

Delegated Report

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport.

Date: 05 August 2019

Agenda item: N/A

Wards: Pollards Hill Ward

Subject: Windmill Road – Road Safety Improvement

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration Environment & Housing

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Abobaker Abdalla 0208545 3690

Email: Abobaker.Abdalla@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and

- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation that was carried out between 21st of June and 12th July 2019 on proposed Sinusoidal speed humps on Windmill Road between Croydon Road and Commonsides East. Copy of the statutory consultation is attached in Appendix 2.
- B) Considers the representations received in response to the statutory consultation which are detailed in Appendix 4.
- C) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of a proposed measures as shown in Drawing No. Z38-261- 01 attached in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the result of the statutory consultation carried out on the proposed Road Safety Improvement scheme and seeks Cabinet Member approval to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed measures as shown in Drawing No. Z38-261- 01 attached in Appendix 1.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Windmill Road is a two-way single carriageway subject to a 20mph speed limit. It runs parallel to Mitcham Common on both sides and does not directly accommodate any residential properties. It is a local distributor road subject to a 7.5T lorry ban. It is also a bus route for one bus service. It provides a direct route for traffic bounded from Sutton and Croydon toward Pollards Hill, Figges Marsh and Longthornton wards.

2.2 RECORDED PERSONAL INJURY ACCIDENT DATA

2.2.1 According to the recorded Personal Injury Accident data, over the last 3 years, there have been 5 accidents, one fatal motorcycle accident occurred this year and the others are detailed in Appendix 3. The Council also routinely receives complaints about incidences and excessive speed.

3.0 PROPOSALS

- 3.1 To improve safety, reduce speed and maintain a lower speed along Windmill Road, it is proposed to introduce Sinusoidal speed humps and the appropriate road markings. These type of features have a lesser adverse impact on cyclists and buses when compared to the normal standard road humps. Although it is customary to introduce speed cushions on bus routes, given the isolated nature of the road and the fact that cushions will do nothing to slow buses and powered two wheelers, it is officer's opinion that on this occasion, Sinusoidal speed humps which have been designed specifically for cyclists in mind, are the best available option to effectively reduce speed of traffic and thereby minimising the risk of further accidents and incidences.
- 3.2 A copy of the proposals was forwarded to the Ward Councillors and Cabinet member.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The statutory consultation was carried out between 21st June and 12th July 2019. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website.
- 4.2 A total of 2 representations were received which are detailed in Appendix 4.
- 4.3 All Emergency Services have been consulted and no objections have been raised.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member considers the representations received along with officer's comments and approves the making of the Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the proposed measures. If agreed the works will be carried out during August 2019.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 6.1 Do Nothing. This however, will do nothing to reduce the number of accidents and the speed along Windmill Road.

7. FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of implementing this scheme is estimated at £40k. This includes the cost of the statutory consultation and making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO's).
- 7.2 The cost of this scheme will be funded from TfL Capital allocation for 2019/20.

8. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Introduction of the Sinusoidal speed humps will be made under the Highways Act 1980. The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.
- 8.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a Traffic Management Order or to modify the published draft Order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Cabinet Member in reaching a decision.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

9.1 N/A.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATION

10.1 N/A

11. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement any scheme, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Highways Act 1980 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All objections received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

12. APPENDICES

12.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report.

Appendix 1 – Plan of proposals Z38-261- 01

Appendix 2 – Statutory Consultation

Appendix 3 – Accident Data

Appendix 4 – Representation



LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON

PROPOSED SINUSOIDAL HUMPS – WINDMILL ROAD, MITCHAM

1. Notice is hereby given that the Council of the London Borough of Merton, under powers conferred by section 90A-F of the Highways Act 1980 and after consultation with the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, intend to introduce 5 sinusoidal humps, each 3.7 metres long, with a maximum height of 75mm high across the full width of Windmill Road, Mitcham at the locations specified in the Schedule to this notice.
2. A plan of the area showing the proposed sinusoidal humps can be inspected during normal office hours on Mondays to Fridays at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey.
3. Any person desiring to comment on the proposal should send a statement in writing of their representations or objections and the grounds thereof in writing to the Environment and Regeneration Department, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX or alternatively by email to trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk quoting reference **ES/WINDMILLROADSAFETYIMPROVEMENTS** no later than 12 July 2019.

Dated 21 June 2019.

Paul McGarry
Head of futureMerton

SCHEDULE

1. 53 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Croydon Road
2. 161 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Croydon Road
3. 271 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Croydon Road
4. 343 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Croydon Road
5. 86 metres south-west of the south-western kerb-line of Commonsie East

Accident Data

Appendix 3

SEVERITY SLIGHT	District Merton Ref.No 160029061	Accident Date BETWEEN '01-Dec-2015' AND '30-Nov-2018'	Grid Reference 529150 / 168240 Police Officer Attend: Yes
Date 06/10/2016 Day Thursday Time 09:09 Weather Fine without high winds Road Surface Dry Street Lighting Daylight	Road B272 Location Commonside East/J/W Windmill Road Description V1 Pulled out to Turn right across Path of V2 Causing a Collision & Rider to Fall off of Accident		
SITE DETAILS Speed Limit 30 MPH Carriageway Single carriageway Junction Detail T or staggered junction Junction Control Give way or uncontrolled 2nd Road Number B272 Pedestrian Facilities None within 50 metres No physical crossing facility within 50 metre		SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS None CARRIAGEWAY HAZARDS None	CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS 403 Poor turn or manoeuvre (Driver/Rider - Error) Vehicle 001 A 602 Careless/Reckless (Driver/Rider - Behaviour) Vehicle 001 A 405 Failed to look properly (Driver/Rider - Error) Vehicle 001 A 406 Failed to judge other person's path/speed (Driver/Rider - Error) Vehicle 001 A
VEHICLES INVOLVED 2		CASUALTIES INVOLVED 1	
Veh.No. 1 Vehicle type Car Make Model Manoeuvre Turning right Veh. direction from Southwest to Southeast Towing? No tow or articulation Skidded No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning Veh location at impact (restricted lane) On main carriageway not in restricted lane Junct. location of veh. at 1st impact Mid junction - on roundabout or main road Veh left carriageway? Did not leave carriageway Hit object in c'way? None Hit object off c'way? None First point of impact Offside Veh registration no. Other veh.hit (ref.no) 0 Hit and run Not hit and run Drivers age 58 yrs Sex Male Breath test Not requested Driving Lic Left Hand Drive Unknown Foreign veh. Not foreign registered vehicle Journey purpose Other Post code CR4		Cas No 1 Cas Class Driver or Rider Veh ref No 2 Severity SLIGHT Age 37 yrs Sex Male Post code CR4 Car Passenger? Not a passenger PSV Passenger? Not a passenger Seat Belt 8 Cycle Helmet Ped Movement Not applicable Ped Location Not applicable Ped Direction to Not applicable School Pupil Other Roadworker injured Other Details	
Veh.No. 2 Vehicle type Pedal Cycle Make Model Manoeuvre Going ahead other Veh. direction from Southeast to Northwest Towing? No tow or articulation Skidded No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning Veh location at impact (restricted lane) On main carriageway not in restricted lane Junct. location of veh. at 1st impact Mid junction - on roundabout or main road Veh left carriageway? Did not leave carriageway Hit object in c'way? None Hit object off c'way? None First point of impact Front Veh registration no. Other veh.hit (ref.no) 0 Hit and run Not hit and run Drivers age 37 yrs Sex Male Breath test Not Applicable Driving Lic Left Hand Drive Unknown Foreign veh. Not foreign registered vehicle Journey purpose Other Post code CR4			
Full Details 09-July-2019 Accident Ref.No 160029061			

SEVERITY SERIOUS	District Merton Ref.No 16VW40336	Accident Date BETWEEN '01-Dec-2015' AND '30-Nov-2018'	Grid Reference 529080 / 168140 Police Officer Attend: Yes
Date 23/07/2016 Day Saturday Time 00:07 Weather Fine without high winds Road Surface Dry Street Lighting Dark: street lights present and lit	Road B272 Location Windmill Road 118M S of J/W Commonside East Description V1 Came Round Bend and Lost Control of Accident		
SITE DETAILS Speed Limit 30 MPH Carriageway Single carriageway Junction Detail Not at or within 20 metres of junction Junction Control 2nd Road Number Pedestrian Facilities None within 50 metres No physical crossing facility within 50 metre		SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS None CARRIAGEWAY HAZARDS None	CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS 409 Swerved (Driver/Rider - Error) Vehicle 001 A 410 Loss of control (Driver/Rider - Error) Vehicle 001 A 306 Exceeding speed limit (Driver/Rider - Injudicious) Vehicle 001 A 108 Road layout e.g. bend, hill or narrow (Road Environment Contr) Vehicle 001 A
VEHICLES INVOLVED 1		CASUALTIES INVOLVED 2	
Veh.No. 1 Vehicle type Car Make Model Manoeuvre Going ahead right hand bend Veh. direction from South to Northeast Towing? No tow or articulation Skidded No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning Veh location at impact (restricted lane) On main carriageway not in restricted lane Junct. location of veh. at 1st impact Not at or within 20m of junction Veh left carriageway? Left carriageway nearside Hit object in c'way? Kerb Hit object off c'way? None First point of impact Front Veh registration no. Other veh.hit (ref.no) 0 Hit and run Not hit and run Drivers age 63 yrs Sex Male Breath test Negative Driving Lic Left Hand Drive Unknown Foreign veh. Not foreign registered vehicle Journey purpose Other Post code SE5		Cas No 1 Cas Class Driver or Rider Veh ref No 1 Severity SLIGHT Age 63 yrs Sex Male Post code SE5 Car Passenger? Not a passenger PSV Passenger? Not a passenger Seat Belt Unknown Cycle Helmet Ped Movement Not applicable Ped Location Not applicable Ped Direction to Not applicable School Pupil Other Roadworker injured Other Details	
		Cas No 2 Cas Class Passenger Veh ref No 1 Severity SERIOUS Age 62 yrs Sex Male Post code HA3 Car Passenger? Rear seat passenger PSV Passenger? Not a passenger Seat Belt Unknown Cycle Helmet Ped Movement Not applicable Ped Location Not applicable Ped Direction to Not applicable School Pupil Other Roadworker injured Other Details	
Full Details 09-July-2019 Accident Ref.No 16VW40336			

SEVERITY FATAL	District Merton RefNo 180089665	Accident Date BETWEEN '01-Dec-2015' AND '30-Nov-2018'	Grid Reference 529080 / 168150 Police Officer Attend: Yes
Date 12/02/2018 Day Monday Time 10:56 Weather Fine without high winds Road Surface Dry Street Lighting Daylight	Road B272 Location Windmill Road 50M S of J/W Commons East the Nearest Classified	Description Not Known How Collision Occurred of Accident	
SPEED LIMIT 30 MPH CARRIAGEWAY Single carriageway JUNCTION DETAIL Not at or within 20 metres of junction JUNCTION CONTROL 2nd Road Number Pedestrian Facilities None within 50 metres No physical crossing facility within 50 metrc	SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS None CARRIAGEWAY HAZARDS None	CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS 102 Deposit on road e.g. oil, mud, chippings (Road Environment Co Vehicle 001	PARTICIPANT Vehicle 001 PROBABILITY B
VEHICLES INVOLVED 1	CASUALTIES INVOLVED 1		
Veh.No. 1 Vehicle type M/cycle > 500cc Make Model Manoeuvre Going ahead right hand bend Veh. direction from North to North Towing? No tow or articulation Skidded Skidded and overturned Veh location at impact (restricted lane) On main carriageway not in restricted lane Junct. location of veh. at 1st impact Not at or within 20m of junction Veh left carriageway? Left carriageway nearside Hit object in c'way? None Hit object off c'way? Entered ditch First point of impact Front Veh registration no. Other veh.hit (ref.no) 0 Hit and run Not hit and run Drivers age 37 yrs Sex Male Breath test Not provided (medical reas Driving Lic Left Hand Drive Unknown Foreign veh. Not foreign registered vehicle Journey purpose Other Post code CR04	Cas No 1 Cas Class Driver or Rider Veh.ref No 1 Severity FATAL Age 37 yrs Sex Male Post code CR04 Car Passenger? Not a passenger PSV Passenger? Not a passenger Seat Belt 8 Cycle Helmet Ped Movement Not applicable Ped Location Not applicable Ped Direction to Not applicable School Pupil Other Roadworker injured	Other Details	
Full Details 09-July-2019 Accident Ref.No 180089665			

SEVERITY SLIGHT	District Merton RefNo 180110523	Accident Date BETWEEN '01-Dec-2015' AND '30-Nov-2018'	Grid Reference 529130 / 168240 Police Officer Attend: Yes
Date 26/05/2018 Day Saturday Time 04:01 Weather Fine without high winds Road Surface Dry Street Lighting Dark: street lights present and lit	Road B272 Location Windmill Road 10M S of J/W Commons East	Description Not Known How Collision Occurred of Accident	
SPEED LIMIT 30 MPH CARRIAGEWAY Single carriageway JUNCTION DETAIL Mini roundabout JUNCTION CONTROL Give way or uncontrolled 2nd Road Number Pedestrian Facilities None within 50 metres No physical crossing facility within 50 metrc	SPECIAL SITE CONDITIONS None CARRIAGEWAY HAZARDS None	CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS 501 Impaired by alcohol (Driver/Rider - Impairment)	PARTICIPANT Vehicle 001 PROBABILITY A
VEHICLES INVOLVED 1	CASUALTIES INVOLVED 3		
Veh.No. 1 Vehicle type Car Make Model Manoeuvre Turning right Veh. direction from South to Northeast Towing? No tow or articulation Skidded No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning Veh location at impact (restricted lane) Footway (pavement) Junct. location of veh. at 1st impact Approaching junction or waiting Veh left carriageway? Left carriageway nearside Hit object in c'way? None Hit object off c'way? None First point of impact Did not impact Veh registration no. Other veh.hit (ref.no) 0 Hit and run Not hit and run Drivers age 25 yrs Sex Male Breath test Positive Driving Lic Left Hand Drive Unknown Foreign veh. Not foreign registered vehicle Journey purpose Other Post code SW20	Cas No 1 Cas Class Passenger Veh.ref No 1 Severity SLIGHT Age 27 yrs Sex Male Post code SM2 Car Passenger? Front seat passenger PSV Passenger? Not a passenger Seat Belt Worn but not independe; Cycle Helmet Ped Movement Not applicable Ped Location Not applicable Ped Direction to Not applicable School Pupil Other Roadworker injured	Other Details	
Full Details 09-July-2019 Accident Ref.No 180110523			

Wilton Road - Colliers Wood.

I wish to make object to your proposal to install speed humps on Windmill Road, Mitcham as published at <https://www.merton.gov.uk/streets-parking-transport/traffic-management-consultations/proposed-sinusoidal-humps-windmill-road>.

There are two reasons I object.

1. Many councils now have policies to not install new speed humps as they have been shown to create more problems than they solve. Examples are vehicles no longer drive at constant speed and instead accelerate and decelerate between humps. Driving at constant speed produces the least emissions, produces the least amount of noise, is safer, and reduces wear and tear on both vehicles and the carriageway. By promoting a regime of acceleration and deceleration, you are increasing emissions, engine noise, and reducing safety despite the temporary speed reductions. The Police, Ambulance service, Fire service, and bus companies, all oppose speed humps as they increase response times, endanger patients, and create occupational health hazards for those who are driving for a significant part of their day. Speed humps should not be used on any main road, or B road, or on roads where the speed limit is more than 15 mph.
2. Even though the humps you propose are sinusoidal, these still deter cyclists. Humps are not only exceedingly unpleasant to cycle over (regardless of whether or not they are sinusoidal), they are also significantly less safe for bicycles due to the changes of motion. Bicycles and their riders suffer even greater wear and tear when using speed humps than motor vehicles, which at least have suspension. The expected reduction in motor vehicle speed will not outweigh the deterrence caused by humps to cyclists. If a hump is significant enough to slow motor vehicles then it is too aggressive for cyclists. If the hump is so slight that it does not increase discomfort to cyclists, then it won't be effective in slowing motor vehicles anyway. It is my understanding that, unless you have a separated cycle lane, then you are obliged to install speed humps so they traverse the whole of the carriageway. If my understanding is incorrect, then if you must install speed humps, please do so only from the centre of the carriageway until 1.5 m from the kerb. Cars will not be able to avoid the speed hump / cushion, due to this road being so narrow, but at least cyclists won't be adversely affected by the humps as they will not be obliged to cycle over them.
3. Comment 2 and the title of your proposal, "Windmill Road Safety Improvements" invites us to consider what is the better solution. Windmill Road is a busy, congested road. It is also horribly narrow and it is not possible for motor vehicles to safely pass cyclists without crossing over to the lane on the opposite side of the road. Instead, cars squeeze past cyclists, against the rules of the Highway Code. Thankfully, the road has unremarkable grass along the side of it, with trees set back from the road. The obvious solution is to widen the carriageway and install proper, high quality 2.0 m wide, at-any-time cycle lanes, on both sides of the carriageway or, if there is likely to be a bus route on this road in the future, a bus lane in each direction as this would protect both cyclists and encourage use of priority traffic (cyclists, buses, motorcycles etc). At the same time, take the opportunity to widen the carriageway and at the Windmill Road x Croydon Road junction, so that there is a separate right-turn lane for vehicles turning right from Windmill Road on to Croydon Road. This will significantly alleviate this miserable bottleneck, which not only improves pollution, and costs to individuals and business of pointlessly wasting time, but also mitigates the stress of drivers who are caught up in this junction, which is not fit for purpose and a one of the worst bottlenecks in the borough. Stressed drivers are not safer drivers and are more likely to put their foot down in frustration at escaping from the significant, imposed congestion that this junction creates.
4. Comment 3 should also be applied to Beddington Lane, which is another busy, congested road, which is too narrow, especially for the heavy goods vehicles which have to use it, and desperately needs to be widened to include a bus lane each way (the 264 bus which runs along here is unusable because of the traffic speed), and a widened carriageway to accommodate a separate, dedicated right turn lane from Beddington Lane on to Croydon Road.

I know that comment 4 is strictly outside the scope of your proposal but as you are looking at how to improve the safety of Windmill Road, and Beddington Lane is effectively just a continuation of Windmill Road, then it makes sense to consider how to improve safety, as well as make priority traffic more appealing, and so improve the environment, at the same time.

Officer's response

Merton Council does have a duty to improve road safety and this is achieved by using the tools available to the Council. Although compared to previous years, the Council has minimised the introduction of vertical features mainly in residential roads due to the noise and vibration associated with such features. On this occasion, it is considered necessary to address speed and the safety and the proposal as approved by DfT are the appropriate features.

These road humps have been used elsewhere in the borough and they have not raised any concerns by any road users such as cyclists. Infact in roads where it is a cycle route, the Council has previously introduced such a feature without any objections before or after implementation.

Road humps installed at regular intervals along a section of a carriageway is designed to maintain a reduced constant speed; it is acknowledged that there are those very few who may speed and slow when using a traffic calmed road but it is considered that the benefits are greater than those very few who are unlikely to abide by traffic laws regardless. The road humps are likely to minimise risks to cyclists as vehicles would be travelling at lower speed and given the narrow nature of the road, unlikely to make any attempts in overtaking cyclists.

The land that abuts Windmill Road is Common Land and previous requests to establish a footway and undertake improvement work have been rejected. The Council is therefore unable to widen the carriageway.

The footway and the carriageway in Beddington Lane was widened last year.

As with any scheme, all emergency services were consulted and no objections have been raised.

Beech Grove - Mitcham.

I am writing to object to the sighting of five sinusoidal humps in Windmill Road.

Recently there has been the introduction of a 20 mph that slows vehicles down considerably in a road which has a bend which slows traffic down, and there is often a build up of 10-20 vehicles from the Croydon Road.

I therefore strongly object to the proposed installation of even more humps in Mitcham for health reasons (back problems) and emissions from cars as they speed up after negotiating each hump. I also object to the expense of installation of humps where it is not necessary and the considerable disruption to traffic whilst road works take place.

Officer response

Given the number of accidents and recently introduced 20mph speed limit, the Council is obliged to ensure that safety is improved and motorists abide by the speed limit.

Track trials at TRL, measuring passenger discomfort, have shown that, compared with a round top hump, a sinusoidal hump would produce a small reduction in discomfort for cyclists (both humps 75mm high, 3.7m long). The trial indicated that there was little, if any, benefit in terms of driver or passenger discomfort for car or bus passengers in using a sinusoidal hump in preference to a round-top hump or in using sinusoidal ramps in preference to straight ramps.