



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Notice of Non-key Executive Decision

Subject Heading:	ARDLEIGH GREEN ROAD, HORNCHURCH - COLLISION REDUCTION PROGRAMME – PROPOSED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (REFERENCE: QV005)
Decision Maker:	Imran Kazalbash Assistant Director of Public Realm, Neighbourhoods
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Barry Mugglestone
SLT Lead:	Andrew BlakeHerbert Chief Executive Officer
Report Author and contact details:	Velup Siva, Senior Engineer 01708 433142 velup.siva@havering.gov.uk
Policy context:	Havering Local Implementation Plan 2022/23 Delivery Plan
Financial summary:	The estimated cost of £0.080m for the implementation of Ardleigh Green Road scheme will be met by Transport for London through the 2022/23 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Ardleigh Green Road (C40280)
Relevant OSC:	Places
Is this decision exempt from being called-in?	Yes-Non Key

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

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

Part A – Report seeking decision

DETAIL OF THE DECISION REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDED ACTION

This Executive Decision details the findings of the formal consultation and approves the implementation of installing raised speed tables at two existing pelican crossings and two raised speed tables at existing pedestrian refuges along Ardleigh Green Road as shown on the attached Drawing Nos. QV005/1R and QV005/2R in Appendix 2.

The estimated cost of £0.080m for the design, consultation and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2022/23 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Ardleigh Green Road (C40280).

AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH DECISION IS MADE

Council's Constitution

Part 3

3.8.3. Assistant Director of Environment Delegated Powers

(s) To authorise minor alterations to traffic management orders to enable implementation of approved proposals or continuation of traffic management schemes.

(v) To exercise all powers and duties under the Highways Act 1980 that are not delegated to the Leader or Cabinet Member.

STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1.0 Background

1.1 In November 2022, Transport for London (TfL) approved funding for a number of Collisions Reduction Schemes as part of the 2022/23 Local Implementation Plan. The 'Ardleigh Green Road - Collisions Reduction Programme' was one of the schemes approved by TfL. A feasibility study has been carried out to identify potential collisions reduction measures in the area. The feasibility study looked at ways of reducing casualties and risk exposure (especially to vulnerable users) and a series of safety improvements were identified. 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 Mayor'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 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) 70% reduction in KSIs by 2030 against 2010-2014 baseline average
- (b) 0 KSIs by 2041
- (c) 0 KSIs by buses by 2030

Non-key Executive Decision

The Ardleigh Green Road Collisions Reduction Scheme was developed to help to meet the above targets.

- 1.3 A formal public consultation was carried out in January 2023 and this report details the findings of this consultation as summarised at Appendix 1. This report approves the implementation of raised pelican crossings and pedestrian refuge speed tables along Station Lane as shown on the attached Drawing No. QV006/1 in Appendix 2.

Traffic Survey Results Summary

- 1.4 Traffic surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 1500 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Ardleigh Green Road by Ardleigh Close.

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

Location	85 th Speed (mph)		Highest Speed (mph)	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
Ardleigh Green Road by Ardleigh Close	26	27	40	40
Ardleigh Green Road between Helen Road and Cecil Avenue	28	29	40	50
Ardleigh Green Road by Nelmes Way	31	32	50	45
Ardleigh Green Road by Ayloff's Walk	32	31	50	50
Ardleigh Green Road by Woodlands Avenue	32	30	50	40

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

Collisions Summary

- 1.5 In the five-year period to 30th June 2022, **sixteen** personal injury collisions (PICs) were recorded along Ardleigh Green Road. Of these sixteen PICs, one was fatal, 2 were serious; one involved pedestrians; seven involved motorcyclists and five occurred during the hours of darkness.

Non-key Executive Decision

Details of PICs are as follows:

Location	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total PIAs
Ardleigh Green Road between A127 and Ardleigh Close	0	1 (1-M/C)	0	1
Ardleigh Green Road between Ardleigh Close and Helen Road	0	0	1 (1-Dark) (1-speed)	1
Ardleigh Green Road between Helen Road and Cecil Avenue	0	0	2 (1-M/C)	2
Ardleigh Green Road / Squirrels Heath Lane / Cecil Avenue Junction	0	0	3 (3-Dark) (1/M/C)	3
Ardleigh Green Road between Squirrels Heath Lane and Michael Gardens	0	0	1 (1-M/C)	1
Ardleigh Green Road / Michael Gardens Junction	0	0	1 (1-Ped)	1
Ardleigh Green Road / Rowan Walk Junction	0	0	1 (1-M/C) (1-Dark)	1
Ardleigh Green Road / Nelmes Way Junction	1 (1-M/C) (1-speed)	0	1	2
Ardleigh Green Road between Ayloff's Walk and Wootton Close	0	0	1	1

Non-key Executive Decision

Ardleigh Green Road / Haynes Road / Woodland Avenue Junction	0	1 (1-M/C)	2	3
Total	1	2	13	16

2.0 Proposals

The following improvements are proposed to reduce vehicle speeds and collisions along Ardleigh Green Road as shown on the attached drawing Nos. QV005/1 and QV005/2.

- (a) Raised pedestrian refuge along Ardleigh Green Road outside property Nos. 154a, 154b, 154c & 154d.
- (b) Raised pelican crossing along Ardleigh Green Road outside The Ardleigh PH and properties Nos: 203,205 & 207
- (c) Raised pedestrian refuge outside All Saints Church and property Nos: 167 & 169
- (d) Raised pelican crossing outside Havering College and property Nos: 135, 137 & 139
- (e) Raised pedestrian refuge along Ardleigh Green Road outside property Nos:119 & 121
- (f) Raised pedestrian refuge along Ardleigh Green Road outside property Nos:113 & 115

3.0 Outcome of formal public consultation

- 3.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / businesses / occupiers. Approximately, 250 letters were delivered via post to an area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals.
- 3.2 Eight written responses from the Metropolitan Police, London Ambulance Services, Local Member, Better Streets for Havering and Havering residents were received and the comments are summarised in the Appendix 1. A brief summary of comments is as follows.
 - Supported the scheme (three respondents)
 - No objections in principle (one respondent)
 - Should not be an issue if the speed tables are bus friendly (one respondent)
 - Design are based on the bus guidelines (one respondent)
 - Concerns about the speed table outside the property (one respondent)
 - Do not support the proposals, request to reallocate the road space (one respondent)

Non-key Executive Decision

4.0 Officers' comments and conclusions

- 4.1 Of the eight written responses, no objection was received to the proposals except one is not supported the proposals, but stated that they do not object to the casualty reduction projects and other raised concerns about the speed table outside resident's property.
- 4.2 The Metropolitan Police, London Ambulance Services and London buses stated that they have no objections to the proposals.
- 4.3 One local members supported the scheme and no responses received from the other local Members.
- 4.4 One resident was concerned about the raised pedestrian refuges outside their property due to various reasons which are described in Appendix 1.
- 4.5 Following the formal consultation, two raised pedestrian refuges along Ardleigh Green Road by Nelmes Way will be omitted from the original proposals due to concerns, raised by the respondents. However, the existing speed cushions will be upgraded to current standards. Officers' recommend that the remaining two raised pelican crossings and two raised pedestrian refuges should be implemented along Ardleigh Green Road as shown on the revised plan QV005/1R and QV005/2R.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

None.

PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION

A formal consultation has been carried out in January 2023.

NAME AND JOB TITLE OF STAFF MEMBER ADVISING THE DECISION-MAKER

Name: Velup Siva

Designation: Senior Engineer

Signature: *V. Siva*

Date: 07/03/2023

Part B - Assessment of implications and risks

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Here officers seek approval for a scheme to construct raised pelican crossings and raised pedestrian refuges with associated works following public consultation.

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 Council's power to implement traffic calming measures in highway maintainable at public expense is set out in Part V of the Highways Act 1980 ("HA 1980"). Before making an order under this provision the Council should ensure that any relevant statutory procedures set out in section 90C, Part V of the HA 1980 and the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 ("Regulations") are complied with.

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.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

This report is asking the Assistant Director of Public Realm, Neighbourhoods to approve the implementation of the above scheme.

The estimated cost of £0.080m for feasibility, consultation, detailed design and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2022/23 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Ardleigh Green Road (C40280).

Non-key Executive Decision

This is a standard project for Public Realm 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.

HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS (AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS WHERE RELEVANT)

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 AND SOCIAL INCLUSION 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.

Non-key Executive Decision

ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

The provision of the raised zebra crossings and speed tables may change the drivers driving pattern and promote more sustainable travel and therefore this may change emissions in line with the Climate Change Action Plan 2021.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Non-key Executive Decision

Part C – Record of decision

I have made this executive decision in accordance with authority delegated to me by the Leader of the Council and in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

Decision

Proposals as recommended in the report - agreed

Details of decision maker

Signed



Name: Imran Kazalbash, Assistant Director of Public Realm, Environment

CMT Member title: Assistant Director, Public Realm, Environment
Cabinet Portfolio held: Councillor Barry Mugglestone, Cabinet Member for Environment

Head of Service title: Mark Hodgson, Head of Highways, Traffic & Parking, Environment

Date: 16/03/23

Lodging this notice

The signed decision notice must be delivered to Democratic Services, in the Town Hall.

For use by Committee Administration

This notice was lodged with me on _____

Signed _____

**APPENDIX 1
SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

RESPONSE REF:	COMMENTS	COUNCIL COMMENTS
QV005/1 (Metropolitan Police)	At this stage I have no objections in principal.	-
QV005/2 (London Ambulance Services)	As long as the speed tables are bus friendly and the works will not create full closures and emergency access can be maintained at all times then there should not be an issue.	The speed tables are bus friendly. The Council will try and minimise the delays to all traffic during the construction stage.
QV005/3 (London Buses)	<p>The old traffic calming guidance states heights are 75mm which the consultation confirms. My one area to clarify is if the plateaus are at least 6m long – most of them look ok on sight although the one outside 154 A-D Hadleigh Park Road looks like it is only just.</p> <p>The note does talk about a maximum of speed calming features along a route, however that is now much harder to enforce with the increase in 20 mph zones and the greater usage of vertical deflections required.</p> <p>Looking at the plans I do think they consulted this guidance and they are compliant.</p>	The speed tables are bus friendly and they are at least 6 metres flat top area.
QV005/4 (Local Member 1)	I welcome your proposals for this scheme.	-
QV005/5 (Havering resident 1)	I've just received your letter from about the parking that not the parking the road ants that one of you put in you your 1500	The scheme funded by the Transport for London

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>vehicles per hour is like 36,000 vehicles a day over A5 year period which you say this is done and fight the fatality of 1 and I know all fatalities are no good but the fatality of 1 and 16 personal injuries. It is it send it fantastic, I reckon pro for a road that is a major Rd. As long as the costs of this scheme that you've got, who's ever made this up. As long as it ain't coming out of the rates and the government's paying for it all and good otherwise, don't do it. Thank you.</p>	
<p>QV005/6 (Havering resident 2)</p>	<p>I would like to say that I welcome the proposed improvements, I have lived in my property for over 22 years. To give you some further justification. There have been a number of multiple incidents to my property and my neighbours' properties due to speeding cars and this has been raised with Havering Council previously. I have heard various reasons that they can't put traffic calming in because it is a bus route. However, you have it in less built up areas such as Elm Park Avenue that are on a bus route as well as Avon Road.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are a little town that has a two schools and a college in the road and I worry so much that a child is going to be killed.</p> <p>Some context:-</p>	<p>Further traffic calming measures are not necessary at this stage. It could be considered at a later date, if necessary.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>Our double front wall has been knocked down completely on two separate occasions, we are still fighting to this very day to get our money back from the insurance due to no fault of our own. It is the attitude of the drivers that it is your fault because you live near a bend. The problems seem to have been escalated since the keep left bollards were installed near houses, several years ago, near 154c because the cars are driving too fast and need to pull into the left coming road the corner.</p> <p>We have had a car written off because of a driver driving too fast and they hit and run.</p> <p>My neighbour has also had his wall knocked down twice, and my neighbour next to me once also. Both of them have had their cars hit and written off also on several occasions. We have all had verbal abuse from the drivers and passengers even though we are in our homes minding our own business.</p> <p>Just between the three homes there has been over eight incidents. The house that is on the corner of Ardleigh Close has had cars in their front garden at least three occasions and loads of damage to their property. All of these accidents could have been prevented and I can't believe that nobody</p>	
--	---	--

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>was walking past at the time and got killed.</p> <p>Going forward would you be able to consider some road calming before you get to the corner of Ardleigh Green road from 164?</p> <p>I am so terribly concerned about the speed of cars coming of the A12/A127 entering Ardleigh Green Road. I have contacted the council and police concerning this matter but unfortunately, no action has been taken. You need only to look out of my window at the speed of the drivers coming around the blind bend.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention, I appreciate that at this stage you can't respond to individuals, but could you please submit this on your summing up when you take your case to panel for them to consider?</p>	
<p>QV005/7 (Havering resident 3)</p>	<p>I would like to offer some points and comment on the proposal to raise the road islands outside my property 119/121 Ardleigh Green Road</p> <p>1) The road at that particular island point is already considerably narrower and although designed to assist pedestrians crossing, the closeness in proximity to the roundabout actually causes more problems than it resolves. Drivers exiting right from Nelmes Way regularly mount the pavement outside 117/119</p>	<p>Although the proposed raised pedestrian refuge would reduce vehicle speeds and minimise collisions, it is considered that this proposal will be omitted from the original proposals due to the concerns, raised by the residents.</p> <p>In the raised pedestrian refuge proposal, only pedestrian crossing points will be raised to same level as footways. There will be a kerb face between carriageway and the footway in other areas. This will force the drives to drive in the</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>as they misjudge the turning circle. On 2 occasions completely demolishing the outside wall of 117. Therefore, If the road is raised to pavement level at this junction they would just drive along the pavement until they feel they can safely dismount. Therefore, completely missing the purpose of its proposed function.</p> <p>2) There would be an Increased level of noise pollution which is already caused by vehicles hitting the centre of the roundabout at any speed. Despite its purpose to slow traffic the roundabout has actually had little or no affect on speed. Skip lorries, container lorries, cars with trailers travelling even at the speed limit or lower still make significant noise when hitting over the existing raised areas causing an unbelievably noisy area to live.</p> <p>3) Additional slowing of traffic in highly populated areas would raise the pollution levels. A fact about these types of traffic schemes I believe has already been scientifically proven and there is a call to remove these types of scheme, so why implement this now!!</p> <p>4) With regard to the fatality mentioned in the letter. As the eye witnesses to the accident my Wife and I can confirm this was caused by</p>	<p>carriageway. As stated, the vehicles may misjudge the roundabout and hit the kerbs.</p> <p>Site observations showed that vehicles are slowing down at the mini roundabout which is main purpose of introducing mini roundabout at this location. The Council considered that the proposed raised pedestrian refuge would not increase noise and pollution significantly, but it would reduce the vehicles speed further.</p> <p>See comments above.</p> <p>The Council aware the details of the fatal injury at</p>
--	---	--

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>the current sleeping policeman being hit by the rider on a motor cycle and losing control of the bike. The accident occurred at approx 5am when the road was traffic free. There was no other vehicle or person involved in this incident it was a one off tragic accident which could have been avoided. I would be happy to provide any further clarification on this event should you wish to understand what actually happened rather than take a statistic out of context.</p> <p>5) Loss of privacy to both properties would occur. Since the implementation of the current road planning there has been a significant increase to the volume of tailbacks outside our property (119) Traffic is regularly sat on the roundabout blocking both Nelmes Way and the entrance to 119 due to tail backs from the A127 and lack of understanding and consideration of using the mini roundabout. With car height being raised this will impact any privacy we have left.</p> <p>6) Flooding to this area, I believe this would increase as the drainage would be impacted outside 119 causing a danger and damage to all.</p> <p>I have lived at this address (119) for over 25 years and witnessed the roundabout and islands being erected</p>	<p>this location. The introduction of raised speed table would have been eliminated the risks of fatality.</p> <p>The Council considered that the proposed raised table would not increase the delays and queues significantly but it would improve road safety.</p> <p>Gullies will be provided to eliminate any ponding near the raised pedestrian refuge area.</p>
--	--	---

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>on a busy main road. This was, to my understanding, originally put in place for the college to assist its traffic management when exiting from its Nelmes Way entrance. The college stopped using that exit over 5 years ago, (probably due to the increased number of crashes the new roundabout has caused, by drivers having no idea who has priority on the roundabout.) In fact that is the main issue and cause of the many accidents I have witnessed, not speed. At that part of the road nobody knows who has priority to go first, signage is incorrectly positioned far too late on the junction for traffic to react to and know it's there. Additionally, the signage is unlit, dirty so unreadable and following numerous collisions has regularly been knocked down!</p> <p>If you check the statistics I would be interested to see the comparison in accidents etc before and after its erection as I feel it has caused more accidents and congestion than it has prevented.</p> <p>I also note that the entrance to my property via driveway is not even recorded on your plan! As you will see from the attached photo from my property.</p> <p>I wonder if that's even been taken into consideration when planning this new scheme?</p> <p>I have to turn across the road and pull out into it</p>	
--	--	--

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>daily, I doubt that's even been thought about.</p> <p>I would also note that I am not against accident management but do not believe the current proposal will have any direct effect or impact on the speed vehicles will travel at as generally these days the road is a carpark with the traffic trailing back as noted for the A127 Proper speed limit signage and proper management of the area say speed signs showing drivers how fast they are travelling and pedestrians where they should cross might be more effective. I would also suggest educating the college students who regularly walk out from either behind or in front of the buses without looking might well reduce the number of accidents / incidents. Re-sighting the bus stop by Michaels close so the island is behind the bus to accommodate the new college entrance may help prevent people randomly walking out into the road.</p> <p>I do not believe the proposal will have any benefit, in fact it will have the opposite. Unless the area is set up and controlled properly you will continue to have high accident rates.</p> <p>Should you wish to discuss any point further with a resident who has witnessed issues directly, please feel free to contact me.</p>	
QV005/8 (Better street for Havering)	We do not support these proposals.	

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>While flush crossing points are useful from a walking and wheeling point of view, there are wider systemic layout issues which encourage poor driver behaviour which humps are unlikely to solve.</p> <p>There was a scheme here in 2012 which added speed cushions at Nelmes Way and the pedestrian refuges the council now suggests need to be humped. It would appear that this scheme failed to address the issues and it is hard to see that this scheme will be different.</p> <p>We'd like the council to try something more radical such as reallocate road space for cycling to narrow the carriageway which would also have a driver speed reduction impact as set out in Manual for Streets with the speed/ road width relationship set out in Figure 16.</p> <p>We do not wish to object to collision reduction projects in Havering given how little funding the council has managed to obtain in recent years with poor quality bids, however, we cannot support the proposals.</p>	<p>The introduction of mini roundabout and pedestrian refuges have reduced the serious collisions significantly at this location. Unfortunately, a fatal collision occurred 5 years ago due to speeding motor cyclist lost control, causing fatal injury. The proposed raised pedestrian refuge would reduce vehicle speeds and minimise collisions at this location.</p> <p>It is a good idea to relocate the road space for cycling. However, it is considered that the vertical deflection features would reduce vehicle speeds significantly and minimise collisions in the area. There are two schools along Ardleigh Green Road.</p>
--	--	--

Non-key Executive Decision

APPENDIX 2

Drawing Nos. QV005/1, QV005/2, QV005/1R and QV005/2R