

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 11 February 2020

| Subject Heading: | UPPER BRENTWOOD ROAD/ BEAUMONT CLOSE JUNCTION CASUALTY REDUCTION PROGRAMME – PROPOSED MINI ROUNDABOUT (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 £0.012m for implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2019/20 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Upper Brentwood Road (A3071). |

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

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

SUMMARY

Upper Brentwood Road / Beaumont Close Junction Casualty Reduction Programme 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 a mini roundabout road markings and road signs to improve access and reduce danger at this junction. 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 Squirrels Heath ward.



- 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 mini roundabout with road markings and road signs as shown on the drawing No. QP004-5/U be implemented:
- 2. That, it be noted that the estimated costs of £0.012m, will be met from the Transport for London's (TfL) 2019/20 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Upper Brentwood Road.

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 'Upper Brentwood Road/Beaumont Close Junction Casualty Reduction Programme was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study was carried out to identify potential casualty reduction measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing casualties to improve Beaumont Close access. A mini roundabout with road markings, and road signs 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.
- 1.2 The Government and Transport for London have set targets for 2020 to reduce Killed or Serious Injury collisions ("KSIs") 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.
- 1.3 The Mayor's Vision Zero Strategy aims to eliminate deaths and serious injuries on London's road and street network including **Havering** roads in light of previous incidents. The Mayor'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 roads and streets 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
- (c) 70% reduction in KSIs by 2030 against 2010-2014 baseline average
- (d) 0 KSIs by 2041
- (e) 0 KSIs by buses by 2030

The Upper Brentwood Road / Beaumont Close mini roundabout Scheme was developed to help to meet the above targets.

Traffic Survey Results Summary

1.4 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 1100 vehicles per hour during peak periods and vehicle speeds are up 45mph along Upper Brentwood Road in the vicinity of Beaumont Close.

Injury Collision Data

1.5 In the five-year period to 31st December 2018, **two** personal injury collisions (PICs) were recorded along Upper Brentwood Road in the vicinity of Beaumont Close and Ferguson Road. Both PICs were slight injuries. In the past, the PICs involved a wall being knocked down.

Proposals

1.6 A mini roundabout and road signs are proposed at the Upper Brentwood Road / Beaumont Close Junction to reduce vehicle speeds, minimise collisions and improve access to Beaumont Close.

2.0 Outcome of public consultation

- 2.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 70 letters were delivered by hand 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, the Metropolitan Police and residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix 1. A local member is in favour of the scheme. Metropolitan Police advised on the signage. Five residents opposed to 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 the Appendix 2.

3.0 Officers' comments and conclusions

3.1 The collision analysis indicated that **two** personal injury collisions (PICs) were recorded along Upper Brentwood Road in the vicinity of Beaumont Close. Both PICs were slight injuries. In the past, two PICs at this junction involved the walls of property No.567 Upper Brentwood Road being knocked down.

- 3.2 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 Upper Brentwood Road. 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 minimise collisions along Upper Brentwood Road by Beaumont Close.

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 £0.012m 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 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 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:

- 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.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

| RESPONSE REF: | COMMENTS | STAFF COMMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| QS015/1 (Local Member) | If there is enough space to insert a mini roundabout, I am fully in favour of the installation. It will be interesting to hear what residents think of the idea. | There is a space for smaller centre dome mini roundabout. |
| QS015/2 (Metropolitan Police) | Police have recommendation that diagram 611(TSRGD 2016) is placed on the approaches to the proposed mini roundabout. | This will be provided on all approaches to the mini roundabout |
| QS015/3 (Upper Brentwood Road resident 1) | We are writing to express our concerns with the proposed mini roundabout. We live one of two houses that will be sitting directly on top of the roundabout. This will mean it will become nigh on impossible to reverse onto our driveways to park. The mini roundabout would mean that we would have to drive onto our driveways and reverse off again; reversing onto a mini roundabout is dangerous. Having lived in our house for 13 years we can honestly say that the stream of traffic going into and coming out of Beaumont Close has not increased enough to warrant a mini roundabout; so we would like to know why this has been proposed? It will cost a lot of money to put in because there are manhole covers that would need to be moved. Surely the money this would cost would be better spent on fixing the many potholes that currently on the road to put a mini roundabout in and wonder if you would be proposing to make the pavements narrower, which on a busy road is a safety issue. Upper Brentwood Road is used by a lot of HGV lorries and the 496 double decker buses. If you were to put a mini roundabout in, we think these vehicles would find it very difficult to manoeuvre. We concrete that at certain that at certain periods of the day traffic does queue up on Upper Brentwood Road in the direction of Main Road, but we fail to see how the addition of a mini roundabout would prevent this congestion. If your | See staff comments below this table. |

| reasoning behind it is to make it easier for Beaumont Close residents to enter and exit their road, may be suggest putting a yellow box junction in instead, The yellow box junction on Main Road acts as a good deterrent to drivers who are turning right onto Main Road to prevent the crossing being blocked. We think the current problem on Upper Brentwood Road is how quickly people drive around the bend close to Ferguson Avenue. Has the Council considered putting traffic calming measures on this section of the road? Our final concern with having a mini roundabout directly outside our house is that it would affect the value of our property and would also be detrimental to the saleability. If this scheme were to go ahead, we would seek compensation from Havering Council. I have lived here; I have only seen two accidents in this area and both involved brick walls being broken through drivers speeding around the bend from the bollards. Beaumont Close is no through Road with only 19 houses so how does this warrant the expense of a mini roundabout to improve the residents access, does someone special live down there? In this time of austerity, I am sure the money can be put to better use in the Borough such as reducing pot holes and improving the roads. With the amount of traffic already using Upper Brentwood Road the residents have difficulty in parking and getting on and off their driveways at the moment, this will only make it more difficult. It appears that you are solving perceived problems for the residents of Beaumont Close and creating issues for a lot more people. Specially, in my case, the proposed mini roundabout would appear to be directly | See staff comments below this table. |
|--|---|
| | |
| | Beaumont Close residents to enter and exit their road, may be suggest putting a yellow box junction in instead, The yellow box junction on Main Road acts as a good deterrent to drivers who are turning right onto Main Road to prevent the crossing being blocked. We think the current problem on Upper Brentwood Road is how quickly people drive around the bend close to Ferguson Avenue. Has the Council considered putting traffic calming measures on this section of the road? Our final concern with having a mini roundabout directly outside our house is that it would affect the value of our property and would also be detrimental to the saleability. If this scheme were to go ahead, we would seek compensation from Havering Council. I have lived here; I have only seen two accidents in this area and both involved brick walls being broken through drivers speeding around the bend from the bollards. Beaumont Close is no through Road with only 19 houses so how does this warrant the expense of a mini roundabout to improve the residents access, does someone special live down there? In this time of austerity, I am sure the money can be put to better use in the Borough such as reducing pot holes and improving the roads. With the amount of traffic already using Upper Brentwood Road the residents have difficulty in parking and getting on and off their driveways at the moment, this will only make it more difficult. It appears that you are solving perceived problems for the residents of Beaumont Close and creating issues for a lot more people. Specially, in my case, the proposed mini roundabout would appear to be directly across my dropped kerb meaning it would make it very dangerous for me to park and reverse out onto a roundabout. It would also appear that you are |

| | outside my house meaning the public | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | would be walking closer and potentially on my driveway invading my property and privacy. Buses already make the house tremble, | |
| | you would be bringing them closer to my home causing potential damage to my | |
| | property and again invading my privacy. | |
| | This will cause problems for me visitors getting on and off my driveway as there would be less access and issues for any | |
| | deliveries that I may be receiving. There is also the concern for me and my | |
| | close neighbours that this will devalue our properties and I will be seeking advice on this. | |
| | There are other options possible rather than a mini roundabout. Yellow box | |
| | markings where the current keep clear | |
| | sign is, left turn only from Beaumont Close and sleeping policeman on the | |
| | approach to the bend near the bollards at | |
| | Fergusion Avenue. It is speeding around | |
| QS015/5 | this bend that causes the issues. We oppose the proposed installation of a | See staff comments |
| (Upper Brentwood Road resident 3) | mini roundabout at the junction of Beaumont Close and Upper Brentwood Road. | below this table. |
| | Where you propose this roundabout, it will be very difficult to get off the drives. | |
| | Also we feel this roundabout will devalue our properties, a s we have lived here for | |
| | 45years, I feel the need of a roundabout, unnecessary Beaumont Close is a no | |
| | through road and very little traffic uses it. We feel it is money that could be used | |
| | elsewhere. A mini roundabout at | |
| | Beaumont Close is unnecessary. We feel | |
| | a speed bump would be more useful at the junction of Ferguson Avenue/Upper | |
| | Brentwood Road because of the bend; | |
| | drivers do not always slow down there and there have been numerous accidents. | |
| QS015/6 (Upper Brentwood Road resident 4) | I feel this will be a total waste of Council money and will cause more congestion to what is already a really busy road, namely Upper | See staff comments below this table. |
| | Brentwood Road. | |

| | If a vehicle wanted to go around this mini roundabout, which they would have the right to do, there is not enough room without going on to the pavement, putting pedestrians at risk of injury. What would happen is the vehicles would end up going into Beaumont Close and turning around causing upset to the residents. | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | There is already a "Keep Clear" sign at the junction of Upper Brentwood Road / Beaumont Close, if you changed this to a yellow box or keep it as is with signs telling motorists to keep out of the box, - in the extreme the Council could put a camera at the junction to fine motorists who disregard the signs and enter the yellow box without the exit being clear, see below: | |
| | Rule 174 of the highway code Box junctions. These have criss-cross yellow lines painted on the road (see 'Road markings'). You MUST NOT enter the box until your exit road or lane is clear. However, you may enter the box and wait when you want to turn right, and are only stopped from doing so by oncoming traffic, or by other vehicles waiting to turn right. If the residents of Beaumont Close wanted to turn right they could enter the yellow box and wait for the opportunity to exit the yellow box and not be at risk of a fine. Also they would have an easy opportunity to turn left into Upper Brentwood Road ahead of the traffic approaching from their right. | |
| QS015/7 (Beaumont Close resident) | This would be more cost effective and provide income for the council Like many residents of the close I am very surprised to hear that the council are planning to install a mini roundabout at | See staff comments below this table. |

| the junction of Beaumont close and Upper Brentwood Road. It would seem that there has been little, or no thought to the issues we have when trying to exit Beaumont Close. | |
|--|--|
| The issue is that when exiting from Beaumont close whether you are turning left or right due to the angle of the bend to the right you have limited or no visibility of traffic travelling along Upper Brentwood Road towards the direction of Main Road. I myself have been hit whilst trying to exit the close by a car travelling at a high speed. If you are in a small car you have no visibility due to residents in Upper Brentwood Road having fences and hedges that have increased in height. We frequently incur rude language and signs from drivers when trying to exit the close. | |
| We have raised the issue of speed on many occasions with the council and councillors but nothing has been done to reduce the speed of traffic travelling along this stretch of road. | |
| I am not aware that there has been any monitoring of traffic and speeds along this section of road since the matters was raised and feel that the installation of a mini roundabout is purely a cheap option by Havering Council so that they can say they have taken notice and acted for the residents. Virtually every other long road in the area now has speed/calming bumps. There is also concern for the school children who cross at this end of Upper Brentwood Road. The traffic island does not provide a safe crossing. | |
| Our close would be keen to see the issues are looked into and a proper survey of traffic is undertaken along with monitoring of speeds and a scheme that will address the issues. | |
| In our opinion installing a mini roundabout at this junction will neither slow the traffic in Upper Brentwood Road or assist | |

| anyone existing Beaumont Close and would just be a complete waste of time and money. | |
|---|--|
| I would also like to put myself forward to speak at the meeting if I am the first person to register an interest. | |

STAFF COMMENTS

The Transport for London casualty records showed that two personal injury accidents had occurred along Upper Brentwood Road in the vicinity of Beaumont Close and Ferguson Road junctions over three year period to 31st of December 2018. In the past, the front wall of property No. 567 Upper Brentwood Road near the junction damaged as a result of the collision.

Transport for London approved funding in December 2018 to improve access at the Upper Brentwood Road / Beaumont Close Junction. This scheme was included as part of a Highways Advisory Committee request process. Following an accident, involving a wall being knocked down, local residents and local Members raised concerns regarding the danger at this location. As a result, the Council proposed the installation of a mini roundabout to improve access and reduce vehicle speeds at this location.

Officers have considered the consequential effect of the roundabout on vehicular access/egress from and the scheme will retain all existing footway and will not require any physical changes to the existing kerb lines.

Although the visitors will not be able to park their vehicles outside two properties Nos. 594 and 596 Upper Brentwood Road within the mini roundabout, the parking spaces for visitors are available in Beaumont Close, opposite to these properties.

The alternative proposals suggested by residents of a yellow box markings and right turn ban are not suitable for this location. The speed control hump or speed table at the pedestrian refuge would cause noise and vibration to the nearby properties

APPENDIX 2 SUMMARY OF CASULATY 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 heath 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.**