September 2021		ITEM dem services to add number
Delegated Decision Report		
Location – London Road, Purfleet-On-Thames		
Wards and communities affected:	Key Decision:	
West Thurrock & South Stifford	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		

### **Executive Summary**

This report is Public

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 London Road, Purfleet-On-Thames.

### 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 London Road

## b) Retain the traffic calming measures on London Road

## 2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The purpose of the scheme for Purfleet-on-Thames was to create a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists along London Road on route to the Station by reducing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph and installing traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speed.
- 2.2 The speed limit was lowered along London Road, from the junction with Church Hollow in the west, eastwards to just east of Linnet Way. 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 20<sup>th</sup> Oct 2020 to 30<sup>th</sup> 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 13 residents responded to the questions that were asked, but not all expressed their objection or support to the scheme. After review it is noted that there was one direct objection and there were more negative comments towards the temporary measures, than positive.

### 3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

3.1 One direct objection for the scheme was received, however, there were also 2 negative comments and 1 positive comment recorded, with the details below:-

of Covid 19 is a complete abuse of process. It is clear that none of the measures being implemented will make things any better for pedestrians or stop the spread of an airborne virus. Nothing in this scheme benefits pedestrians as the footway widths haven't been increased to allow for social distancing. I also believe the reason this scheme is being put in by stealth is actually for the benefit of the Harris Academy and has nothing to do with Covid 19. Traffic speeds are low in this section of road due to the bends and the railway barriers, and illegal parking etc. The public needs to fully understand how this scheme	Objection 01	of the measures being implemented will make things any better for pedestrians or stop the spread of an airborne virus. Nothing in this scheme benefits pedestrians as the footway widths haven't been increased to allow for social distancing. I also believe the reason this scheme is being put in by stealth is actually for the benefit of the Harris Academy and has nothing to do with Covid 19. Traffic speeds are low in this section of road due to the bends and the railway barriers, and illegal parking etc. The public needs to fully understand how this scheme relates to Covid 19 and its spread and who is going to enforce it. The police currently do not enforce the 30MPH limit. Some detailed answers to these questions are needed before

	without any proper consultation and under the radar I and my neighbours may seek to take this matter to a judicial review.
Negative 01	Don't think it'll make much difference to current conditions
Negative 02	Remove speed cushions as cars are passing over them dangerously on wrong side of road and some drivers are braking to pass over them causing congestion around level crossing. Some are located in a difficult position to pass over safely.
Positive 01	As a Purfleet resident the speed restrictions are a welcome change to the area. It makes it safer for all the road users and the pedestrians.

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 34.8mph and has subsequently reduced to 30.9mph. This indicates that drivers are ignoring the 20mph limit, but that the speed cushions may have helped reduce speeds slightly.

### 4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 Due to the higher number of negative comments towards the reduction of the speed limit it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit is removed and the original 30mph limit is reinstated.
- 4.2 The speed survey data indicates that reducing the speed limit to 20mph cannot be justified, as driver behaviour has not changed significantly. However, the reduction in the 85%ile does show that the speed cushions are having an effect and lowering the speed of traffic through the area, it is therefore recommended that they are left in place.

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

### 5.1 Ward Members:

Cllr V Holloway, Cllr L Watson & Cllr Q Abbas

Ward members were consulted between 25<sup>th</sup> October and 1<sup>st</sup> November 2021. Only 1 response was received.

Cllr Holloway:

How are residents being consulted on the affectiveness of the scheme?

It can be confirmed that this was addressed in paragraph 2.3 above.

# 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 partially removed on London Road, the financial implications would be the cost of removing the lit and unlit 20mph signage and the introduction of road hump warning signs.

The cost of these works is estimated at being circa. £7,931.30 and is covered under the Active Travel scheme budget allocation.

There is sufficient funding available for this project.

Implications verified by: Mark Terry

Telephone and 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. Regulation 19 permits an order to be made in part, provided the necessary notices to the public advertising the experimental order have been undertaken. A notice of the making of a modified order can then be made.

Implications verified by: Linda Saunders

Email: LegalImplicationsRequests@thurrock.gov.uk

## 7.3 Diversity and Equality

The speed cushions which are to remain in place have reduced the overall traffic speed significantly, which has improved the situation for vulnerable road users.

However, the speed reduction measured did not achieve the aim of reducing speeds down to 20mph. Therefore, the removal of the 20 limit will have no 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