

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 16 December 2015
AGENDA ITEM:	12
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Croham, Coulsdon East, Purley and Thornton Heath
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: This report is in line with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6• The Croydon Plan 2nd Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.• Croydon Corporate Plan 2013 – 15• www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/	
FINANCIAL IMPACT: These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: n/a	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they: 1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions and the officer's recommendations in response to these in: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mayfield Road, South Croydon• Tollers Lane, Coulsdon East• Edgehill Road, Purley• Grangecliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath	

1.2 Agree the following:

- Mayfield Road, South Croydon – not to proceed with the original proposal
- Tollers Lane, Coulsdon East – to proceed with the original proposal
- Edgehill Road, Purley – to proceed with the original proposal
- Grangecliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath – to proceed with the original proposal

1.3 Delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Highways, the authority to make the necessary Traffic Management Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to implement recommendations 1.2 above.

2 1.4 Note: the officer to inform the objectors of the above decision.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Tollers Lane, Coulsdon East, Edgehill Road, Purley and Grangecliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 **Mayfield Road near Essenden Road, Croham** – A request was received from a disabled resident for the extension of the existing double yellow lines due to obstruction problems with vehicles parking close to their driveway. Surveys have shown that parking in the section of the road close to Essenden Road does cause problems for through traffic on the approach to a double bend where Mayfield Road meets Carlton Road. Further restrictions would ensure that northbound traffic keeps to the left side of the road and reduce potential conflict with traffic exiting Essenden Road and help with driveway obstruction issues experienced by this and other residents.

3.2 Five local residents have objected to the proposed extension of the double yellow line in Mayfield Road for a number of reasons including:-

- Extending the existing double yellow line will not decrease traffic flow or improve safety.
- On street parking will increase on the east side of the road where parking will cause more issues to traffic flow in Mayfield Road.
- The issue of obstruction when exiting Essenden Road is more than adequately dealt with by the existing double yellow line.
- The extension of the double yellow line in Mayfield Road will reduce the number of free parking spaces.

- The extension of the double yellow line will not help with driveway obstruction issues in Mayfield Road.
- The existing vehicles being parked at this location slows traffic flow in Mayfield Road improving safety.
- The proposed extension of the double yellow line may exacerbate the speed of the traffic flow.
- The publication of the proposed amendment has taken place at the peak of the summer months with local residents away on holiday etc.

3.3 **Response** – A site meeting took place between officers and local residents on 11 November and during the evening to discuss the parking issues. At the time there was a van parked close to the driveway which would have caused some difficulty in exiting the driveway. However, other residents also experience driveway obstruction issues and surveys have shown that there are not always vans parking at this particular location. In view of the number of objections and the fact that the parking may simply move further along the road, it is proposed not to extend the restrictions as shown on **PD-276f** at the current time but to monitor parking along this section of the road for future review.

3.4 **Tollers Lane, Coulsdon East**

3.5 A local resident requested parking restrictions at the junction of Curling Close and Tollers Lane where obstructive parking is making it increasingly dangerous for motorists exiting Curling Close. In view of this it was proposed to introduce 10 metres of “at any time” waiting restrictions in Tollers Lane, either side of its junction with Curling Close and in Curling Close, at the junction with Tollers Lane.

3.6 One household has objected to the proposed restriction as they have two vehicles and park one outside and one adjacent to their property. One of the vehicles is a van and they are concerned that they cannot park it outside neighbouring properties as it will block the light and cause distress to their neighbours. They feel that these restrictions will prevent them parking near their house.

3.7 **Response** - The purpose of the proposed waiting restrictions is to improve visibility and safety at this junction as an engineer visiting the site has agreed that parking at this location blocks the view of drivers exiting Curling Close.

3.8 Whilst the proposed restrictions will remove parking spaces, they are confined to the junction, where vehicles should not park, in accordance with rule 243 of the Highway Code. In addition, the majority of Tollers Lane and Curling Close will remain unrestricted, which should ensure that there are alternative parking options nearby for any displaced vehicles.

3.9 As the proposed restrictions are the minimum necessary to prevent obstructive parking at this junction, which has been the source of a complaint, it is proposed

to proceed with the restrictions originally proposed and shown in plan no. **PD – 283d**.

3.10 Edgehill Road, Purley

3.11 A resident requested parking restrictions at the corner of Edgehill Road and Kingsdown Avenue. Double yellow lines are already in place on the apex of the bend. However, when cars park by the entrance to Willowbank Close, traffic approaching from Edgehill Road has to cross the centreline, which is particularly dangerous due to the 90 degree bend. In response it was proposed to introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions either side of the entrance to Willowbank Close.

3.12 A resident has objected to the proposed restriction on the grounds that members of the household are disabled and the driveway is not big enough to accommodate all the household’s vehicles. Consequently they park some of their vehicles outside the house and the proposed restriction will cause inconvenience as this will no longer be possible.

3.13 **Response** - It is acknowledged that the proposal would remove one car space from outside the objector’s property. However, the space immediately outside the objector’s driveway entrance would remain unaffected and available for parking and as the remainder of the carriageway is unrestricted, residents should still be able to park in the vicinity.

3.14 The disabled members of the household should not be inconvenienced if they park on the driveway, nearest the house, whilst the able-bodied members of the household find alternative locations in the street.

3.15 For the reasons detailed above, it is proposed to go ahead with the proposal as shown in plan no. **PD – 283g**.

3.16 Grangecliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath

3.17 A request was received from the Highway Improvements Section for parking restrictions to be implemented at the junctions of Grange Road, Grange Hill and Grangecliffe Gardens. Parked cars frequently cause obstructions near these two junctions where pedestrian crossing facilities have been installed, blocking sightlines and compromising pedestrian safety. In view of this it was proposed to introduce 10 metres of “at any time” waiting restrictions on both sides of Grangecliffe Gardens at the junction with Grange Hill, in addition to proposed “at any time” waiting restrictions in Grange Hill and Grange Road, to prevent obstruction at the junctions.

3.18 Two residents have objected to the proposed restrictions in Grangecliffe Gardens on the grounds that they go too far and will impact on residents’ lives at weekends and in the evening. One of the objectors suggests that the restrictions should be reduced to single yellow line restrictions operating from Monday to

Friday at times when the Council are likely to require access for refuse vehicles (e.g. 6am to midday). One objector is concerned that the introduction of these restrictions at the junction will increase parking in the “keep clear” area at the other end of the road, which is used as a turning circle. This objector questions the need for the two pedestrian refuges in addition to the raised zebra crossing in Grange Road and suggests that a 20mph speed limit and footway parking should be introduced to reduce parking congestion.

- 3.19 **Response** – The restrictions in Grangecliffe Gardens, Grange Hill and Grange Road were proposed in response to a complaint about obstructive parking from a local resident. The restrictions complement the pedestrian crossing facilities in Grange Road (a raised zebra crossing and pedestrian refuge islands either side of the junction with Grange Hill) and Grange Hill (a pedestrian refuge island near the junction of Grange Road) ensuring that sightlines on the approach to these crossing points are kept clear at all times. The crossing facilities were introduced in accordance with the Council’s policy to introduce them where they would be well used, reduce accident risk and encourage walking as a mode of transport. A reduced restriction would not be sufficient to ensure that the approach to these crossing points was kept clear at all times and would also fail to keep the junctions clear for emergency service vehicles, should they require access.
- 3.20 The Council is in the process of rolling out 20mph zones across the borough and this programme should eventually include Grangecliffe Gardens. However, the street does not fit the criteria for a footway parking scheme as the carriageway is of an average width which should allow vehicles to pass each other, providing the junction is kept clear of parked vehicles. Further restrictions could be considered in the keep clear area at the end of Grangecliffe Gardens, should obstructive parking become a problem there.
- 3.21 In view of the above and the fact that the restrictions in Grangecliffe Gardens are limited to 10 metres at the junction, where rule 243 of the Highway Code states vehicles should not park, it is proposed that they should go ahead as shown in the plan no. **PD – 283L**.

4. 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. 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 £4k un-allocated to be utilised in 2015/2016.

4.1 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	25	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Capital Budget</u> available	0	0	0	0
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision</u> <u>from report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

4.2 The effect of the decision

4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at the above locations (in conjunction with the restrictions on the same public notice) including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £9,200.

4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2015/16.

4.3 Risks

4.3.1 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.

4.3.2 The cost per restriction is reduced by introducing a number of parking restrictions in one schedule and therefore spreading the legal costs.

4.4 Options

4.4.1 The alternative option is to not introduce the parking restrictions. This could cause traffic obstruction and have a detrimental effect on road safety.

4.5 Savings/future efficiencies

4.5.1 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.

4.5.2 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.

4.5.3 Approved by: Louise Phillips, Business Partner, Place Department.

5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

5.1 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.

5.2 The Council must comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (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.

5.3 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor, Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Borough Solicitor & Director of Democratic & Legal Services.

6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

6.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

6.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of Human Resources, Chief Executive Department.

7. EQUALITIES IMPACT

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

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

8.1 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.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 9.1 Waiting restrictions at junctions are normally placed at a minimum of 10 metres from the 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.

10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 The recommendation is to introduce the original proposals in Tollers Lane, Edgehill Road and Grangecliffe Gardens. These proposals will improve visibility and safety at locations where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. Surveys have been undertaken which confirm the parking problems and justification to introduce new restrictions. It is proposed to not proceed with the proposal for extending the double yellow lines in Mayfield Road, South Croydon due to the number of objections from local residents.

11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 11.1 The alternative to new double yellow line waiting restrictions would be additional single yellow line daytime restrictions. However, as these locations are ones where obstructive parking causes traffic flow or road safety concerns, 'At any time' waiting restrictions are more appropriate to prevent obstructive parking at all times.

REPORT AUTHOR: Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Order Engineer
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8604 7363
(Ext. 47363)

CONTACT OFFICER: David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8726 6000
(Ext. 88229)

BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972