

September 2021		ITEM dem services to add number
Delegated Decision Report		
Location – Princess Margaret Road & East Tilbury Road, East Tilbury		
Wards and communities affected: East Tilbury	Key Decision: No	
Portfolio Holder: Councillor B Maney – Environment & Highways		
Accountable Assistant Director: Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transportation and Public Protection		
Accountable Director: Julie Rogers, Corporate Director of Public Realm		
This report is Public		

Executive Summary

In June 2020, DfT grant funding was provided to the Council under the Government's Active Travel Tranche 1 programme to help introduce schemes that would encourage Walking and Cycling as the Country came out of the national lockdown.

Thurrock used this funding to improve sustainable and healthy routes around 4 Travel Hubs (Train Stations) by introducing schemes which would slow vehicle movements in order to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The four areas in Thurrock were:

- London Road Purfleet-On-Thames
- West Road in South Ockendon
- London Road/Church Hill & Butts Lane in Stanford-le-Hope
- Princess Margaret Road/ East Tilbury Road in East Tilbury

This report considers the results of the consultation and traffic surveys undertaken for the Princess Margaret Road/East Tilbury Road, East Tilbury Scheme.

1. Recommendations

1.1 Considering the comments made during the consultation period and the results of the speed surveys undertaken, the recommendation is that:

a) The Council remove the temporary 20mph speed limit on East Tilbury Road and Princess Margaret Road

b) Remove the traffic calming measures on East Tilbury Road and Princess Margaret Road

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The purpose of the scheme in East Tilbury was to create a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists along East Tilbury Road and Princess Margaret Road on route to the Station by changing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph and installing traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speed.
- 2.2 The speed limit was lowered along East Tilbury Road, from just north of Hampshire Gardens, southwards to Princess Margaret Road, 100m south of the railway line. Speed cushions were installed along the full length of the affected area to help support the speed reduction.
- 2.3 The scheme was introduced as an experimental Traffic Regulation Order which gave a minimum six-month public consultation on the scheme after it was implemented. The Statutory Consultation was carried out between 20th Oct 2020 to 30th June 2021
- 2.4 The consultation was carried out via the Council's online consultation portal. As part of the consultation, a number of questions were asked regarding perceived vehicle speeds and perception of feeling safe when walking or cycling in the area.
- 2.5 In total 30 residents responded to the questions that were asked, but not all expressed their objection or support towards the scheme. After review, it is noted that there were no direct objections; however, there were more negative comments towards the temporary measures, than positive. Throughout the consultation period the Council received many negative emails about this scheme and local Ward Members expressed their opinions against the scheme.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 No direct objections to the scheme were received via the consultation, however, there were 9 negative comments and only 1 positive comment recorded, with the details below:-

<i>Positive 01</i>	The speed bumps seem to have reduced many instances of speeding along sections of the Princess Margaret Road
<i>Negative 01</i>	The scheme has been an absolute waste of time. Drivers are moving to straddle the road humps and not adhering to the speed limit. If it is not going to be policed at all then nothing will change.

<i>Negative 02</i>	This route has a roundabout, parking at the shops and turnings into Linford housing. Traffic is already slowed down naturally. Don't waste our money
<i>Negative 03</i>	The speed bumps put in place are dangerously close together at points, forcing traffic towards one another moving on the carriageway. They have no impact on the excessive amount of large, speeding lorries that frequent this road, so are not fit for purpose.
<i>Negative 04</i>	Speed restriction in wrong place - should be by the school. Speed bumps are not effective as will not slow most vehicles, especially lorries, as they are not big enough and have not been put in correctly. Don't understand why they are near a roundabout as most vehicles naturally slow down there anyway. Total waste of time and money.
<i>Negative 05</i>	Recent speed bumps don't achieve end goal of slowing traffic down. Speed bumps should have been laid across road similar to bumps on Riverview, Chadwell. Current restrictions are not wide enough and lorries (wide loads) just drive over and make no impact to speed
<i>Negative 06</i>	Traffic calming cushions do not influence the behaviour of the high % of HGV's that use this route.
<i>Negative 07</i>	Totally ridiculous placement of speed bumps. Force you on otherwise of the road heading out of Linford towards tip
<i>Negative 08</i>	It is adding to the noise pollution from 7am to 6pm from Monday to Saturday as they do nothing to slow down the traffic or the Tipper Drivers or other Lorry drivers as they hit the Ramps at speed as they are not adhering to the 20 mile and hour speed limit.
<i>Negative 09</i>	The strategies that have been put in place have had little impact on reducing the speed of the vehicles using this section of the road. It

3.2 Speed surveys were carried out before the scheme was implemented and on three occasions during the consultation period. The results of the speed surveys indicate that the 85%ile speed prior to the limit was 31mph and has subsequently reduced to 30.2mph. This indicates that drivers are ignoring the 20mph limit and that the speed cushions have not helped to significantly reduce the speed to an acceptable level. It is also worth noting that the survey data showed a modest average speed reduction that reflects that the speed cushion scheme has had little effect on driver behaviour and limited highway safety benefit for this category of road.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

4.1 Due to the high proportion of negative comments towards the reduction of the speed limit and the traffic calming measures it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit is removed and the original 30mph limit is reinstated.

4.2 The small reduction in the 85%ile speed show that the speed cushions are having a minimal effect in lowering the speed of traffic through the area, therefore, it is recommended that the speed cushions be removed along the length of the scheme.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

5.1 Ward Members:

Cllr S Sammons & Cllr F Massey

Ward members were consulted between 25th October and 1st November 2021.

Cllr Sammons:

I am pleased this scheme is going to be removed as it had no effect on traffic speed reduction.

The road humps caused many residents to complain to Councillors that they felt the humps were more of a danger to road users than anything as many vehicles tended to just move over to the middle of the road to avoid them and this was far more dangerous if an HGV happened to be driving towards them.

It certainly did not make any vehicles slow down, mainly due to the fact that they want to avoid the railway gate shutting and causing delays to their journey either in or out of the area. If anybody does happen to cycle in the area unfortunately it is usually on the pavement which is wide as the road has always been far too busy and dangerous to cycle safely as in most parts of East Tilbury Road the road is very narrow and with the amount of trucks it is just not wide enough for them to pass let alone cyclists.

What would be a better for the area would be speed cameras to slow down the traffic especially at the school where we have asked for speed reduction on many occasions.

I hope my comments are helpful as I have lived in the area for 38 years now and as I also live on Princess Margaret Rd can see daily that this scheme just did not work.

Cllr Massey:

Much like Cllr Sammons the 'speed humps' due to the size did not slow down the HGV traffic, some still seem they are a little off too much to the side and not central for the route vehicles take.

I would welcome a view to retain the 20mph limit and also extend or a new 20mph zone around the school and main shopping area on Princess Margaret Road. Some certainly do observe the new limits which would give the Police more power to enforce against those who use Princess Margaret Road as a racetrack.

What budget/monies is being used to remove this ATS ?

Cllr Sammons made reference to a speed cameras request, however this falls outside the area of the Active Travel scheme funding.

Cllr Massey made request that the 20mph limit remain, however evidence from the speed surveys established that this could not be justified. This is stated in paragraph 3.2.

Cllr Massey enquired which budget is used for the proposals. This is stated in paragraph 7.1.

Both Councillors made reference to safety around the school. This falls outside the area of the Active Travel scheme funding and is being

investigated within the current years ITB programme under TDP2 Safer Routes to School.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

6.1 These actions accord with the Council priorities to create a safer environment.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

As the scheme is to be fully removed on East Tilbury Road and Princess Margaret road, the financial implications would be the cost of removing the traffic calming and reinstating the carriageway and that of disconnection and removing the lit and unlit street signing

The cost of these works is estimated at being circa. £34,170.98 and is covered under the Active Travel scheme budget allocation.

There is sufficient funding available for this project.

Implications verified by: Mark Terry
Email: FinancialImplication@thurrock.gov.uk

7.2 Legal

Regulation 22 of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 enable experimental orders to be made, subject to the procedure in Schedule 5 to the Regulations.

Implications verified by: Linda Saunders
Email: LegallImplicationsRequests@thurrock.gov.uk

7.3 Diversity and Equality

This speed reduction scheme did not have a significant effect on vehicle speeds from those recorded before it was implemented, therefore, its removal will not have any detrimental effect on vulnerable road users.

Implications verified by: Roxanne Scanlon
Email: Diversity@thurrock.gov.uk

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health Inequalities, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder, and Impact on Looked After Children

None

8. Background papers used in preparing the report

- Survey results
- emails of support
- emails against the proposal

9. Appendices to the report

- None

Report Author:

Name: Neil Wakeling

Telephone: 01375 652214

E-mail: NWakeling@thurrock.gov.uk