



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Notice of Non-key Executive Decision

Subject Heading:	HACTON LANE, UPMINSTER - COLLISION REDUCTION SCHEME – PROPOSED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (REFERENCE: QW001)
Decision Maker:	Councillor Barry Mugglestone Cabinet Member for Environment
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Barry Mugglestone
SLT Lead:	Imran Kazalbash Director of Environment
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 £0.100m for the implementation of Hacton Lane scheme will be met by Transport for London through the 2023/24 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Hacton Lane (C41260)
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

Non-key Executive Decision

DETAIL OF THE DECISION REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDED ACTION

This Executive Decision seeks approval for the installation of: a raised pelican crossing, raised pedestrian traffic islands, speed tables, rumble strip areas, a vehicle activated sign, street lighting improvements, repeater 30mph signs, warning sign and road markings as shown on the attached Drawing Nos. QW001/1DD, WQ001/2DD, QW001/3DD, QW001/4DD and QW001/5DD in Appendix 2.

The estimated cost of £0.100m for the design, consultation and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2023/24 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Hacton Lane (C41260).

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

Background

- 1.1 In November 2022, Transport for London (TfL) approved funding for a number of Collisions Reduction Schemes as part of the 2023/24 Local Implementation Plan. The 'Hacton Lane' - Collisions Reduction Scheme' 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 an informal 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's roads. 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

The Hacton Lane Collisions Reduction Scheme was developed to help to meet the above targets.

Non-key Executive Decision

- 1.3 An informal public consultation was carried out in October 2023 and this report details the findings of this consultation as summarised in Appendix 1. This report seeks to approve the implementation of a raised pelican crossing, raised pedestrian traffic islands, speed tables, rumble strip areas, a vehicle activated sign, street lighting improvements, repeater 30mph signs, warning sign and road markings as shown on the attached Drawing Nos. QW001/1DD, QW001/2DD, QW001/3DD, QW001/4DD and QW001/5DD in Appendix 2.

Traffic Survey Results Summary

- 1.4 Traffic surveys were carried out between 25th March 2021 and 31st March 2021 and recorded two-way traffic flows for a seven day period. The surveys showed that two-way traffic flows are up to 1300 vehicles per hour during peak periods along Hacton Lane.

Location	85 th ile Speed (mph)		Highest Speed (mph)		Mean Speed (mph)	
	N-bound	S-bound	N-bound	S-bound	N-bound	S-bound
Hacton Lane by Ravenscourt Grove	32	33	45	50	28	29
Hacton Lane by Alma Avenue	36	37	50	50	32	33
Hacton Lane by Derby Avenue	35	37	50	55	30	30
Hacton Lane by Little Gaynes Lane	30	30	40	40	26	27

The speed surveys show that 85th percentile traffic speeds (the speed at which 85% of vehicles are travelling at or below) exceeds the 30mph speed limit along Hacton Lane in three of the four sites where speed surveys were carried out. Recorded speeds were highest at sites two and three by Alma Lane and Derby Avenue. Generally where 85th percentile speeds are above 35mph Officers would consider there to be demonstrable and evidenced based issues associated with speeding vehicles.

Collisions Summary

- 1.5 In the five-year period to 30th June 2022, **twenty** personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded along Hacton Lane between Upminster Road and Park Farm Road. Of these twenty PIAs, one was fatal, five were serious; two involved pedestrians and five occurred during the hours of darkness.

Non-key Executive Decision

Details of PIAs are as follows:

Location	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total PIAs
Hacton Lane between Upminster Road and Ravenscourt Grove	0	1	1 (1-Ped)	2
Hacton Lane / Ravenscourt Grove Junction	0	0	3 (1-Wet)	3
Hacton Lane / Alma Avenue Junction	0	1 (1-Dark)	2	3
Hacton Lane between Alma Avenue and Derby Avenue	0	1 (1-Wet)	0	1
Hacton Lane between Derby Avenue and Little Gaynes Lane	1	0	0	1
Hacton Lane / Little Gaynes Lane Junction	0	1	6 (1-Dark) (1-Wet) (1-Ped)	7
Hacton Lane between Little Gaynes Lane and Park Farm Road	0	1 (1-Dark)	1 (1-Dark) (1-Wet)	2
Hacton Lane / Park Farm Road Junction	0	0	1 (1-Dark) (1-Wet)	1
Total	1	5	14	20

Non-key Executive Decision

Proposals

1.6 A series of proposals are set out in detail below along with the rationale behind them. In each case the proposals have been developed considering site conditions and considering the recorded personal injury collisions that have occurred. The proposals are also shown in Appendix 2.

Hacton Lane between Upminster Road and Ravenscourt Grove

1.7 The speed survey showed that 85thile vehicle speeds are slightly higher than the posted speed limit along Hacton Lane by Ravenscourt Grove. Collision analysis showed that two PIAs occurred between Upminster Road and Ravenscourt Grove. Since a low level of collisions are occurred along this stretch of Hacton Lane compared to other locations along Hacton Lane, no proposals are proposed.

Hacton Lane between Ravenscourt Grove and Alder Avenue

1.8 Analysis of the speed surveys indicates that 85thile vehicle speeds are high in Hacton Lane by Alma Avenue and Derby Avenue. Collision analysis showed that five personal injury accidents occurred in this stretch of road. Of these five PIAs, one was fatal; two were serious and two were slight injuries. The following speed reduction measures have been proposed to improve safety based on the above collision analysis

- (a) Raised sinusoidal speed table along Hacton Lane between Railway Bridge and Alma Avenue.
- (b) Raised sinusoidal speed table along Hacton Lane south of Alma Avenue.
- (c) Raised pedestrian traffic islands along Hacton Lane between Alma Avenue and Derby Avenue
- (d) Raised pelican crossing along Hacton Lane south of Derby Avenue.
- (e) Raised sinusoidal speed table outside property Nos. 117 and 119.

Hacton Lane between Alder Avenue and Park Farm Road

1.9 Analysis of the speed surveys indicates that 85thile vehicle speeds are within the speed limit in Hacton Lane by Little Gaynes Lane. Collision analysis showed that ten personal injury accidents occurred in this stretch of road. Of these ten PIAs, two were serious and four occurred during the hours of darkness. Hacton Lane between Little Gaynes Lane and Park Farm Road is unlit. The following speed reduction measures have been proposed to improve safety based on the above collision analysis.

- (a) No right turn ban on Little Gaynes Lane at its south junction with Hacton Lane.
- (b) No left turn ban on Little Gaynes Lane at its north junction with Hacton Lane.
- (c) Vehicle activate sign along Hacton Lane south of Little Gaynes Lane
- (d) Rumble strip areas and repeater 30mph signs along Hacton Lane between Little Gaynes Lane and Park Farm Road.
- (e) Street lighting upgrade at its junction with Little Gaynes Lane

Non-key Executive Decision

3.0 Outcome of formal public consultation

- 3.1 Letters, describing the proposals were delivered to local residents / businesses / occupiers. Approximately, 300 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 Twenty-nine written responses were received from Metropolitan Police, cycling representatives, Better Streets for Havering and Havering residents. The comments are summarised in the Appendix 1. A brief summary of comments is as follows.
- 83% respondents supported the scheme
 - 3% respondents objected the scheme
 - 66% respondents raised concerns about left and right turn bans
 - 38% respondents requested additional measures

4.0 Officers' comments and conclusions

- 4.1 Of the twenty-nine written responses, twenty-one respondents supported majority of the scheme while one respondent objected to the scheme. Nineteen respondents have raised concerns about the right and left turn bans.
- 4.2 The Metropolitan Police, Havering Cyclists and Better Street for Havering supported the scheme.
- 4.3 Following the meeting with local Members, all local members supported the scheme.
- 4.4 Eleven respondents suggested various additional measures such as speed cameras, mini roundabouts, a one-way system, additional rumble strip areas and additional speed tables. The proposed measures are considered to be adequate to reduce collisions along Hacton Lane. Further measures could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.
- 4.5 Following the consultation, right and left turn bans along Little Gaynes Lane at its junction with Hacton Lane will be omitted from the original proposals due to concerns, raised by the respondents. Officers' recommend that the remaining proposals as detailed above should be implemented along Hacton Lane as shown on the attached drawing Nos. QW001/1DD, QW001/2DD, QW001/3DD, QW001/4DD and QW001/5DD in Appendix 2.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

None.

Non-key Executive Decision

PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION

A formal consultation has been carried out in October 2023.

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

Name: Velup Siva

Designation: Senior Engineer

Signature: *V. Siva*

Date: 02/01/2024

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

The estimated cost of £0.100m which include feasibility, consultation, detailed design and implementation will be met by Transport for London through the 2023/24 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Casualty Reduction Programme – Hacton Lane (C41260) which at the time of this report has sufficient available budget.

This is a standard project for Highways 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.

Non-key Executive Decision

The costing breakdown is as follows:

Item	£(m)
Feasibility, Consultation & Design	0.015
Construction/Implementation	0.085
Total Value	0.100

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

Non-key Executive Decision

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.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

The provision of the raised pelican 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

Barry Mugglestone

Name: Councillor Barry Mugglestone, Cabinet Member for Environment

Date: 11/01/2024

CMT Member title: Tony Galloway, 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

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
QW001/1 (Metropolitan Police)	I welcome the proposed speed reduction methods here. You may wish to also reconsider rumble strips to have a raised vertical feature instead to reduce speeds further.	- Additional vertical features could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.
QW001/2 (Havering cyclists)	We the support the proposals. We are pleased to see traffic calming to make the crossing of Hacton Lane safer for walkers, wheelers and cyclists both at Gaynes Parkway for users of NCN136 and at the junction of Bevan Way and Newbury Gardens which is a popular route for cyclists wishing to avoid the A124.	-
QW001/3 (Hacton Lane Resident 1)	I am in full agreement with anything that will either reduce the amount of traffic and the excess speeds	-
QW001/4 (Hacton Lane Resident 2)	I am in favour of all the suggestions, apart from one with one further suggestion. The proposed right turn ban from Little Gaynes Lane to Hacton Lane would force vehicles to use the other side of the junction to turn right. Due to the angle of that road, some vehicles (including panelled vans) would not be able to see oncoming traffic from their left-hand side. People who are not familiar with the road do this occasionally and they have no option but to pull out slowly, hoping that no vehicles are approaching. Imposing this right turn ban would create an unnecessary safety risk and rather than prevent accidents it would inevitably cause them.	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.
QW001/5 (Bevan Way Resident 1)	First and foremost, a massive thank you to whoever is responsible for proposing these particular safety improvements. From a Bevan Way resident for over 20 years, this junction has been a source of anxiety and trepidation almost every time I venture out in the car. I'm sure you know the failings of	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents'

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>the current layout here but just to be clear I'll reiterate. Pulling out from an Alma avenue direction and attempting to turn right on to Hacton Lane is always taken with a leap of faith and an almost close my eyes and hope for the best kind of mind set. The way the southbound Hacton Lane traffic has two lanes (due to the turn right box) is double difficult to navigate, especially when a 'helpful' turn righter flashes you to go and encourages you to drive straight in to the flow of traffic which is squeezing past them on the far side. The only way to make this junction safer AND slow traffic, is with the addition of a mini roundabout as shown in my attachment. This will also have the added benefit of reducing congestion as it will help vehicles turn on to Hacton Lane. Any other solution would just be half hearted. In regard to the proposal of a safer pedestrian crossing at the existing pedestrian refuge, I find the fact that this has been highlighted as a high pedestrian traffic area is fantastic and I applaud anyone who has been involved with trying to make this safer. Anything to be done to improve the safety of this crossing section of Hacton Lane would most welcomed. The proposed no right turn, as highlighted in the attached picture, is an extremely dangerous proposal in regard to vans, lorries, and cars with no side back windows. If you cannot see out of the rear side window, there is no way of seeing traffic approaching on Hacton Lane (Hornchurch bound). Vans in particular have only side windows at the front and if you were to use this junction as being demanded by the no right turn signs, you would have to edge out blind and just hope and pray no traffic is coming. Please, as a matter of urgency, have someone involved with these proposals either drive a van or a vehicle without rear side windows in the manner in which these signs are dictating and see for yourselves what an unbelievably dangerous proposition this is.</p>	<p>concerns. Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
QW001/6 (Havering resident 1)	We believe that the raised crossings would cause speeders to slow down and we are in favour of these. Furthermore, the speeding continues past the railway line on Hacton	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>Lane between Upminster Road and Ravenscroft Grove where drivers race to beat the traffic lights. Please can a raised traffic island/crossing be considered on this stretch of road as well. We note the proposed slow signs, electric speed signs and rumble strips which may help but in our experience, these are unlikely to make a big improvement. Drivers who speed without consequences are likely to continue to speed so we would strongly urge you to consider a two-way speed camera on the bend of the hill between the valley playground and the railway line. Finally, the proposed left turn only/right turn only at the Optimistic caused us concern. The right turn junction onto Hacton Lane (where the no left turn sign will be) is particularly challenging to tackle. I have lived in this area since I was 11 and frequently used this junction in my 18 years of driving experience. It is a fast junction and can cause nervous drivers to make risky decisions.</p>	<p>from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
<p>QW001/7 (Havering resident 2)</p>	<p>The plans seem sound apart from stopping Right turn from Little Gaynes Lane into Hacton Lane. As a van driver this manoeuvre is the only safe way of exiting the junction as the side panel of the van impairs the view. If at the junction nearest the Optimist It becomes necessary to Stop about 3 car lengths back from the white lines and release your seatbelt and lean forward enough to observe the road from the left, as you can imagine you are then having to get back into your driving position in order pull out of the junction safely.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>
<p>QW001/8 (Hacton Lane Resident 3)</p>	<p>I welcome these traffic calming view as I live on this road and my family and I have personally witnessed accidents and been victims of accidents on our doorsteps. Our then 20-year-old daughter was witness to the aftermath of this horrific fatality opposite our home and has suffered the trauma of trying to assist with the saving of this poor man's life. She has sought counselling since then but there is a constant reminder there literally outside our window. Let me be clear we do not object to this tribute – it only</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>reminds us to be as safe as we can be pulling out on this road. I have often thought what can I do to get this road safety improved? Three of us in this household drive and have all come to the same conclusion. Each junction on this road need to be A ROUNDABOUT. This works so well at the Ravenscourt Grove Junction. It changes the flow of traffic and calms the speed. This needs to be implemented at the Optimist/Little Gaynes and Alma/Bevan/Clement Way Junctions. Two roundabouts. There is the room to do this and would really slow traffic at the Optimist from the lanes and equally simplify the junction at Alma. I believe the junction at Derby may be a little small for a mini roundabout.</p>	
<p>QW001/9 (Little Gaynes Lane Resident 1)</p>	<p>The safety improvements being proposed indicated in your letter of 27th October 2023 generally appear to address the speeding issue but it may perhaps be more beneficial to review the road layout of the triangular junction to Hacton Lane/Little Gaynes Lane junction. This has always been a problematic junction and we have witnessed or heard many vehicular collisions which have occurred on each of the forks of the triangular junction over the years. The proposal to ban the right turn from Little Gaynes Lane (left fork) onto Hacton Lane has the potential of causing accidents on the right fork feeder into Hacton Lane as a large number of vehicles which turn right on the left fork are vans which have restrictive visual capability on their nearside to see traffic approaching from their left along Hacton Lane. The majority of accidents we have witnessed on this junction are caused either by vehicles turning right into Little Gaynes Lane from Hacton Lane colliding with speeding cars coming up from the Ingrebourne, due to limited/poor visibility around the bend. We would suggest that consideration be given to either a mini roundabout being provided at this junction replacing the triangular junction, or some kind of traffic light system.</p>	<p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

<p>QW001/10 (Clement Way Resident 1)</p>	<p>I am fully supportive of the proposed ideas. I would just like to add the crossing I use on Hacton lane to travel between clement way to Bevan way are currently unsafe. When crossing with school age children the cars do not stop. Once in the middle we are often stuck until the other side is clear to cross. The safety barrier that was there is gone from the clement way side.</p>	<p>- Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
<p>QW001/11 (Alder Avenue Resident 1)</p>	<p>I'd have no strong objections to the speed tables of pedestrian refuge, providing they are not built in a way that going over them at a reasonable speed for the road will not cause damage to the cars. Saying they, I don't particularly support them either. I think the right and left turn bans are unnecessary and unwarranted will cause motorists undue inconvenience. I don't think repeated speed signs would make a massive difference either but also wouldn't have any issues with them being introduced. I'm addition to the proposals I'd support average speed cameras.</p>	<p>- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>
<p>QW001/12 (Little Gaynes Lane Resident 2)</p>	<p>I agree that this is a dangerous road that would benefit with the improvements of lighting, raised traffic islands, rumble strips and activated signage. I also agree with the no left hand turn proposal. However, the right hand turn ban from Little Gaynes Lane onto Hacton Lane will actually make this junction even more dangerous that it already is. Because of the angle of the road, if you have a vehicle that doesn't have any back windows (namely work's vans, to which there are a lot that go up and down that road), you simply cannot see the traffic coming from the left hand side. You have to completely angle the vehicle onto the other side of the road to be able to get a good view of Hacton Lane. My husband owns a works van that has no back windows, so I know this to be a fact as we drive this section of the road daily. You have to go straight up Little Gaynes Lane to take the right onto Hacton Lane to be able to turn right safely. I urge you, or anyone that is approving these changes to take a drive in a vehicle that has no back windows to be able to see for yourselves that it will in fact</p>	<p>- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	be more dangerous and it will in fact create more collisions if there is a no right hand turn rule. This I can guarantee. Living right on top of this junction, and having two school children that walk to and from the bus stop themselves at Hacton Lane, I encourage the safety improvements of this road - all except the right hand turn ban.	
QW001/13 (Better Street for Havering)	We fully support the proposals for the above scheme.	-
QW001/14 (Hacton Lane Resident 4)	We have no objections to the proposals.	
QW001/15 (Hacton Lane Resident 5)	I can see no objection to all that is being suggested. However I do notice that once again our stretch of Hacton Lane (Upminster Road traffic lights to Ravenscourt Drive) has been totally ignored. All too frequently traffic travelling up Hacton Lane from the traffic lights hurtles' up to the mini-roundabout at 40-45 mph. Therefore I would propose that some form of traffic calming be positioned in this portion of Hacton Lane thereby reducing the opportunity to speed.	- Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.
QW001/16 (Clement Way Resident 2)	I have studied the contents of the letter and are in agreement with most points. However, your proposal to ban a right turn from Little Gaynes Lane into Hacton Lane will prove extremely problematic if you are in a van or similar high sided vehicle. I think your drawing is QW001/4 - the photocopy cuts off just above the details. If you are the sole occupant of a normal right hand drive van, you will find it impossible to see the oncoming traffic from the left if you are forced to make the right turn where you propose. If you have another occupant, you have to trust their judgement on when to safely pull out. If you are the sole occupant, you have to pull out halfway and block the road and hope someone let you go and doesn't have a head on collision with you.	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.
QW001/17 (Clement Way Resident 3)	I am in favour of steps being taken, especially with this area being exceptionally busy with school children. I believe the proposals do not go far enough. 1. The junction between Hacton Lane /Alma Avenue is chaos with vehicles edging out	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>vying for a space at busy times. What consideration has been given to installing a mini roundabout in this location, which would then give clear rules and structures in place for priority of vehicles. 2. The pedestrian crossing between Clement Way and Bevan Way should, as a minimum, be a zebra crossing or pelican crossing. Children use this crossing regularly during school times and it is very narrow especially for those with buggies, wheelchairs etc. I am not in favour of bans on left/right turns, which will cause inconvenience. Havering have experimented with these both at Lidl and Minster Way and both did not work. However the proposed 'Left' turn ban from Little Gaynes to Hacton makes some sense as that is far to acute a turn that I don't think even a hackney carriage could perform. I do not know how many people would actually try that manoeuvre as it seems dangerous. The proposed right ban doesn't seem necessary and actually that manoeuvre is safer as you have an easier line of sight in both directions to your left and right. Whereas using Little Gaynes to turn right is, due to the oblique angle, quite dangerous to assess incoming traffic from both left and right as you are almost having look back and to the left rather than just left.</p>	<p>local residents' concerns.</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
<p>QW001/18 (Little Gaynes Lane Resident 3)</p>	<p>Overall some good ideas but:- Increased lighting a VERY bad idea - few of the accidents at this junction have been at night - and probably none the result of insufficient light. Introducing 'no right turn' from the SW corner of the triangle into Hacton lane northbound is a VERY bad idea. This is the only safe way for some vehicles to make this right turn What is missing from these plans is education and enforcement. It is already a 30 mph limit and 30 mph means 30 mph MAX (not 30 + 10% plus 3 mph) -. You don't have to give everyone a penalty but you do need to stop them and educate them.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>
<p>QW001/19 (Havering resident 3)</p>	<p>I am not in favour of making a left turn only from Little Gaynes Lane. It is safer to make a right turn from this junction as it gives a better and longer view of traffic from both directions. Making a right turn from road</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	outside the Optimist Public House is difficult due to traffic not being in view due to curvature of road (traffic left) and hidden traffic by hill (traffic right). Also exit from road outside Optimist PH is really straight ahead and not right turn only (road markings).	proposals due to local residents' concerns.
QW001/20 (Hacton Lane Resident 6)	i believe to have some concerns regarding your proposals and will only outline those. 1. Turning right from little gaynes lane into hacton lane. This would force all traffic wanting to turn right onto the rh fork, which is acutely joined to Hacton Lane, the visibility over ones left shoulder is almost impossible and to those with impaired or partially ability to turn enough will be at danger of not seeing the traffic from the left. Also you would be denying vans and small lorries to negotiate the junction safely as they would be blind to traffic from the left, those concerned now use the existing rh turning at the end of LG lane.2. These alterations to a junction that is negotiable with a little thought safely would then become unusable to some disabled drivers, and commercial traffic. 3. Your scheme to use speed humps all around this junction and calming measures should make this a lot safer without the turning restriction required.	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns. Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.
QW001/21 (Clement Way Resident 4)	The actions i would be happy with, is the speed warning cameras, a safe zebra crossing which isn't on the bend, maybe speed ramps before the bend approaching the zebra crossing? i think the road is well lit and would not need to have left or right hand turnings ban. it would also be nice to deter fly tipping from the passing cars, which i clean up once a week and sometimes collect 3 black bags of rubbish. if drivers thought they might get a fine? might stop them littering? thank you for making hacton lane less speedy and dangerous.	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns. Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.
QW001/22 (Havering resident 4)	I used Hacton Lane regularly and this proposal is welcomed. I had an observation on the no left and right turn detailed in QW001/4. On the junction outside of the Optimist Tavern that would have a "no left	- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>turn"/right turn only restriction, the current layout is extremely difficult for drivers entering Hacton Lane from Little Gaynes Lane immediately outside of the Optmist tavern. The angle means that the road is obscured from a drivers view by the vehicles 'B' pillar. I think that a wider correction of the layout of this junction is needed to make this safer, than just the restrictions on turning. The first option could be to fill in this side of the road by extending the grass area, and having a single lane that is one way from Hacton Lane into Little Gaynes Lane, from North to South. The other junction further south could then be made better by removing vegetation to open up the visibility, or turned into a mini roundabout. The second option would be re-alignment of the junctions, and possibly forming one junction through the middle of the current grassed area that could then perhaps be a mini roundabout. I wanted to ask you if as part of this safety scheme including Hacton Lane and roads off it, you will join up the double yellow lines on Derby Avenue between Hacton Lane and Chelmsford Drive? Derby Avenue is on QW001/3.</p>	<p>proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
<p>QW001/23 (Hacton Lane Resident 7)</p>	<p>I very much welcome your proposal to improve the safety of this area. Unfortunately there are a number of areas you have overlooked which, as a resident, I know are key to improving the safety as we daily see and experience the constant 'near misses' which your stats don't include. Your proposal puts rumble strips on the entry from Rainham end (left) which are very welcome but our experience is that, unfortunately, as people leave Upminster and come round the bend from Hacton or Little Gaynes they speed up! This give the vehicle turning right only a few seconds to pull out as they come around the bend so fast. Your plan does not put any rumble strips in this area and we really need something to slow the traffic so we can exit right safely.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p> <p>Additional proposals could be considered at a later date if necessary, subject to funding and resources.</p>
<p>QW001/24 (Havering resident 5)</p>	<p>1. The pelican crossing does not need to be raised, drivers can see crossings easily so do not require another vehicle damaging</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed measures would</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>obstacle built on our roads, build it flat, not raised. 2. I am against any speed tables being constructed, we have enough all over Havering which are only being built because TFL is providing cash. Speed tables cause more pollution, damage vehicles, wear components delay emergency vehicles and cause discomfort to drivers and passengers. 3. I am against the left and right turn bans. All the above measures are anti driver, a waste of money and will only exist due to money offered by car hating TFL.</p>	<p>reduce vehicle speeds and collisions in the area.</p>
<p>QW001/25 (Havering resident 6)</p>	<p>I object to the planned ban for the following reasons. It is clear that the sole intention of this scheme is purely to raise revenue by catching out the unwary or infirm which is contrary to the intention of the Government when they deregulated traffic management rules. It is clear that the person who dreamt up this hare brained scheme has never driven a van or lorry or been disabled or suffer with neck mobility problems Vans and lorries and disabled and other drivers with neck mobility problems turn right at the southern junction of Little Gaynes Lane northwards onto Hacton Lane as it is safer as the junction is more or less 90 degrees and the drivers can see both left and right. Turning right from Little Gaynes Lane northwards onto Hacton Lane at the northern junction is difficult due to the acute angle of the junction and relies on the use of mirrors because it is impossible to look left as the view is obscured by the side panels of the van or lorry (as there are no rear side windows behind the driver) or the driver is unable to turn their neck to look over their left shoulder. Banning the left turn at the northern junction is just petty and clearly designed solely to raise revenue.</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed measures would reduce vehicle speeds and collisions in the area.</p>
<p>QW001/26 (Havering resident 7)</p>	<p>We generally approve of the changes north of The Optimist. However, banning the right hand turn from left hand section of Little Gaynes Lane will encourage those turning left to speed even more then they do now, because there will never be an obstruction (apart from Hacton Lane traffic approaching). Can this junction also be graded or raised, to slow traffic down?</p>	<p>- Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>Otherwise, as they head south we are going to get both Hacton Lane & Little Gaynes Lane traffic ' putting the foot down as they clear the new restrictions'. We have a problem with speeding into the lanes which makes it difficult for properties beyond Little Gaynes Lane to access onto Hacton Lane.</p>	
<p>QW001/27 (Haverling resident 8)</p>	<p>I appreciate the council are trying to reduce incidents on Hacton Lane, and I am in favour of a number of proposals, including speed tables and the pelican crossing. However, the banning of left and right turns from Hacton Lane on to Little Gaynes Lane will be a disastrous proposal for a number of reasons, which, if I may, I note down below: 1. Local Businesses on Gaynes Park Road There are a number of local businesses operating on Gaynes Park Parade, which have been there for decades that would be heavily affected by this proposal. As these are local stores that have been serving the local residents for decades, the banning of left/right turns on to Little Gaynes Lane will heavily affect these businesses. Local businesses have already suffered a lot during the recent years and this would be grossly unfair on those businesses operating on Gaynes Park Parade. In fact, you may note this parade is a local favourite amongst the residents. Upminster and a lot of High Streets in Haverling are already struggling, with the council neglecting a lot of these businesses, turning them into empty shops. 2. Resident roads This will only create residents' roads more busier within the vicinity if you were to ban the left/right turn on to Little Gaynes Lane. Please note that the residential roads surrounding the ban will become more busy, which are predominantly residential. This may further lead to more casualties on the residential area roads. For example, Alder Avenue may become more of a busier road for cars to cut through, which can be more dangerous than Little Gaynes Lane. It is important that the views of the residents are respected as we are the ones living in this vicinity. 3. School - Branfil School There is a great school (Branfil School)</p>	<p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	<p>close by, with a number of parents needing to use the Little Gaynes Lane turning point to drop-off and collect their children. There have already been a number of big issues relating to parking for this school, and therefore we urge you to not ban the left/right turn on to Little Gaynes Lane, as mentioned above, this will only cause more pressure for the roads surrounding the ban.</p> <p>4. Residents After speaking to a number of residents on Little Gaynes Lane/Gaynes Park Road, we all agree that the banning of a left/right turn on to Little Gaynes Lane would be disastrous based on a number of reasons as mentioned above. I urge you therefore to respect our residents' voice. We humbly request that you do not go ahead with the left/right ban on to Little Gaynes Lane, as we residents will have to face the negative consequences based on your decision. As local residents for a number of years we urge that you respect our opinion on not banning the left/right turn on to Little Gaynes Lane.</p>	
<p>QW001/28 (Little Gaynes Lane Resident 4)</p>	<p>With regard to the proposed no right turn at the end of little Gaynes lane into Hacton lane, has anyone proposing this actually driven a small car or large van along the proposed forced turning? If you have no passenger or blanked back windows, there is no way at all you can see cars coming around the corner from the left. It is 100% going to cause accidents at a junction where there does not need to be changes. Presumably the council will then accept responsibility should accidents be proven to occur if these changes takes place (insurance companies will have a field day as this will be created by Havering Councils design)?</p>	<p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>
<p>QW001/29 (Havering resident 9)</p>	<p>I know the consultation has ended but the proposed changes at the junction of Little Gaynes Lane are going to increase the dangers of an accident. Any vehicle which has no rear view mirror/windows cannot see left oncoming vehicles at the angle of the slip road. I drive a van and have to turn right where the proposed 'No right turn' implementation is proposed as I cannot see to my Left coming from the other slip road,</p>	<p>Right and left turn bans will be omitted from the original proposals due to local residents' concerns.</p>

Non-key Executive Decision

	as I have only side mirrors. Please take this into account because vans, lorries and Buses would not be able to see and increase accident risk at the junction.	
--	---	--

APPENDIX 2

Drawing Nos. QW001/1DD, QW001/2DD, QW001/3DD, QW001/4DD and QW001/5DD

APPENDIX 3

Public consultation letter