additional measures could be considered at a later date if necessary.</p>
<p>QS019/10 (Gubbins resident 2)</p>	Lane	<p>I would like to raise my concerns for the proposed Zebra Crossing for St Clements Avenue. As I believe this is a good step to provide pedestrians with a better solution to cross the road than currently present, I don't think this would be best location for a Zebra Crossing. See my bullet points below for my views on this proposal;</p> <p>- Gubbins Lane is a busy road which is a through road for access to the</p>	<p>The Council believe that the proposed zebra crossing would improve pedestrian safety at this location</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would not cause significant problems for the turning traffic.</p>

	<p>A12 &amp; A127 this means the road has traffic present at most times of the day. Placing a Zebra crossing to the entrance of St Clements Avenue will further contribute to the traffic on this road.</p> <p>- Harold Wood station exits are close to the pedestrian crossing located on Station Road. This often means when a surge of pedestrians exit from the station it's quite common for people to run over both the Station Road and Gubbins Lane crossings. I believe if the changes were added to St Clements Avenue entrance, pedestrians will also run over this crossing. All of these breaks up the flow of traffic on the road as cars wait for pedestrians to safely cross all 3.</p> <p>- The proposed location of the crossing seems unsafe. If a car is exiting St Clements Avenue and it waits after the pedestrian crossing, pedestrians are still able to cross behind this car. I believe this car waiting to exit from St Clements Avenue could obscure the view for cars planning to pull into St Clements Avenue. Moving the crossing to allow 2 car lengths waiting to enter St Clements Avenue would help with this issue as it gives more time for drivers to react when pulling in.</p>	
--	---	--

## APPENDIX 2

### SUMMARY OF CASUALTY TARGETS, CASUALTY REDUCTION, TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES AND THEIR EFFECT

#### 1. PERCENTAGE OF CASUALTY REDUCTION

The following table shows the percentage of casualty reduction achieved on the implementation of Accident Reduction Programme schemes in recent years using vertical deflections such as humped crossings, speed tables and speed cushions.

SCHEME	IMPLEMENTATION DATE	PERCENTAGE CASUALTY REDUCTION
Mawney Road and White Hart Lane Between A12 and Collier Row Road	March 2012	77%
Hornchurch Town Centre (20mph zone)	June 2012	45%
Collier Row Lane Between Goring Road and Playfield Avenue	March 2014	60%
Crow Lane Whole length	March 2015	40%
Dagnam Park Drive Between Gooshays Drive and Chudleigh Road (20mph zone)	January 2016	100%
Rainham Road Between Ford Lane and Wood Lane	December 2016	50%

Please note that vertical deflections such as humped crossings, speed tables, speed cushions were used in all the above schemes to reduce accidents. The casualties are compared before and after implementation of the schemes.

#### 2. TFL 2020 CASUALTY TARGETS

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 **Havering** Accident Reduction Programme, funded by Transport for London will help to meet these targets.

#### 3. LONDON MAJOR'S VISION ZERO STRATEGY

The Major's Vision Zero Strategy aims to eliminate deaths and serious injuries on London's road and street network including **Havering** roads in the light of previous incidents. The Major's aim is for no-one to be killed in or by a London Bus by 2030 and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's road and street by 2041. The main targets are as follows:

- (a) 65% reduction in KSIs by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average
- (b) 70% reduction in KSIs by buses by 2022 against 2005-2009 baseline average
- (b) 70% reduction in KSIs by 2030 against 2010-2014 baseline average
- (d) 0 KSIs by 2041
- (e) 0 KSIs by buses by 2030

#### **4. TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES IN UK AND THEIR EFFECT ON SPEED REDUCTION, ACCIDENT REDUCTION AND AIR QUALITY/ HEALTH/ POLLUTION**

##### **(a) TRAFFIC CALMING TECHNIQUES**

The following 'Traffic calming techniques' are widely used in UK.

- (1) Vertical deflections include Road hump, speed table, speed cushions, rumble strips
- (2) Horizontal deflection include Chicanes
- (3) Road Narrowing
- (4) Central islands
- (5) Traffic calming at junctions includes changes in alignment, roundabout and mini roundabouts.
- (6) Gateway measures include different surface materials, traffic islands, 20/30mph road signs
- (7) Speed cameras and speed limit changes
- (8) Traffic management measures include road closures and one way streets

All the above traffic calming measures are not suitable for all the roads in **Havering**. The selected traffic calming measures are generally used depending on the road character and nature of achievement such as speed reduction and accident reduction.

##### **(b) SPEED REDUCTION**

Vertical deflections such as road humps, speed tables and speed cushions in the carriageway have a **greater impact on vehicle speeds** than any other measures. In order to achieve greater vehicle speeds reduction, the vertical deflections need to be placed close apart which may require greater funding.

##### **(c) ACCIDENT REDUCTION**

The impact of traffic calming schemes on accident levels is generally related to both the speed reducing effect of the scheme and any reduction in traffic levels as a consequence of it. Slower vehicle speeds in 20mph speed limit roads compared with 30mph or over speed limit roads, not only reduce the occurrence of the accidents, but also have a significant effect on their severity such as from fatal and serious injuries to slight injuries.

#### **(d) AIR QUALITY / HEALTH / POLLUTION**

WHAT IMPACT DO SPECIFIC SCHEMES HAVE ON AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH?

The Transport for London research suggest:

(i) 20mph zones **do not increase air pollution**. Imperial College University's evaluation of 20mph zones in London suggested they had **no net negative impact on exhaust emissions** and resulted in clear benefits to driving style and associated particulate emissions.

(ii) Speed bumps generate small, local increase in emissions, but the health impacts are likely to be **negligible**. They dramatically reduce road danger and support the Health Street Approach. It is uncertain whether speed bumps have negative impacts on air quality over the whole area of a scheme. There is good evidence they are one of the best ways to reduce vehicle speeds and are expected to reduce collisions by around 44%. Speed tables should be considered as an alternative to speed bumps.

(iii) Protected cycle lanes tend not to prolong journey time and are **not expected to increase air pollution**.