

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Environment Portfolio Holder

**For any pre-decision scrutiny questions by the Environment
PDS Committee on**

Date: 11th January 2011

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: **KINGS HALL ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**

Contact Officer: Leon Darrell, Traffic Engineer
Tel: 020 8313 4231 E-mail: leon.darrell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Director of Environmental Services

Ward: Penge & Cator

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the installation of safety measures in the Kings Hall Road area in 2008 there have been further collisions on the bends in Kings Hall Road, which are also of concern to residents.
- 1.2 Officers have investigated possible further measures to reduce the speed of drivers passing through these bands.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Portfolio Holder approves that Option 2 outlined in paragraph 3.11 should be adopted.
- 2.2 That the Portfolio Holder agree that scheme costs be funded from the underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme, subject to agreement from TfL.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost Option 1 - £14,000, Option 2 - £23,000
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost. ~ £500
 3. Budget head/performance centre: TfL budget for Casualty Reduction Schemes and Transport and Highways budget.
 4. Total current budget for this head: £567,000. There is a projected underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme of £40,000, which will be used to fund this scheme in Kings Hall Road, subject to the agreement of TfL. £1.9m for footway maintenance.
 5. Source of funding: Transport for London and existing revenue budget 2010/11.
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-statutory - Government guidance.
 2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Depending on the types of measures are implemented (if any) some crossing facilities will be lost, although traffic speeds should be reduced as a result.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Cllr Getgood is supportive of either measure.

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 In 2007 it was identified that there had been a larger than expected number of injury collisions in the Kings Hall Road area, in the three years to 2006. Subsequently a safety scheme was consulted upon and the scheme was installed in March 2008, comprising central islands, a priority give way feature on Kings Hall Road and an improved crossing facility on Lennard Road which narrows the carriageway slightly. Associated new road markings and mini roundabouts, at the junctions with Reddons Road, Lennard Road and Bridge Road were also installed.
- 3.2 As well as the mini-roundabouts, a feature of the safety scheme in Kings Hall Road itself was a number of traffic islands and associated central hatch markings.
- 3.3 The effectiveness of the scheme was investigated in 2009 and a report was presented in September 2009. In the post-scheme consultation in 2009, a majority of residents stated that they were not happy with the scheme, especially not with the islands on the bend.
- 3.4 As a result of that investigation a further measure was installed to reduce speeds on the bend in Kings Hall Road, namely vehicle speed activated signs either side of the bend. However, it was not possible to fully determine the effectiveness of the scheme in respect of accidents, as very little post-scheme collision data was available at that time. It was therefore agreed that a further review be carried out once more post-scheme collision data was available.

Accident data

- 3.5 Accident data is now available for a period of 17 months from when the scheme was substantially complete. During this period there have been three recorded injury collisions on or near the bend in Kings Hall Road. We are aware from the reports made by residents that a number of other collisions have occurred on the bends, particularly adjacent to the island outside house number 136.

Traffic Speeds

- 3.6 A speed survey was undertaken in early October 2010 and was compared to the results of a speed survey undertaken by the police in May 2009. Both surveys were taken at the same location outside No. 84 for a period of two weeks and the results are shown below

| Eastbound Survey Statistics | May '09 | Oct '10 |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Total vehicle count | 44,472 | 44,126 |
| No. vehicles in excess of limit | 16,273 | 16,309 |
| Total average speed | 29 mph | 29 mph |
| Total 85th percentile speed | 34 mph | 34 mph |
| Westbound Survey Statistics | May '09 | Oct '10 |
| Total vehicle count | 43,513 | 42,773 |
| No. vehicles in excess of limit | 18,614 | 10,831 |
| Total average speed | 30 mph | 28 mph |
| Total 85th percentile speed | 34 mph | 32 mph |

- 3.7 The 85th percentile speeds are the best indicator of whether speeds are high. The survey results show there has been a decrease in the westbound direction for 85th percentile speeds by 2mph since the installation of the speed activated signs. The speed of 34mph for this type of road is relatively low. The 85th percentile speed is a good indication of the speeds the majority of cars

would be travelling at the upper end of the scale, with 34mph being a speed at which the traffic police would be unlikely to take enforcement action.

- 3.8 However, despite the speeds not being excessive, there is no doubt that collisions continue to occur on the bend.

Proposals

- 3.9 As a way of slowing drivers on the approaches to the bend, and helping ensure that they drive through the bend with more care, two options for further changes have been considered by officers.
- 3.10 Option 1: This scheme comprises of high-friction surfacing through the bend and both approaches, which will aid drivers in negotiating the bend itself. Chevron signs would also be installed for both approaches giving advanced warning of the bend along with timber posts with reflective discs to highlight the presence of the bend. The islands outside No.116/118 & 136/138 would be removed and the central hatching would be replaced with hatching with a buff coloured background, to emphasise the narrow running lanes.
- 3.11 Option 2: This scheme comprises two double chicane features on both approaches to the bend. This arrangement affords the drivers already on the bend right of way and as such drivers approaching the bend must stop, or at least slow down, and are forced to do so by the arrangement of the chicanes. All other features are included as outlined in option 1, however it would be necessary to remove a further traffic island outside No.100/102 to accommodate the chicanes.

Consultation

- 3.12 At the time of writing the report the consultation process has not been completed. The results of any consultation will be reported at committee.

Conclusions

- 3.13 Subject to the results of any further consultation and in light of safety audit recommendations, both of which are to be presented at committee, officers would recommend Option 2, as it is more likely to slow vehicles on the *approach* to the bend.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 Vision – Quality Environment”, a stated issue is the need to maintain our progress in improving road safety.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The estimated costs of the two options are £14,000 for option 1 and £23,000 for option 2. There is a projected underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme of £40,000, which will be used to fund this scheme in Kings Hall Road, subject to the agreement of TfL.
- 5.2 If Option 2 is chosen there would be minor on-going running costs associated with the maintenance of the extended footway, in the region of £500 p/a, which would be funded from the footway maintenance budgets (£1.9m) within Transport and Highways.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Non-Applicable Sections: | Legal implications |
| Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer) | |