

## Notice of Non-key Executive Decision

<b>Subject Heading:</b>	SOUTH STREET / EASTERN ROAD ROMFORD TRAFFIC SIGNALS – CYCLE CROSSING FACILITIES (REFERENCE QR032)
<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Councillor Barry Mugglestone Cabinet Member for Environment
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Barry Mugglestone
<b>SLT Lead:</b>	Andrew Blake Herbert Chief Executive Officer
<b>Report Author and contact details:</b>	Velup Siva, Senior Engineer 01708 433142 <a href="mailto:velup.siva@havering.gov.uk">velup.siva@havering.gov.uk</a>
<b>Policy context:</b>	Havering Local Development Framework (2008)
<b>Financial summary:</b>	The estimated cost of £0.200m for implementation of this scheme will be met by S106 Contribution for Old Church Hospital (C29390)
<b>Relevant OSC:</b>	Places
<b>Is this decision exempt from being called-in?</b>	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 informal and formal consultation and approves the implementation of installing contra flow cycle lanes, a segregated two-way cycle track, signage associated with reinforcing the cycle lanes, track and existing no entry system, taxi bays amendments, new traffic islands, a traffic signal re-design, zebra crossing with cycle crossing facilities, loading bay amendments, motor cycle bays, restricted parking zone changes and minor carriageway widening in Havana Close, South Street, Eastern Road and the South Street / Eastern Road Traffic Signal Junction as shown on the attached Drawing Nos. BRJ10378-SK-001R, BRJ10378-SK-002R and SCH\_22890 in Appendix 3.

It should be noted that the estimated cost of £0.200m for the design, consultation and implementation would be met by a S106 Contribution for Old Church Hospital (C29390).

This report is asking the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve the implementation of the above scheme.

### AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH DECISION IS MADE

Council's Constitution

Part 3, Section 2.6, paragraph (y) Portfolios to be assigned to individual Cabinet Members - Highways & Traffic Schemes

### STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION

#### 1.0 Background

1.1 At a meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2021 the Highways Advisory Committee ("HAC") considered a report on the above proposals to informally consult. Following the HAC approval, the Cabinet Member for Environment approved the proposals for the informal public consultation.

1.2 An informal and a formal public consultation have been carried out in December 2021 and October 2022 respectively and this report details the findings of these consultations and approves the implementation of the measures as shown on the attached Drawing Nos. BRJ10378-SK-001R, BRJ10378-SK-002R and SCH\_22890.

#### 2.0 Proposals

2.1 The following improvements are proposed to improve cycle crossing facilities in

## Non-key Executive Decision

Havana Close, South Street and Eastern Road. The proposals are shown on the attached Drawing Nos. BRJ10378-SK-001R, BRJ10378-SK-002R and SCH\_22890.

### (a) Havana Close

The proposals include an advisory contra flow cycle lane, traffic island, coloured surfacing, motorcycle bay, relocation of taxi bay, No Entry, No waiting and No loading 'At any time' signage. These proposals will provide a safer link to South Street from Exchange Street for cyclists in the area of strategic cycling importance – ie Romford Station and Town Centre.

### (b) South Street

The proposals include a segregated mandatory cycle facility with minor carriageway widening; signage and restrictions for no motorised vehicles except buses, no motorised vehicles except solo motorcycles, buses and taxis; loading bay changes, restricted parking zone changes, and No waiting 'At any time' restrictions. These proposals will enable cyclists to travel more safely in a south east direction along South Street, again in an area of strategic cycling importance.

### (c) Eastern Road

The proposals include a segregated two-way cycle facility; removal of a traffic island; Signage and restrictions for No motorised vehicles except buses and taxis; No waiting and No loading 'At any time', minor carriageway widening; the relocation, reduction and extension of taxi bays. These proposals would improve safety, particularly for cyclists and will link to London Cycle Network Route 12.

### (d) Chandlers Way

A raised zebra crossing with cycle crossing facilities is proposed to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

### (e) South Street / Eastern Road Traffic Signal Junction

The traffic signals are to be re-designed to cater for safer cycle crossing facilities.

## **3.0 Outcome of informal public consultation**

- 3.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 700 letters were delivered via post to the area affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the proposals. Eleven written responses from the Metropolitan Police, London Ambulance Services, London Buses, Cycling representatives, Better Streets for Havering, Taxi Rank representatives and residents were received and the comments are summarised in Appendix 1. Six responses supported the scheme and the remaining raised concerns for some parts of the scheme.
- 3.2 In addition to the above responses, eighteen responses received from Chairman of the Synagogue and the synagogue worshippers, raising concerns about the two way cycle lane and removal of a parking meter. The synagogue is situated at No.

## Non-key Executive Decision

25 Eastern Road which is between Chandlers Way and the Ring Road. These respondents did not fully understand the proposals, and assumed the proposal would pass outside of the synagogue. The Council had a communication with the synagogue and informed them the extent of the proposals. The synagogue were satisfied that our proposals would not affect their activities outside their property.

- 3.3 Local Members, Town Centre Manager, Havering's Regeneration and Transport Planning team were also consulted on the revised plans. One member raised some concerns about part of the proposals but was happy to proceed with Formal consultation. No comments were received from the other two members. The Town Centre Manager, Regeneration and Transport Planning team supported the scheme.
- 3.4 Following the informal consultation, a site meeting was arranged with Metropolitan Police, London Buses, Jacobs Consultancy and Council Officers to discuss the concerns, raised during the consultation. Various details were discussed and it was agreed to revise the proposals to address any concerns. The revised proposals are shown on the attached plans.

### **4.0 Outcome of formal public consultation**

- 4.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / occupiers. Approximately, 525 letters were delivered via post to the area directly affected by the proposals. Emergency Services, bus companies, local Members and cycling representatives were also consulted on the revised proposals. Eighteen written responses from the London Ambulance Services, London Buses, cycling representatives, Taxi Rank representatives and residents were received and the comments are summarised in Appendix 2. The formal consultation proposals are shown on the attached drawings, Nos. BRJ10378-SK-001, BRJ10378-SK-002 and SCH\_22890.
- 4.2 Of the eighteen responses, eleven respondents supported the scheme; two respondents objected; one respondent has raised concerns and the remaining four have requested clarification and suggestions of some parts of the scheme. Of the two objections, one was from a Havering resident and other one was from the Transport for London's taxi rank team. The resident's objection is that the scheme is detrimental to motorists and may encourage an anti-drive attack. The Council believes that the proposed scheme will improve safety in the area and would not affect motorists significantly. The TfL's taxi rank team objected to the proposals as the scheme would provide a net loss of one taxi bay in Eastern Road. They also wanted to keep the four taxi bays in Eastern Road close to Romford Railway Station. Following lengthy discussions and site meetings, the taxi rank team have withdrawn their objection with minor changes to the taxi rank and existing taxi bays in Eastern Road close to the station. One respondent, Union representing motorcycle riders raised concerns about the loading bay in South Street and motorcycle bay in Havana Close. A meeting was arranged to discuss their concerns. Following the meeting, the Council have proposed various proposals to address their concerns. These include street lighting improvements, time changes to the motorcycle bay and allowance for motorcycles to enter from South Street

## Non-key Executive Decision

under the Railway bridge. The Council believe that these changes would address their concerns. Clarification for four respondents on proposals was also made. The majority of feasible suggestions will be considered in the detailed design stage but are all minor.

- 4.3 Local Members supported the scheme, particularly changing the loading bay to Goods vehicles only in South Street and motorcycle bays in Havana Close.
- 4.4 Following the formal consultation, it is considered appropriate that the taxi bays in Eastern Road are relocated closer to the Railway Station and South Street. The amendment of the taxi bay in Eastern Road; the 'no motorised vehicles except buses' restriction in South Street and 'no motorised vehicles except buses and taxis' restriction in Eastern Road have been formally re-advertised again. No responses have been received to these proposals.

### **5.0 Officers' comments and conclusions**

- 5.1 Of the eighteen written responses, eleven respondents supported the scheme; two respondents objected; one respondent has raised concerns and the remaining four requested clarification and suggestions to some parts of the scheme. These objections and concerns have been addressed in the revised proposals.
- 5.2. The proposals have been subjected to an independent Road Safety Audit as part of the design process.
- 5.3 The section between Eastern Road and Exchange Street does not currently provide an effective link for cyclists. The proposed scheme provides safer cycle crossing facilities through the South Street / Eastern Road Traffic Signals Junction, South Street and Havana Close to connect the east – west route and the north – south route. On-street cycle parking facilities are available in the vicinity of Romford Station. Cycling is a key transport mode to address issues associated with sustainability, air quality and public health. There are links to other areas and the proposal provides an effective and safe connection, attracting more cycling trips by Havering residents into Romford Town Centre and Romford Station.
- 5.4 The Council prepared a set of proposals which are considered appropriate for Havana Close, South Street, Eastern Road and the South Street / Eastern Road Traffic Signals Junction. These proposals will improve connectivity, should positively influence driver behaviour and will reduce the risk exposure of vulnerable road users to collisions. Officers' recommend that the proposed measures in the recommendation should be implemented.

### **OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

None

**Non-key Executive Decision**

**PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION**

All schemes are presented on Calendar Brief prior to any consultation or design. At its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2021 the Highway Advisory Committee approved the scheme for an informal consultation.

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

Name: Velup Siva

Designation: Senior Engineer

Signature: *V. Siva*

Date: 20/06/2023

## Part B - Assessment of implications and risks

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

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 Council's power to create a pedestrian crossing on roads is set out in Part III of the 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 has powers to install traffic signs on its road network by virtue of powers granted under Part V of the RTRA 1984, with s65 granting powers and giving duties for the placing of traffic signs.

The form and conditions under which traffic signs may be installed are prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions 2016 and road markings that indicate stopping controls are prescribed traffic signs for this purpose.

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.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

The estimated cost of £0.200m for feasibility, consultation, detailed design and implementation will be met by S106 Contribution (C29390).

The cost breakdown is as follows:

Item	£(m)
Feasibility, Consultation & Design	0.015
Construction/Implementation	0.185
Total	0.200

## Non-key Executive Decision

### **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 reduction in the taxi parking provision in Eastern Road and parking restriction proposals in South Street may discourage drivers from using this facility and therefore this may reduce emissions in line with the Climate Change Action Plan 2021.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

1. HAC Report (16<sup>th</sup> November 2021).
2. Non-Key Decision (November 2021)

## **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**

Proposal agreed

### **Details of decision maker**

Signed

*Barry Mugglestone*

**Name:** Councillor Barry Mugglestone, Cabinet Member for Environment

Date:02/08/2023

CMT Member title: Imran Kazelbash, 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

### **Lodging this notice**

**Non-key Executive Decision**

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 INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

<b>RESPONSE REF:</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COUNCIL COMMENTS</b>
QR032/1 (Metropolitan Police )	The following concerns were raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- tactile paving removal affect partly sighted people.</li><li>- Contra flow cycle lane may confuse vehicles users</li><li>- Use of elephant foot print markings may confuse cyclists</li><li>- Use of bollards in the middle of two way cycle lane may be a risk for collisions</li><li>- How are cyclists to gain access from South Street turning right into the bi directional cycle lane?</li><li>- I do like the segregated stop line for cyclists on South Street.</li></ul>	Following informal consultation and the site meeting, the proposals were revised to address all of the concerns raised. Metropolitan Police are now happy with the revised proposals.
QR032/2 (Havering Cycling representative)	It is very welcome and we are very keen for it to proceed. It would be worth considering changing the rights of way at this point so that traffic from Chandlers Way has to yield to traffic in Eastern Road?	
QR032/3 (Better Streets for Havering)	We are writing to give our full support to this scheme as it is a much needed update to the junction which will connect east-west and north-south cycle routes. We have some comments that we would request are taken into account. These include reducing island in Havana Close, cycle lanes to Western Road, cycle track island risk, Eastern Road cycle track surface in red, Cycle track bollards' risk, non-complaint cycle track markings and a zebra crossing (with eastbound cycling) in Chandlers Way	Revised proposals addressed the majority of concerns. The remaining will be considered at the detailed design stage.
QR032/4 (Havering Resident 1 )	Improved cycle facilities at this location is a brilliant idea. I don't cycle myself, but anything that encourages it, and makes it safer is surely a must.	-
QR032/5 (Havering Resident 2)	I just want to welcome these proposed works and look forward to their approval.	-

**Non-key Executive Decision**

	I used to live just south of the town centre and travelling around that area was inconvenient if you weren't going in the right direction. Having full two-way access for cycles makes South Street significantly more accessible.	
QR032/6 (Havering Resident 3)	I was so pleased to read your consultation documents on the proposed cycle lanes being introduced In Romford, I hope that they are brought in as planned and that this is just the start of a Borough wide drive to increase cycling lanes and encourage more residents to take up cycling.	-
QR032/7 (Havering Resident 4)	It is important to encourage and facilitate cycling across our Borough. This will help to reduce traffic, improve health and keep riders safer. With that in mind, I shall start by thanking the Borough for proposals to achieve that. However, I do not believe that these proposals are the best available regarding the risk from buses and deliveroo drivers risk..	Revised proposals addressed these concerns.
QR032/8 (Havering Resident 5)	I wish to add my support to this proposal	-
QR032/9 (London Buses)	I have concerns regarding the Cycle Lane on Eastern Road going across the junction of Chandlers Way.  This is an extremely busy junction with a high frequency bus usage. I do have concerns regarding site lines for both cycles & buses and feel this has a high risk of Bus v Cyclist.	Following informal consultation and the site meeting, the proposals were revised to address all the concerns raised. London Buses are happy with the revised proposals.
QR032/10 (London Ambulance Services)	I would have concerns regarding conflict between cyclist and other road users (buses) with these proposals in Eastern Road.	Revised proposals addressed these concerns.
QR032/11 (Taxi Rank Representative)	TfL Taxi and Private Hire have not been consulted in relation to these changes before a public consultation has gone out. Some of these changes involve moving taxi ranks and may well effect a busy taxi rank on Eastern Road.	Additional taxi bays will be provided in Eastern Road. However the majority of taxi bays are not currently utilised by

**Non-key Executive Decision**

		taxis.
QR032/12 (18 responses received Synagogue worshipers)	Concerns about two way cycle lane and parking meter removal outside No. 25 Eastern Road where Synagogue is located.	The synagogue worshipers did not fully understand the proposals. The Council are not proposing anything outside of the synagogue. Staff advised to the respondents who are happy with the response.

**APPENDIX 2  
SUMMARY OF FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

<b>RESPONSE REF:</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COUNCIL COMMENTS</b>
QR032/F/1 (Local Member 1 )	Happy with the scheme, particularly loading bay proposal. This is wonderful news.	-
QR032/F/2 (Local Member 2 )	Ask for clarification on the proposals.	The details were provided and no further comments were received.
QR032/F/3 (Local Member 3)	Highlight any changes made since we last spoke in the meeting.	The proposal changes were clarified. The member previously supported the scheme for formal consultation. No further comments were received.
QR032/F/4 (Cabinet Member for Public Realm)	I was aware of the proposal	-
QR032/F/5 (Havering Resident 1)	I welcome the removal of the bikes in Romford near the station, its intimidating walking past the group of mainly young men, who do not make way for the pedestrians and prams, mobility scooter. I understand that they are helping local businesses but another location in a side street would be more convenient.	-
QR032/6 (Havering Resident 2)	I agree with the proposals to change the restrictions however I would propose the delivery mopeds serving McDonalds in Chandlers Way. It is only driver preventing them parking in that carpark and walking round to South Street via Eastern Road	-
QR032/F/7 (Havering Resident 3)	These delivery scooters parking and occupying a loading bay all day and night are on South Street, are blocking what is essentially pavement. They are also entering a part of South Street that is for buses and cycle use only, erratic driving also adds to the dangerous way they use this part of South Street and Western Road.	-
QR032/F/8 (Havering cyclists)	I would like to submit my view regarding the proposals. These are suggestions	The majority of suggestions will be

**Non-key Executive Decision**

	that deserve to be implemented and I very much support this scheme once these observations have been looked into and hopefully included.	considered at the detail design stage and hopefully will be included in the implementation.
QR032/F/9 (Coordinators for Havering cyclists and better streets for Havering)	Both organisations strongly support the proposals. We do have some further comments on the drawings in the table below and hope that these can be taken into account in the detailed design stage.	The majority of suggestions will be considered at the detail design stage and hopefully will be included in the implementation
QR032/F/10 (Havering Resident 4)	I am writing in support of the proposal to improve cycling facilities in Romford town centre.	-
QR032/F/11 (Regeneration team)	Support for the proposals	-
QR032/F/12 (London Ambulance Services)	The scheme seems to be formalising the existing scheme with minor alterations to road layouts and kerb-lines, I cannot see it causing us too many issues.	-
QR032/F/13 (Romford Civic Society)	<p>The Society whole-heartedly supports the proposal. In particular we are extremely supportive of the proposal to move the delivery-bike waiting area to Havana Close, and to sharpen and clarify restrictions on the loading bay outside units at 110 and 112-116 South Street (until recently a Coop store).</p> <p>We would like to suggest the following items for consideration, which may help to make the scheme even stronger.</p> <p>There is a plethora of street signage in this area of Romford already, creating a confusing and cluttered effect. If it were possible to simplify and reduce the total amount of signage in the area as part of this scheme, that would be welcome.</p> <p>We would like to see greater discipline in access to the centre of the town than at present, when many drivers seem to ignore restrictions and drive into South Street. In this context, we suggest that signage for the entrance to the area covered by this scheme from the Victoria Road side of the station be signed as being for “authorised vehicles only”, rather</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The majority of suggestions will be considered at the detail design stage and hopefully will be included in the implementation.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>than the proposed (weaker) “except for access”. It seems to us that almost anyone can claim to have driven into the restricted area for access to something. To enforce this we suggest that the same technology be used as enforces restrictions on areas near schools.</p> <p>We felt there was a lack of clarity in the proposed signage, with it being wholly unclear where the area only for cycles and buses actually starts. There seem to be cycle markings in the road in the proposed scheme before people have been told that the area is reserved for cyclists and buses – this seems particularly to be the case in South Street.</p> <p>To clarify which different types of traffic are permitted in different parts of the scheme, we suggest differentiated road surfacing be used (as has been done near Chelmsford Station) to indicate where buses only should travel.</p> <p>We hope our support for the scheme, and our observations on how it seems to us it could be made even stronger, are of interest.</p>	
QR032/F/14 (Romford Recorder)	<p>I have seen that the delivery bikes often parking up by Romford station are to be moved to Havana Close, following a consultation.</p> <p>By 12.30pm tomorrow, could you please provide a response outlining;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• when the consultation was run,</li><li>• why Havana Close was chosen,</li><li>• and the benefits to moving the delivery bikes from South Street to the new location?</li></ul>	The details were provided.
QR032/F/15 (Havering Resident 5 )	<p>I am against the proposed scheme as it is detrimental to drivers and another anti driver attack.</p>	The Council considered that the scheme would provide safety improvement to all road users,

Non-key Executive Decision

		particularly for cyclists.
QR032/F/16 ( Transport for London taxi rank team)	We would object very strongly to this scheme as outlined in the e-mail.	Following the lengthy discussion, the TfL's taxi rank team has withdrawn their objections with minor changes to the taxi bays close to the station.
QR032/F/17 (Independent workers union of Great Britain)	<p>We are writing to ask that you halt the consultation process until you have met with representatives of our union to discuss the problems we detail below, and possible solutions.</p> <p>Delivery drivers uniting with IWGB union believe the move to Havana Close will bring problems for drivers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Havana Close is dimly lit and away from public view, putting the safety of drivers and our vehicles at risk</li> <li>• Havana Close is small and it is unclear how many spaces will be available</li> <li>• Drivers cannot return to Havana Close within 30 minutes, meaning the number of orders we can collect will be limited. As we are paid per order this will result in a severe loss of earnings.</li> <li>• Enforcement of the changes will result in parking fines which would be debilitating for underpaid, precarious workers such as ourselves.</li> <li>• If delivery drivers do not have sufficient space to park and we are delayed collecting orders this will result in penalties from the app companies, and put us at risk of having our accounts terminated.</li> </ul>	<p>Following the request, a Teams meeting has been arranged to discuss the concerns.</p> <p>Following the meeting, the Council has recommended various improvements to address their concerns. These include street lighting improvements, motorcycle bay time changes etc. The council believed that the above changes would address the majority of their concerns.</p>
QR032/F/18 (London buses)	<p>- Just need to ensure that the Road Safety Audit is ok with cyclists coming from Havana Close turning right into South Street being relied upon to obey the give way.</p> <p>- The signage has change on South Street from</p> <p>Just need to make sure that TfL operational vehicles continued to be</p>	The suggestions will be considered at the detailed design stage.

**Non-key Executive Decision**

	'whitelisted' and allowed through the new restriction.	
--	--	--

**Non-key Executive Decision**

**APPENDIX 3**

Drawing Nos. BRJ10378-SK-001R, BRJ10378-SK-002R, SCH\_22890,  
BRJ10378-SK-001 and BRJ10378-SK-002