

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  <b>2 May 2019</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Paul Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share)</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Addiscombe West, Fairfield, Norbury and Pollards Hill, Purley and Woodcote and Shirley North</b>

**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:

- Croydon Local Plan – Nov 2015
- Local Implementation Plan 2; 2.8 Transport Objectives
- Croydon's Community Strategy 2013-18; Priority Areas 1, 2 & 3
- Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 – 18
- [www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/](http://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 Environment, Transport and Regeneration that they:

- 1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions and the officer's recommendations in response to these in:
- Amberley Grove, Addiscombe West
  - High Street, Croydon / Robert Street, Fairfield
  - Dalmeny Avenue / Dunbar Avenue / Kilmartin Avenue / Melrose Avenue, Norbury & Pollards Hill
  - Reedham Drive, Purley & Woodcote
  - Bywood Avenue, Shirley North
- 1.2 Agree the following, for the reasons set out in this report:
- To proceed with the restrictions, as proposed, at each of the above locations.

- 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 recommendation 1.2 above.

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 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Amberley Grove, Bywood Avenue, Dalmeny Avenue, Dunbar Avenue, Kilmartin Avenue, Melrose Avenue and Reedham Drive, and 7am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday, loading restrictions in a section of High Street, Croydon.
- 2.2 On 23 April 2019 and pursuant to the delegation from the Leader dated 6 June 2016, the Executive Director Place, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) determined that it was appropriate to refer consideration of the matters detailed paragraph 2.1 above to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for onward recommendation and determination to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share).

## 3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

### 3.1 Amberley Grove, Addiscombe West

A request was received from a local resident asking for existing parking restrictions to be extended around the cul de sac end of Amberley Grove. 'At any time' restrictions are already in situ at the south-eastern end of the cul de sac, extending from outside No. 11 Amberley Grove on the south-western side to No. 15 Amberley Grove on the north-eastern side. In addition, white 'keep clear' markings have also been installed to draw attention to the dropped kerbs of Nos. 13 and 14 Amberley Grove. However, obstructive parking still takes place. As a result, vehicles are unable to turn around and have to reverse back along the road to the junction with Morland Road. The situation has recently deteriorated further due to an increase of vehicles associated with development of No. 14 Amberley Grove at the end of the cul de sac into flats.

- 3.2 Site visits confirmed that the existing markings are in need of refurbishment and that illegal parking was taking place. It is also noted that with a vehicle parked outside No. 16 Amberley Grove, the ability for vehicles to turn around at the end of the cul de sac is significantly compromised. It was therefore proposed to extend the existing "At any time" waiting restrictions on the north-eastern side of the road outside No. 16 Amberley Grove to match those already in situ on the south-western side as illustrated on drawing No. **PD - 379a**.
- 3.3 One objection has been received from a relative on behalf of a local resident for the following reasons:-

- 3.4 Parking in Amberley Grove is already limited.
- 3.5 The resident is disabled, uses a wheelchair and is attended daily by carers. The resident is regularly transported to Day Care Centres by mini bus and occasionally transported to hospital by ambulance and to the GP's surgery by relatives.
- 3.6 The resident used to have a disabled bay but this was removed and the introduction of the double yellow lines will make it very difficult for relatives, Day Care Centre vehicles and Ambulances to pick up the resident when necessary.
- 3.7 **Response-** The 'At any time' waiting restrictions have been proposed to remove obstructive parking in the turning head at the cul-de-sac end of Amberley Grove. Site visits have shown that with cars parked in the turning head where these restrictions are proposed, there is insufficient space to enable vehicles to turn round.
- 3.8 Whilst the extended restrictions will prohibit vehicles waiting, they will not prevent vehicles stopping to drop-off or pick-up a passenger, or to load and unload goods. This could actually assist in ensuring the space remains clear for the use of vehicles in the process of picking up the resident for Day Care Centre visits or medical appointments.
- 3.9 Although the restrictions will remove one car space, the rest of Amberley Grove will remain unrestricted, which should allow visitors opportunities to park.
- 3.10 A disabled bay application form has been sent to the resident and a response is awaited. However, in order to be eligible the resident must have regular use of a vehicle kept at the address, either as a driver or passenger. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the proposals shown in drawing No. **PD – 379a**.
- 3.11 **High Street, Croydon (Katharine Street to Mint Walk), Fairfield**  
Complaints have been received regarding delivery vehicles causing congestion when loading and unloading to adjacent commercial premises on the north-eastern side of the High Street, between Katharine Street and Mint Walk, despite there being a dedicated loading bay being provided on the opposite side of the road. This activity is of a particular issue for buses during peak hours and during the working day with vehicles parked at this location the carriageway width is narrowed, leading to congestion and service delays.
- 3.12 Consequently, to remove this obstructive parking and improve safety in this section of the High Street it was proposed to introduce 7am – 7pm, Monday to Saturday loading restrictions as illustrated on drawing No. **PD – 379g**.
- 3.13 One objection has been received from a public house on the following grounds:-
- 3.14 The public house receives deliveries every day which are often heavy loads, and health and safety requires their deliveries to be made as close as possible to their premises.
- 3.15 Deliveries cannot be made in Katharine Street or on the opposite side of the High

Street, where “at any time” loading restrictions already apply, and the existing loading bay, also on the opposite side of the High Street, is insufficient.

- 3.16 It is not possible for the business to arrange deliveries outside the times of the proposed loading restriction.
- 3.17 Other businesses, including a café and supermarket, will also be affected.
- 3.18 **Response** – The loading restrictions have been proposed due to the obstruction caused by delivery vehicles in this section of High Street, Croydon. Whilst it is appreciated that this amendment to the loading restrictions will cause affected commercial premises some inconvenience, the traffic congestion caused by delivery vehicles, particularly delays to buses, can only be prevented with the introduction of these restrictions.
- 3.19 Whilst facilities are very limited, a loading bay operating “at any time” has been provided on the opposite side of the High Street adjacent to the junction with Surrey Street. Alternatively, businesses can arrange to receive deliveries outside of the loading restriction times (before 7am or after 7pm from Monday to Saturday, or on Sunday).
- 3.20 In the circumstances, it is proposed to proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing No. **PD – 379g**.
- 3.21 **Robert Street, Fairfield**  
Concerns have been raised about obstructive parking in the turning head area of Robert Street, a small cul de sac leading off High Street, Croydon. Site visits confirmed that parking takes place in the turning head which severely limits the ability for large vehicles to manoeuvre in the road. To ensure access for large vehicles such as waste collection lorries, delivery and emergency services vehicles, it is proposed to introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions as illustrated on drawing No. **PD – 361I**.
- 3.22 One local resident has objected as follows:-
- 3.23 Parking is already restricted and double yellow lines will make it impossible to drop items off or park outside at any time, making life more difficult for residents.
- 3.24 The current restrictions are adequate and regularly enforced as the Civil Enforcement Officers are based in Robert Street.
- 3.25 If this is being introduced due to taxi cabs parking then a restriction on cabs only would be more appropriate.

- 3.26 **Response** – The restrictions have been proposed to ensure that large vehicles such as waste collection lorries and fire service vehicles can manoeuvre. Whilst the restrictions will mean that residents cannot park in Robert Street at any time, they will not prevent vehicles stopping to load or unload goods or to drop off or pick up a passenger. Residents of Robert Street are eligible to purchase parking permits for the Central controlled parking zone to enable them to park in other streets in the vicinity.
- 3.27 The problem is not confined to taxi cabs and although the existing restrictions are regularly enforced, it is considered necessary to extend them to provide an additional visual deterrent, in the form of double yellow lines, to help prevent obstruction. Consequently, it is proposed to proceed with the proposals as shown in plan No. **PD – 361I**.
- 3.28 **Ardfern Avenue/Dalmeny Avenue/Dunbar Avenue/Ederline Avenue/ Kilmartin Avenue/Melrose Avenue, Norbury & Pollards Hill**  
Complaints were received from local residents regarding vehicles parking too close to the above mentioned junctions causing visibility issues. Officers visiting the site observed that obstructive parking does indeed take place. Consequently, to improve sightlines and increase safety at these junctions it is proposed to introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions as illustrated on drawing Nos. **PD - 379b**.
- 3.28 Objections have been received from nine local residents, five from residents of Dalmeny Avenue, two from residents of Melrose Avenue, one from a resident of Dunbar Avenue and one from a resident of Kilmartin Avenue. The issues raised by objectors and Officers’ responses are as follows (listed by road).
- 3.29 **Objections from Dalmeny Avenue**
- 3.30 A car dealership in Ederline Avenue parks cars for sale in the vicinity and this restricts spaces for residents, which will be further limited by these restrictions. The Council has not prevented the car dealership from doing so, although it has been advised of this issue.
- 3.31 A resident of Ederline Avenue is carrying out vehicle repairs and sales close to the junction with Dalmeny Avenue and this also reduces spaces and is an activity the Council has failed to restrict.
- 3.32 Problems with refuse vehicles turning are often caused by the drivers’ poor navigational skills.
- 3.33 Fly tipping in Ederline Avenue happens regularly and also reduces available spaces.
- 3.34 Dropped kerbs in front of garages in Ederline Avenue reduce the available parking space for residents.
- 3.35 The proposal will affect at least four households on each corner, some of whom have small children and need a convenient parking space.

- 3.36 The restrictions will lead to the loss of spaces that residents cannot afford to lose as Dalmeny Avenue is heavily congested. The proposals will escalate existing problems and increase bad feelings among neighbours.
- 3.37 Many of the houses in Melrose Avenue and Kilmartin Avenue have off-street parking. Dalmeny Avenue does not, so the ability to park on the road is essential.
- 3.38 Clamping down on illegal street selling of cars and untaxed cars could clear many hazards. Untaxed vehicles have been reported but and nothing has been done.
- 3.39 One objector says the proposals will lead to a loss of 12 car parking spaces at the cross roads junction of Ederline Avenue and Dalmeny Avenue, where are these cars supposed to go?
- 3.40 One objector does not see the purpose of the proposals and states that no accidents have occurred in the area.
- 3.41 The only vehicles that reduce sightlines are big white work vans. Can't these vehicles be banned instead of a blanket restriction?
- 3.42 **Response – Dalmeny Avenue**  
Selling vehicles on the public highway and fly tipping are activities that constitute an offence under Section 38 of the London Local Authorities Act 1990 (as amended) and the Environmental Protection Act 1990 respectively. These issues can be investigated by the Council and reported via forms provided on the Council's web site, which require details of specific instances of selling/fly tipping to be input. Untaxed vehicles are the responsibility of the DVLA and can be reported via their website or hotline. Whilst the Council sympathises with residents affected by a loss of spaces due to vehicles left for sale on the public highway and illegal waste dumping, this does not negate the Council's responsibility to respond to reports of obstructive parking at junctions and to propose appropriate solutions. Rule 243 of the Highway Code instructs that drivers "do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space", although in heavily parked areas it is common for this type of parking to take place.
- 3.43 Parking at junctions causes difficulties for both large vehicles (such as refuse collection vehicles and fire appliances) and residents' cars and vans. These restrictions should assist all motorists by ensuring that sightlines at junctions are kept clear.
- 3.44 Parking in front of a dropped kerb that gives access to off-street parking is not permitted unless the owner of the driveway or garage gives permission. Although the Council appreciates that this restricts spaces on street, those residents who have paid for a garage or driveway are entitled to maintain their access to it.

- 3.45 Whilst the proposals will lead to a loss of spaces, these spaces are at or near junctions where the Highway Code specifically instructs drivers not to park. The restrictions proposed are considered to be the minimum necessary to deal with the issue of blocked sightlines, and must apply to all vehicles to ensure that the junctions are kept clear. Therefore it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as proposed at the junctions of Dalmeny Avenue with Ederline Avenue, Melrose Avenue and Kilmartin Avenue and shown in drawing No. **PD - 379b**.
- 3.46 **Objections from Melrose Avenue**  
No problems have been observed with vehicles turning and therefore the proposed restrictions are not warranted.
- 3.47 The Council should make use of the existing regulations to issue tickets or warnings rather than expensive lining that won't work if there is no enforcement.
- 3.48 One objector wonders where the cars displaced by these restrictions will park and is concerned that they will obstruct driveways and garages instead.
- 3.49 One objector wants the proposed yellow lines to stop at their driveway entrance and start again at the other side of it to preserve their access to the space outside their driveway.
- 3.50 **Response – Melrose Avenue**  
Although the objector has not observed any problems his neighbours have either experienced or observed difficulties with obstructive parking, as complaints have been received about this issue.
- 3.51 The Council has no power to issue Penalty Charge Notices for obstruction, which is an offence that can only be enforced by the police, who do not have the resources to do so. The Council can only take enforcement action against vehicles parking at junctions if yellow lines are present and these also have the advantage of creating a visual deterrent.
- 3.52 As explained in paragraph 3.45 above, the proposals will lead to a loss of spaces, but these spaces are at or near junctions where the Highway Code specifically instructs drivers not to park. The restrictions are considered to be the minimum necessary to deal with the issue of blocked sightlines at these locations.
- 3.53 The purpose of the restrictions is to remove parking within 10 metres of the junction and this cannot be achieved if there is a break in the restrictions to allow vehicles to park. The remainder of the road will be left unrestricted.
- 3.54 In light of the above it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as proposed and shown in drawing No. **PD - 379b**.
- 3.55 **Objection from Dunbar Avenue**  
The objector does not object to the yellow lines but wants them shortened as they cover the entire frontage of the objector's house and this means they will no longer be able to park outside their house or next door, as their neighbour has a driveway.

**3.56 Response – Dunbar Avenue**

As explained in paragraph 3.53 above, the purpose of the restrictions is to remove parking within 10 metres of the junction and this cannot be achieved if the restrictions are shortened to allow vehicles to park. The remainder of the road will be left unrestricted. Therefore, it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as proposed and shown in drawing No. **PD - 379b**.

**3.57 Objection from Kilmartin Avenue**

The objector's father is elderly, has difficulty walking and attends the hospital three times a week. The restrictions will make it difficult to transport him to the hospital and the objector suggests a single yellow line so that their vehicle could be parked in the evening and early hours.

**3.58 Response – Kilmartin Avenue**

The restrictions will prevent parking but will not prohibit vehicles from stopping to drop off or pick up a passenger when they are in force, which means the objector can still park outside whilst picking up or dropping off their father. If the objector's father's mobility is restricted, he may be entitled to a disabled person's Blue Badge, which would entitle the objector to park on yellow lines for up to three hours whilst displaying the badge (whilst the vehicle is in use for their father's benefit). Alternatively, if the objector's father qualifies for a disabled badge, he may also be eligible for a disabled bay, which would be provided as near as possible to his home.

**3.59** A single yellow line is not considered sufficient as the junction needs to be kept clear at all times. In view of the above it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as proposed and shown in drawing No. **PD – 379b**.

**3.60 Reedham Drive, Purley & Woodcote**

Waste Services advised that, due to parked cars at the bend of the west to east arm of Reedham Drive, its refuse vehicles have been experiencing problems when attempting to negotiate the left hand turn for access to properties in the south to north arm of Reedham Drive. Site visits confirmed that parking does indeed take place on both sides of the road on this bend, with cars parked fully on the carriageway on the eastern side outside Nos. 38-42 Reedham Drive and parked partly on the footway on the opposite side of the road along the side of No. 7 Reedham Drive. As the carriageway width at this point is only 5.6m, to maintain sightlines and improve safety it was proposed to introduce "at any time" waiting restrictions as illustrated on drawing No. **PD – 379k**.

**3.61** Five local residents (two from the same household) have objected to the proposal on the following basis.

**3.62** One objector accepts that it can be hard for large vehicles to get through but feels that the restriction will make parking too difficult for residents, who are already concerned that a recently approved development of seven flats with only one space per dwelling, will put pressure on parking in the area.

- 3.63 One objector suggests that the restrictions should be amended to be operational from 8am to 5pm, to allow residents to park overnight.
- 3.64 The restrictions will exacerbate existing parking problems.
- 3.65 The restrictions will make it more difficult for one objector's elderly mother, who is a Blue Badge holder, to park outside their house.
- 3.65 One objector does not understand why the restrictions are necessary as delivery vans and refuse lorries have negotiated the bend for almost 40 years.
- 3.66 **Response** – The restrictions have been proposed in response to complaints from Waste Services, who have confirmed that negotiating the bend in this section of Reedham Drive has become difficult due to cars parking there.
- 3.67 Although the restrictions will remove approximately two parking spaces, they are at or near a junction, which should not be used as a parking place, according to Rule 243 of the Highway Code. The restriction as proposed is considered to be the minimum required to assist large vehicles negotiating the bend. The rest of Reedham Drive will remain unrestricted and available for parking.
- 3.68 Blue Badge holders can park for up to three hours on single or double yellow lines with their badge and clock displayed and set to the time of arrival. Alternatively, a Blue Badge holder can apply for a disabled parking bay which, if they are eligible, would be provided as near as possible to their house.
- 3.69 A single yellow line would not be considered sufficient as the junction needs to be kept clear at all times, not just for waste collections, but also for emergency service vehicles. In view of this, it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as proposed and shown in drawing No. **PD – 379k**.
- 3.70 **Bywood Avenue, Shirley North**  
A local resident contacted the Council to ask if it would be possible to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions at the junction of Bywood Avenue and Brookside Way. The resident expressed concern that vehicles park too close to the junction and make it difficult for residents to see oncoming traffic when tuning into and out of the road. She is also worried about the safety of pedestrians and in particular children associated with the nursery in Brookside Way. Site visits by council staff confirmed these problems and to improve visibility at this and adjacent junctions it is proposed to introduce 'At any time' double yellow line waiting restrictions as illustrated in drawing No. **PD – 379d**.
- 3.71 One objection has been received from the local nursery as follows.
- 3.72 The proposed restrictions will directly affect the nursery, which has staggered drop-off and collection times.
- 3.73 The proposal notice was so tightly wrapped around the lamp post it was barely legible. The objector suspects that this was deliberate to avoid any objections to the proposals.

- 3.74 The objector feels that a problem is caused by employees of local shops who park in the vicinity and that restrictions that actually work should be introduced by someone who understands the local area.
- 3.75 **Response** – The restrictions have been proposed to keep sightlines clear at this junction and although they prohibit parking, they will not prevent parents or guardians from stopping to drop off or pick up children from the nursery. The rest of Brookside Way and the majority of Bywood Avenue will remain available for parking.
- 3.76 The Council notifies residents and businesses of proposed parking restrictions in a number of ways: by advertising in the local press and on the Council’s website, by writing to directly affected frontages, and by displaying public notices on the nearest lamp post or sign post in the vicinity. Public notices are wrapped around the post to ensure that they cannot easily be removed or blown away. Experience shows that these notices are an effective means of notification as comments and objections are regularly received in response to them.
- 3.77 Two local residents have written in support of the proposed restrictions in Bywood Avenue (although not specifically the junction in question) and no other objections have been received, which indicates that there is some support for the proposals in the area. The restrictions will apply to any vehicle parking at the junction, including those belonging to employees of local businesses.
- 3.78 In view of the above, it is proposed to introduce the restrictions as shown in drawing No. **PD – 379d**.

#### 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.

##### 4.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast			
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Available Revenue Budget</b>				
<b>Expenditure</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Income</b>	0	0	0	0

**Effect of Decision  
from Report**

Expenditure	6	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**Available Capital  
Budget**

Expenditure	0	0	0	0
-------------	---	---	---	---

**Effect of Decision  
from report**

Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**4.2 The effect of the decision**

4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at all the sites originally on the public notice, including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £6,000.

4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2019/20.

**4.3 Risks**

4.3.1 The cost per restriction is reduced by introducing a number of parking restrictions in one schedule and therefore spreading the legal costs. The marking of the restrictions and the supply and installation of signs and posts where necessary is carried out using the new Highways Contract and the rates are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.

**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 No further savings have been quantified, although new parking restrictions do make an income contribution to the revenue budget. The introduction of these proposals would increase the potential to recover income in this way.

4.5.2 Approved by: Flora Osiyemi, Head of Finance, Place, Residents and Gateway.

**5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

5.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance that sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provides the Council with the

power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.

- 5.2 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.
- 5.3 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as 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. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
  - The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
  - The national air quality strategy.
  - The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
  - Any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.
- 5.4 Recent High Court judgment confirms that the Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.
- 5.3 Approved by: Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer.

## **6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 6.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.
- 6.2 Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of Human Resources.

## **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. Specific equalities issues raised as

part of the formal consultation are referenced within the officers' response to those objections within the body of the report.

## **8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 8.1 Double yellow line waiting restrictions do not require signage therefore these proposals are environmentally friendly. Where signage is required 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. This can be varied according to the circumstances applying at different locations.

## **10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 10.1 The recommendations are for new 'At any time' waiting restrictions and 7am to 7pm loading restrictions at locations across the Borough where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. At each location surveys have been undertaken which confirm that road safety issues exist and double yellow lines/loading restrictions as appropriate, would encourage the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

## **11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 11.1 Instead of double yellow line waiting restrictions the alternative would be to introduce single yellow line daytime restrictions. However, as most of the above locations are at junctions and other locations where parking could create obstruction at any time, double yellow lines are more appropriate as they reduce obstructive parking at all times.

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Orders Engineer,  
Highway Improvement, 020 8604 7363 (Ext.  
47363)

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,  
Highways Improvement, 020 8667 8229

**BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**