

Croydon Council

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 7 July 2015
AGENDA ITEM:	10
SUBJECT:	PETITIONS: VALLEY ROAD – REQUEST TO SOLVE PARKING PROBLEM GONVILLE ROAD – REQUEST TO REMOVE YELLOW LINES WINGATE CRESCENT – INSUFFICIENT RESIDENTS’ PARKING
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director, Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Kenley and West Thornton
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:	
<p>This report is in accordance with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough’s roads as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Croydon Plan; Transport Chapter. • The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies • Croydon’s Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6 • Croydon Corporate Plan 2013 – 15 • www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/ 	
FINANCIAL SUMMARY:	
These proposal can be contained within available budget	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: Not a Key Decision	

<p>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they:</p> <p>1.1 Consider the petition requesting help to reduce obstructive parking in Valley Road by Glenside Close and the proposals to introduce double yellow line ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions at the Valley Road junctions with Glenside Close and Ashurst Close.</p> <p>1.2 Authorise the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Highways & Parking</p>
--

Services, to give notice and subject to receiving no material objections make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) to introduce the restrictions in paragraph 1.1 above.

- 1.3 Note that any material objections received on the giving of public notice in paragraph 1.2 above will be reported to a future Traffic Management Cabinet Advisory Committee for Members' consideration.
- 1.4 Consider the petition requesting that the single yellow lines in Gonville Road at the entrance to the school are removed and the officer's comments in response and agree to the proposal to retain the existing single yellow line and to monitor parking and the effects of the restriction.
- 1.5 Note that the outcome of the monitoring in 1.4 above will be reported to a future Traffic Management Advisory Committee for Members' consideration.
- 1.6 To consider the petition requesting that the Council help improve parking conditions for residents of Wingate Crescent and agree to the officers proposal to introduce a small residents' only parking scheme (operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday) for Mitcham Road by Therapia Lane subject to consultation with residents.
- 1.7 Note that the outcome of the consultation in 1.6 above will be reported to a future Traffic Management Advisory Committee for Members' consideration.
- 1.8 Note that the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Highways & Parking Services will inform the petitioners of these decisions.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1A petition, signed by 19 residents of Glenside Close and Valley Road has been received. The petition is requesting help to reduce obstructive parking in Valley Road by Glenside Close.
- 2.2A petition signed by 47 residents of the Gonville Road area has been received via a Ward Councillor. The petition is requesting that the single yellow lines in Gonville Road at the entrance to the school are removed.
- 2.3A petition signed by 37 residents of Wingate Crescent has been received requesting that the Council help improve parking conditions for residents.

3. DETAIL

Valley Road by Glenside Close – Obstructive Parking

- 3.1 A petition signed by 19 residents of Glenside Close and Valley Road has been received. A letter with the petition requests help to resolve the current problem with vehicles parking close to the junction restricting access and compromising visibility sight lines.

- 3.2 Surveys have shown that vehicles do park close and sometimes partly across the entrance to Glenside Close creating problems for residents. It was also noted that vehicles park close to the Ashurst Close junction where a footway parking scheme has recently been introduced to help manage parking in the road. It is proposed that double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions should be introduced as shown on **Plan No. PD – 276i**. These proposals should help improve safety and access at both junctions.

Gonville Road – Request to remove single yellow lines

- 3.3 A petition signed by 47 residents from Gonville Road and other nearby roads has been received. The petition is titled 'Petition to remove the yellow line in Gonville Road.'

A letter with the petition was addressed to a Ward Councillor and is titled; Please help us to remove Single / Double yellow lines in front of our houses 113,120, 125, 138 and 140 Gonville Road.

The letter states that:

'Residents strongly objected to the original proposals and that the main issues were with long vehicles accessing the entrance to the school through the off-set gates but residents have always co-operated with the School by relocating parked vehicles when requested.

The school has expanded without due consideration of the traffic and environmental impact suffered by the local community. Despite the objections the yellow lines were introduced resulting in a negative effect in house prices and residents wish to seek compensation from the Council. The request is to remove the yellow lines outside Nos.123 and 125 Gonville Road.

Residents should not be penalised for the facilities enjoyed before parking congestion has been increased due to more staff / visitors having to park in the road. It is requested that the gate be re-located to the centre and that a quote for this has already been given to the school. If the restrictions must remain then they should be amended to 8.30 to 9.30am and 2.45 to 3.30pm and for term time only.'

- 3.4 The original proposal for the restrictions as included in a report to 21 July 2014 Traffic Management Advisory Committee meeting was for double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions. Following objections to this proposal the scheme was amended to single yellow line 8 to 9.30am and 2.30 to 4pm, Monday to Friday waiting restrictions matching the operational hours of School Keep Clear Markings. These restrictions were introduced early in 2015 but instructions have been given to Parking Enforcement to only enforce the yellow lines during School Term time when the entrance is in use.
- 3.5 The single yellow lines (as shown on Plan PD – 231p) were placed at the cul-de-sac end of the road in front of nos.138 and 140 Gonville Road and directly opposite which is on the side of Gonville Primary School grounds where the main

pedestrian entrance is located. Not only do the restrictions ensure that long vehicles can access the gates which are off-set close to no.140 but they also provide a safe area in front of the school entrance and an area where vehicles can carryout a 3 point turn reducing the need for vehicles to be reversed along the road with the potential dangers this entails.

- 3.6 Due to the need to ensure that the entrance is kept clear of parking and the need to have consistent waiting restrictions it is proposed to retain the existing waiting restrictions. However, as the restrictions have only been in place for a few months it is proposed to monitor parking and restrictions at this location for future review.

Wingate Crescent – Request to improve parking conditions for residents

- 3.7 A petition signed by 37 residents of Wingate Crescent has been received. The petition is addressed to Parking Services and states:

‘We live in Wingate Crescent, Croydon CR0. Unfortunately in this area there are many cars and there is no space for some residents. We hope our Council could help us for this problem.’

- 3.8 Wingate Crescent is on the edge of the Borough off Mitcham Road and is a narrow cul-de-sac where the enforcement of the footway parking ban is currently suspended. Over the coming weeks a formal footway parking scheme is being introduced with signs and marked bays where footway parking can safely take place without obstruction to pedestrians or road users. Residents will be informed of the proposals which are also being introduced in other roads where enforcement of the ban has been suspended to ensure that there is clarity for drivers where footway parking can and cannot take place.

- 3.9 There is very limited alternative parking in the area if there are no spaces in Wingate Crescent as there are very few side roads along this section of Mitcham Road and the combination of local parking restrictions and businesses further reduces available parking.

- 3.10 The options for Wingate Crescent with comments include:

- Do nothing – introducing a parking scheme will result in a displacement of parking into the surrounding area and will therefore resolve the parking problem for some residents whilst creating more problems for other residents. A do nothing option will therefore retain the status quo.
- A Residents’ Permit only scheme for Wingate Crescent – a scheme for Wingate Crescent only will limit the impact on the surrounding area and should resolve the parking problems experienced by the residents in the petition. If after a scheme is introduced the parking conditions deteriorate for the neighbouring residents then consideration could be given to extending the parking controls into Mitcham Road and road. It is suggested that the residents’ only scheme operates for between 9am and 5pm, Monday to Saturday matching the majority of Controlled Parking Zone schemes in the Borough.

- A larger Residents' Permit only scheme – consideration could be given to consulting residents in Mitcham Road (perhaps as far as Therapia Lane) and side roads such as Moys Close and part of Rochford Road, to ensure that other residents are included if they are experiencing similar problems. A larger scheme will be more viable for regular enforcement and could benefit more residents. However, there would be a greater displacement of parking by non-permit holders further along the road and on the side roads which currently suffer from some tram commuter parking.
- 3.11 Due to the likely impact of a larger scheme it is proposed to introduce a scheme for Wingate Crescent as shown on **Plan No. PD – 278** subject to consultation with residents.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The legal process requires that formal consultation takes place in the form of Public Notices published in the London Gazette and a local paper (Croydon Guardian). Although it is not a legal requirement this Council also fixes street notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed scheme and writes to occupiers who are directly affected to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.
- 4.2 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK, The Owner Drivers' Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport and bus operators are consulted under the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Additional bodies, up to 27 in total, are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposals.
- 4.3 Once the notices have been published the public has 21 days to comment or object to the proposals. If no relevant objections are received, subject to agreement to the delegated authority sought by the recommendations, the Traffic Management Order is then made. Any relevant objections received will be reported back to this Committee for recommendation as to whether the scheme should be introduced as originally proposed, amended or abandoned. The objectors are then informed of the decision.

5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is a revenue budget of £50k for CPZ undertakings and £50k for Footway Parking and Disabled Bays, from which these commitments if approved will be funded from. Attached to the papers of this meeting is a summary of the overall financial impact of this and other applications for approval at this meeting. If all applications were approved there would remain £45k un-allocated to be utilised in 2015/2016.

5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Revenue Budget</u> available				
Expenditure	70	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
<u>Capital Budget</u> available	0	0	0	0
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision</u> from report				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

5.2 The effect of the decision

- 5.2.1 The cost of introducing the new waiting restrictions in Valley Road, Kenley, including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing in conjunction with other sites included in the 'Proposed Parking Restrictions – Various Locations' report to the same meeting has been estimated at £6,200.
- 5.2.2 The cost of consulting residents of Wingate Crescent on a potential residents parking scheme has estimated at £250.
- 5.2.3 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2015/16.

5.3 Risks

- 5.3.1 Whilst there is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate, this work is allowed for in the current budgets for 2015/16.
- 5.3.2 The cost per restriction is reduced by introducing a number of parking restrictions in one schedule and therefore spreading the legal costs.

5.4 Options

- 5.4.1 The alternative option is to not introduce the parking restrictions in Valley Road, Kenley. This could cause traffic obstruction and have a detrimental effect on road safety.
- 5.4.2 Not consulting residents of Wingate Crescent would not appease petitioners who may feel that the Council is not taking their concerns seriously.

5.5 Savings/future efficiencies

- 5.5.1 The current method of introducing parking restrictions is very efficient with the design and legal (Traffic Management Order) work being carried out within the department.
- 5.5.2 The marking of the bays and the supply and installation of signs and posts is carried out using the new Highways Contract and the rates are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.
- 5.5.3 Approved by: Louise Phillips, Business Partner, Place Department.

6. COMMENTS OF THE COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 6.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Sections 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provide powers to introduce and implement Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The Council must also have regard to matters such as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.
- 6.2 The Council must comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations must be considered before a final decision is made.
- 6.3 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor and Monitoring.

7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 7.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.
- 7.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of Human Resources, Chief Executive department.

8. EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 8.1 An initial Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and it is considered that a Full EqIA is not required.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 9.1 Double yellow line waiting restrictions do not require signage therefore these proposals are environmentally friendly. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

10.1 Waiting restrictions at junctions are normally placed at a minimum of 10 metres from a junction which is the distance up to which the Police can place Fixed Penalty Charge Notices to offending vehicles regardless of any restrictions on the ground.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The recommendations are for new parking restrictions in Valley Road to reduce the obstruction problems experienced by residents. It is proposed not to remove the single yellow line waiting restrictions for Gonville Road as this could adversely affect the safety of Gonville Primary pupils and access to the school. In Wingate Crescent it is proposed to consult residents on a possible residents parking scheme to determine the level of support for parking controls.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 The option for Valley Road would be not to proceed with the yellow line waiting restrictions which would not resolve the parking obstruction problems experienced by residents. If the yellow line waiting restrictions were removed from Gonville Road this could be detrimental to the school due to restricted access and could potentially affect the safety of pupils. Reducing the operational hours of the restrictions may cause driver confusion and it is important to have a consistent approach when tackling school parking issues. Not consulting residents of Wingate Crescent on a potential residents scheme may be seen as ignoring the petitioners requests.

**REPORT AUTHOR /
CONTACT OFFICER:**

David Wakeling, Parking Design
Manager, Infrastructure – Parking
Design, 020 8726 6000 (Ext. 88229)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None