

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

April 2014

KING'S MALL CAR PARK REDEVELOPMENT - TEMPORARY HIGHWAY WORKS

Report of the Cabinet Member for Transport and Technical Services

Open Report

Classification: For Decision

Key Decision: No

Wards Affected: Hammersmith Broadway

Accountable Executive Director: Nigel Pallace

Report Author: Graham Burrell Projects and Development Manager

Contact Details:

Tel: 020 8753 3461

E-mail: graham.burrell@lbhf.gov.uk

AUTHORISED BY:

The Cabinet Member has signed this

report.....

DATE: 7 April 2014.....

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report outlines temporary highway works proposed for Glenthorne Road in respect to construction works associated with the redevelopment of the Kings Mall car park (Phase 1).
- 1.2 The report seeks approval to enter into a section 278 agreement under the Highways Act, 1980, for the proposed highway works.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That approval is given for the Council to enter into a section 278 agreement with the developer to undertake the highway works necessary to allow the construction works to proceed based on one of the options discussed in paragraphs 5.1 - 5.3 below.

3 REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1 In order to ensure the safety of road users and address pedestrian movements during the Phase 1 construction period of the development.

4 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 4.1 The redevelopment of the Kings Mall car park site will result in the demolition of the existing West 45 office building and the 950 space public car park, and redevelopment of the site comprising a single building to provide a mixed use development comprising a 700 space replacement public car park, 529 square metres of ground floor commercial floor space (use classes A1-A4, D1 and D2) and 418 new homes
- 4.2 The site is being redeveloped in two phases. This will ensure that some public car parking spaces remain available whilst the development is in progress. This report addresses temporary highway works associated with phase one of the development which relates to the eastern part of the site. Issues in respect of phase two works will require a separate approval
- 4.3 For most of the construction period the constrained nature of the phase one site means that construction vehicles will use the public highway to pick up and deliver building materials. The strategy developed for construction involves stopping the use of the footway on the southern side of Glenthorne Road adjacent to the Phase one site see plan A attached. Consequently the zebra crossing in Glenthorne Road, just west of Beadon Road is proposed to be removed. The developer is proposing two temporary zebra crossings, one in Glenthorne Road just east of Beadon Road and one just to the west of the phase one part of the site, see again Plan A. This would allow pedestrians to cross Glenthorne Road to the northern footway and then rejoin the southern footway as soon as possible (and vice-versa for eastbound pedestrian movements). The works would also include revisions to traffic orders and road markings.

4.4 Any works are subject to a satisfactory detailed design, safety audit and a designer's report being provided, approval by Transport for London (in particular their Network Management team as part of the Strategic Route Network approval process and London Buses) traffic management orders, Notices under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and consultation with other parties including residents and businesses. In principle, the proposed temporary highway works are considered acceptable to the highway authority and are considered of public benefit as it will ensure that the needs of pedestrians are addressed during the phase one construction works.

5 OPTIONS

Option 1: Do minimum - remove existing crossing point

5.1 The zebra crossing in Glenthorne Road just west of Beadon Road will need to be relocated permanently as part of the development of the Kings Mall car park site and its removal during the construction period is considered necessary. One option would be to simply remove the current crossing and not relocate it, leaving it to the judgement of pedestrians to determine when it is safe to cross. However the busy nature of Glenthorne Road would create a barrier to pedestrian movements which would be undesirable.

Option 2: Relocate the existing crossing only.

5.2 One option would be to relocate the current crossing but not install a new crossing just west of the phase one works. Pedestrians could use the existing zebra crossing just west of Cambridge Grove. The advantage of this would be to limit the number of zebra crossings in Glenthorne Road. It is generally considered that an excessive amount of formal crossings along a road diminishes the overall safety of crossing points along a road as well an impacting on smooth traffic flow.

Option 3: Relocate the existing crossing and install new crossing west of the Phase one works.

5.3 The basis of considering an additional zebra crossing during the period of phase one works is to ensure that pedestrians are inconvenienced as little as possible, and are also dissuaded from making more dangerous ad hoc movements past the construction works. The retention of the additional crossing point during phase one construction works is therefore considered desirable but it is intended to remove this post construction..

6 CONSULTATION

6.1 Paragraph 4.4 outlines the consultation and other approval processes which need to take place ahead of implementation.

7 COSTS AND PROGRAMME

- 7.1 Any of the options would need to be subjected to consultation, approval processes, final design and detailed estimates. It is however envisaged that the likely costs including officers' time are approximately £10,000 (option one), £45,000 (option two) and £95,000 (option three).
- 7.2 The developer has asked for the highway works to be completed by June, 2014. The processes outlined in paragraph 4.4 are however likely to take longer than this and implementation in late Summer 2014 is more realistic. Officers are examining how the processes could be "fast-tracked". One approach is to ensure that the developer's consultants are tasked with producing an acceptable detailed design, carrying out safety audits, risk assessment, and producing a designer's response to the safety audit. This places the onus on the developer to complete these elements in the programme as quickly as possible. Officers at LBHF will audit the documents submitted and judge their acceptability. The works though will be carried out by the highway authority not the developer using the Council's measured term contractors.

8 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The proposed works do not cause any notable changes to equality. For some journeys on foot or by wheelchair the length of the journey will be longer, but only marginally. Option three would offer shorter journey lengths than option two for some journeys if the formal crossing points were utilised. Any new crossings will be constructed with dropped kerbs, and anti-skid resistance material will be provided on the approach to these crossings.

9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The highway authority is permitted under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to enter into agreements with developers for the execution of works at the developer's expense.
- 9.2 The preconditions for an agreement under this agreement are firstly that the highway authority should be satisfied that it will be of benefit to the public to enter into an agreement for the execution of works by the authority.
- 9.3 Secondly, the works must be such that the highway are authorised to execute. The proposed works could fall within the highway authority's power of improvement.

10 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The costs of this project will be charged to the developer. There are therefore no financial implications.
- 10.2 Implications verified/completed by: Giles Batchelor, Finance Manager, Ex. 2407

11 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1 A designer's risk assessment will be undertaken and kept on record.
- 11.2 Implications verified/completed by: Graham Burrell, Projects and Development Manager, Graham Burrell, Tel: 020 8753 3461

12 PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no procurement related issues as any works will be carried out under the Council's Highways Term Contracts

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT

	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.			

[Note: Please list only those documents that are not already in the public domain, i.e. you do not need to include Government publications, previous public reports etc.] Do not list exempt documents. Background Papers must be retained for public inspection for four years after the date of the meeting.

PLAN A - temporary highway works proposed by developer (option 3)

