

Croydon Council

For General Release

REPORT TO:	COUNCIL 20 JULY 2015
AGENDA ITEM NO:	8
SUBJECT:	RESPONSES TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO COUNCIL ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF CROYDON ON 20 APRIL 2015
LEAD OFFICER:	Julie Belvir, Director of Legal and Democratic Services
WARDS:	ALL
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: This report is prepared in keeping with paragraph 3.22 of the Council Procedure Rules at Part 4A of the Constitution.	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 The Council is asked to note the response to the petition presented by Councillors at its last ordinary meeting as detailed in paragraph 4 of the report.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report details Cabinet Member response to the petition presented to Council on 20th April 2015. All Members have the opportunity to ask questions on the responses to any of the petitions.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Part 4A of the Constitution allows Councillors to present petitions to meetings of the Full Council.
- 3.2 The Constitution requires a response to that petition to be presented at this meeting.
- 3.3 A period of up to ten minutes is permitted for questions on the response to the petition.

4. RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

a) Petition presented by **Councillor Steve O'Connell** on behalf of residents:

"We the undersigned believe that the northern junction of Hayes Lane with Park Road (hence the station end) is dangerous to both vehicles and pedestrians and accordingly should be made a "no entry" at that junction, possibly with a pedestrian walkway for improved safety".

Reply from Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

I note that this proposal was the subject of local consultation in 2012 but was not supported by the majority of residents in the area. I also note that this latest petition does not appear to contain many signatures from those residents in Oakland Gardens, who would be most directly affected by the proposed no-entry and one-way working. There are, therefore, still some concerns over the level of support that this proposal might generate.

Officers will be asked to consider this proposal again, for inclusion in a future work programme. As you will appreciate, the 2015/16 work programme is set and it is likely that this proposal will be added to the financial bid to Transport for London for inclusion in the 2016/17 work programme.

b) Petition presented by **Councillor Stuart King** on behalf of residents:

"Please help us remove single/double yellow lines in front of our house 113,120,125,138,140 Gonville Road CR7 6DD"

Reply from Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

The petition will be included in a report to the next Traffic Management Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for 7 July for their consideration.

c) Petition presented by **Councillor Vidhi Mohan** on behalf of residents:

We the residents of Hamlyn Gardens and other affected residents in South Norwood Ward, urge Croydon Council to take immediate action on the following issue affecting us:

Hamlyn Gardens is a new development. When the plans were at consultation stage we were assured that there would be vehicular access only from Hamlyn Gardens into a one-way system. However because of the signage (one right-pointing arrow a quarter into the system) we get vehicles exiting into Hamlyn Gardens on a regular basis. Residents of the new houses (situated before the arrow) can reverse from their drives and exit into Hamlyn Gardens without going against the signage. Mainly though, it is delivery drivers who usually say they did know it was 'No Exit'. Often they come out at speed where children

play - not expecting vehicles to come out into Hamlyn Gardens. When we reverse out of our drives, we need to inch out just in case someone is going against the one-way system.

Even though this is a private road, we urge the Council to liaise with the landlord to ensure that a prominent 'No Exit' sign is put up - similar to the 'No Access' sign that greets vehicles at the other end of the one-way system. If this is not done, we fear that a serious accident will occur sooner rather than later.

Reply from Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

Our planners have inspected the site and can confirm that all the agreed signage for both the one-way working and the 10mph speed limit, as required as part of the planning permission, are present and correct.

However, this new housing development is on private land and not part of the highway. As such, the one-way working and 10mph speed limit are not legally enforceable and not matters that the Council or Police have any direct control.

Given the private nature of this road, any additional signage would be for the private property owners / landowner to consider and provide.

Having said this, it is the responsibility of every motorist to drive with all due care and attention when entering or leaving this private road. Residents should also remember to reverse into private driveways, so that they can emerge onto the highway in a forward direction, which offers far greater visibility of other road users.

d) Petition presented by **Councillor Vidhi Mohan** on behalf of residents

“We the residents of Norbury Avenue are very concerned and angry over the felling of mature trees on the land adjacent to Norbury Station. We urge Croydon Council to ensure that no further trees are cut, and this excellent public amenity is preserved for future generations.”

Reply from Councillor Alison Butler, Cabinet Member for Homes, Regeneration and Planning

Earlier this year several trees were cleared from this site adjacent to Norbury Station. The site has been inspected by Tree and Enforcement Officers from the Development Management Planning service. While understanding the concern about this matter, the trees that were removed were not protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the land owner has therefore not committed any offence in removing these trees. They were mainly self-seeded specimens some 10-15 years old.

However, there is a Tree Preservation Order at the site reference TPO 16/1089. This is an area order applying to all trees at the site at the time of making the order. Unfortunately, it does not apply to trees that have grown at

the site subsequent to the making of the area order in 1989. The Tree Officer has surveyed the site to check if there are any new trees now present at the site that would warrant protection by a new tree preservation order, having regard to the relevant national guidance and the amenity value of the trees at the site. There are no new trees at the site that warrant formal protection.

The remaining mature trees at the site are covered by TPO 16/1989. Therefore the Council's approval would be required to fell or undertake pruning works to these trees. We have ensured that the land owner is aware of this protected status. If an application is received to either fell or undertake other works to any of the protected trees, this would be considered on the planning merits of the case, having regard to the physical condition of the trees in question. This Council and the Development Management service recognises the amenity value of the remaining trees at the site and would seek to retain these trees unless there are compelling reasons for their removal in which case replacement trees could be required.

CONTACT OFFICER: Solomon Agutu, Head of Democratic Services and Scrutiny, x62920.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: