

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 21 JULY 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	9
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS VARIOUS LOCATIONS
LEAD OFFICER:	Executive Director of Development and Environment
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Bensham Manor, Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Croham, Fieldway, Kenley, Purley, Selhurst, South Norwood, Upper Norwood and West Thornton
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.	
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1.1 Consider the objections and comments received to the proposed parking restrictions at the locations listed below:1.2 Agree for the reasons at paragraph 3 to introduce the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">1.2.1 Sandringham Road, Bensham Manor – proceed with the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions with amendments; reducing the length from 10 metres to 7 metres at the Pitt Road and Kynaston Road junctions and retaining the proposal for the junction of Palmerston Road;	

- 1.2.2 **Brighton Road, Coulsdon West** – replace the proposed urban clearway with double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions;
- 1.2.3 **Lodge Lane (Slip Road), Fieldway** – proceed with the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions;
- 1.2.4 **Brancaster Lane, Purley** – proceed with the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions in;
- 1.2.5 **Braybrooke Gardens, Upper Norwood** – proceed with the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions in at the junction between the north-south and west-east arms, including the section between Nos. 25 and 26;
- 1.2.6 **Redford Avenue, West Thornton** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions with the following amendments; reducing the length from 10 metres to 7 metres at the Grove Road, Goldwell Road, Ashley Road and Fairlands Avenue junctions and to 5 metres in the cul-de-sac ends of Grove Road and Fairlands Avenue;
- 1.2.7 **Stoats Nest Road / Coulsdon Road / Petersfield Crescent, Coulsdon East** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions with the following amendments; reducing the length of the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions on the south-west side of Stoats Nest Road to 10 metres, retaining the proposed 15 metres on the north-west side of Petersfield Crescent and abandoning those on the south-west side of Coulsdon Road / south-east side of Petersfield Crescent;
- 1.2.8 **St Saviour’s Road, Selhurst Road** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions with the following amendments; reducing the length from 10 metres to 7 metres at all the junctions in junctions with Greenwood Road, Elmwood Road and Hartley Road;
- 1.2.9 **Rolleston Road, Croham** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions with the following amendments; reducing the length from 10 metres to a minimum of 5 metres at all junction with Bynes Road;
- 1.2.10 **Ullswater and Breakfield, Coulsdon East** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions;
- 1.2.11 **Carberry Road, Upper Norwood** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions;
- 1.2.12 **Gonville Road, West Thornton** – proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions;
- 1.3 Agree for the reasons at paragraph 3.7.3 not to introduce “At any time” waiting restrictions in the turning area at the end of the cul-de-sac, **Braybrooke Gardens, Upper Norwood.**
- 1.4 Agree for the reasons at paragraph 3.12.5 not to introduce “At any time” waiting restrictions in **Oaklands, Kenley** at the current time and monitor parking conditions for future review.
- 1.5 Delegate to the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Parking Services the authority to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road

Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to implement Recommendation 1.2 above.

1.6 Inform the objectors of the above decisions.

1.7 It is recommended that the that Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment agree to Recommendations 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on proposals to introduce parking restrictions at various locations across the borough.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 Sandringham Road junctions with Pitt Road, Kynaston Road and Palmerston Road, Bensham Manor.

3.1.1 One objection has been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Sandringham Road at its junctions with Pitt Road, Kynaston Road and and Palmerston Road. The objector states that the extent of the proposed waiting restrictions of 10 metres is excessive given that this is a residential road. They content that residents would be penalised for an infrequent parking problem caused by match day visitors to the crystal Palace ground. They suggest that the Council intensify parking enforcement activity on match days and reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions to 5 metres to minimise the loss of parking space in the road that could result in reduction in property values.

3.1.2 **Response** – It has not been proven either way that the presence of a section of road with waiting restrictions on has a detrimental effect on property values. The Council has a duty to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods on the highway and on balance these safety and public interest factors override other considerations in this matter. However, following this objection, account has been taken of the objector’s comments regarding the parking needs of residents in the road and consideration given to the fact that Sandringham Road is a relatively quiet and lightly trafficked road.

3.1.3 In view of the above, it is recommended to reduce the extent of the double yellow line “at any time” waiting restrictions at the Pitt Road and Kynaston Road junctions to 7 metres but with no change to the proposal for the junction of Palmerston Road as shown on Plan no.225a.

3.2 Brighton Road between Marlpit Lane and Farthing Way, Coulsdon West

3.2.1 One objection has been received to the introduction of double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions and an Urban Clearway control in Brighton Road between Malpit Lane and Farthing Way, Coulsdon to replace the existing Red Route controls. The objector states that they had been able to load along this section of Brighton Road since being granted planning permission for their business operation in the road and so therefore, have established rights to do so.

3.2.3 **Response** – Following the receipt of this objection, a review of the proposal was undertaken to explore alternative scheme options, taking account of the objector's comments.

3.2.4 The recommendation of this review is to replace the proposed Urban Clearway which prevents stopping on the highway with the introduction of double yellow line "At any time" waiting restrictions as it would be the most effective measure in the circumstances. This is because, whilst the measure would restrict parking, it would allow the objector's business and others to load on the road as necessary.

3.3 Lodge Lane by Headley Drive (Slip Road), Fieldway`

3.3.1 One objection has been received on to the introduction of double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the short slip road in Lodge Road between the fire station and Headley Drive. The objector, who indicated they were writing on behalf of a number of residents, stated that the reason for the objection was that the proposed measure would further disadvantage local residents as the few available parking spaces are usually occupied by non-residents. They feel that the measure would only displace the problem elsewhere.

3.3.3 **Response** – It is acknowledged that the proposal would displace parking on the slip road. However, as the carriageway is only wide enough for one-way traffic flow, it is clearly unsuitable for parking, hence the current undesirable situation whereby traffic is forced to mount the grass verge to pass parked vehicles and severely damaging the verge as a result.

3.3.4 Creating a hard standing or widening the road is unsuitable due to presence of mature trees and likely damage to their roots. In order to prevent further damage to the grass verge from vehicles forced to drive on it, it is recommended to introduce the proposed double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions as shown on drawing number PD - 225e.

3.4 Brancaster Lane by Bowling Club, Purley

3.4.1 Objections have been received from five residents of Brancaster Lane and one each from the President and Secretary of Purley Bury Bowling Club to the introduction of a short section of double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the bend outside the bowling club.

- 3.4.2 The objectors contend that the obstruction caused by parking congestion during events at the bowling club is actually beneficial to road safety as it results in reduced traffic speed and that the proposed waiting restrictions would lead to higher traffic speed and risk of collisions on the bend, especially between residents emerging from their driveways and traffic on the main road. They argue that their concern is about inappropriate vehicle speed, which is higher during quieter times at the club when there are fewer parked vehicles to force drivers to slow down. They suggest that installing traffic calming features, including “SLOW” road markings would be sufficient to slow down traffic.
- 3.4.3 In addition to the above comments, representatives of the bowling club state that the proposal is unnecessary and that a speed hump is what is required to slow traffic down. They are of the view that double yellow lines would cause great inconvenience to their disabled and elderly members and suppliers making deliveries as they would not be able to stop there. They suggest that the proposal be revised to be: waiting restrictions operational only between April and September, Monday to Friday, 9am – 5pm, as the club opens only during this period.
- 3.4.4 **Response** – Parking obstructively and restricting free traffic flow is not the appropriate way of addressing traffic problems or improve road safety. The purpose of the proposed waiting restrictions is to create a passing point for opposing traffic to pass each other at critical times in order to generally improve road and personal safety by preventing collisions, delays and brawls between drivers.
- 3.4.5 The 19 metre length of waiting restriction is not long enough distance to encourage speeding. If the objectors had experienced a speeding problem in the road prior to this proposal, then this should have been reported and addressed beforehand as this proposal is primarily to create a passing point for opposing traffic. The waiting restrictions would not prevent people stopping there to load/unload goods or pickup/set down passengers, so no club members or suppliers would be adversely affected.
- 3.4.5 For the above reasons, it is recommended to proceed with the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions as shown on Plan PD-225i

3.5 Redford Avenue junctions with Fairlands Avenue, Ashley Road, Goldwell Road and Grove Road

- 3.5.1 Objections have been received from fifteen local residents from the area called “Grove Estate”, comprising Grove Road, Goldwell Road, Ashley Road, Fairlands Avenue and Redwood Avenue to the introduction of “At any time” double yellow line waiting restrictions at all the road junctions on Redford Avenue.
- 3.5.2 The reasons given for the objections can be summarised as:
- ◆ waiting restrictions are unnecessary because the roads are not through traffic routes
 - ◆ even if the proposed waiting restrictions are required, their extent of is too excessive

- ◆ if at all necessary to introduce “At any time” waiting restrictions, the Council should consider 5 metres instead of the proposed 10 metres
- ◆ the proposals would worsen the already severe parking congestion in the area
- ◆ the area is characterised by short roads and terraced housing without off-street parking facilities, so the proposals in their present form, would severely inconvenience residents.
- ◆ the cul-de-sacs sections of Grove Road and Fairlands Avenue do not require such long sections of waiting restrictions
- ◆ the limited parking capacity is further reduced by the presence of many disabled bays in the area, so these proposals would make matters even worse
- ◆ there is the problem of many vehicles being repaired and sold or dumped on the streets in the area which the Council ignore but should tackle first
- ◆ with Jubilee Court flats in full occupation, parking is already a very serious problem in the area

3.6 Response – Following the strong objection from so many residents of the area, including the signed petition against the proposals, a review of the proposal was undertaken to take account of the objectors’ comments.

3.6.1 The recommendation of this review is to reduce the length of the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions from 10 metres to 7 metres at each location, except along the cul-de-sac sections of Grove Road and Fairlands Avenue which would be reduced to 5 metres. On account of the objectors’ views, this compromise would improve access and road safety with the minimum loss of parking spaces.

3.7 Braybrooke Gardens, South Norwood

3.7.1 Objections have been received from residents of Braybrooke Gardens to the introduction of “At any time” double yellow line waiting restrictions at the Braybrooke Gardens junction between the north-south and west-east arms as well as the turning area at the end of the road. Five individual objections and a signed petition by 18 residents were received.

3.7.2 The objectors are exasperated that the Council has consulted them again over the same issue so soon after the consultation in January 2012 that they overwhelmingly rejected. They feel that the shortage of parking spaces that because residents of Nos. 15-21 have no access to any other place to park, they and their young families would be affected very negatively.

3.7.3 Residents are happy with current parking restrictions in the road and are opposed to any additional restrictions, even if they are during daytime weekdays. Introducing “At any time” waiting restrictions would make life difficult during evenings/weekends for not only residents but visitors, people attending events at Queens Hotel and church worshippers.

3.7.4 Residents request that the Council abandon these proposals for the above reasons.

3.7.5 **Response** – Following the receipt of this objection, a review of the proposal was undertaken to take account of the objector’s comments.

3.7.6 In view of the strength of objections received to the proposal for double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in the turning area at the end of Braybrooke Gardens, particularly due to the limited parking for residents, it is recommended to:

- ◆ abandon the proposal as it applies to the turning area at the end of the road
- ◆ proceed with the proposal as it applies to the junction between the north-south and west-east arms, including the section between Nos. 25 & 26

3.8 Stoats Nest Road / Coulsdon Road / Petersfield Crescent, Coulsdon East

3.8.1 One objection has been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Stoats Nest Road at its junction with Coulsdon Road and Petersfield Crescent.

3.8.2 The objector states that the restrictions are unnecessary, would displace parking to where it would cause problems and would also “be damaging and preventing necessary parking”. They suggest that, should the Council be determined to proceed with the proposal, to reduce it to 5 metres.

3.8.3 **Response** – The proposal has been reviewed in response to the objector’s comments and observations.

3.8.4 The recommendation of this review is to reduce the length of the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions on the south-west side of Stoats Nest Road to just 10 metres, retain the proposed 15 metres on the north-west side of Petersfield Crescent and abandon those on the south-west side of Coulsdon Road / south-east side of Petersfield Crescent.

3.9 St. Saviour’s Road junctions with Hartley Road, Elmwood Road and Greenwood Road, Selhurst

3.9.1 Two objections have been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in St Saviour’s Road at its junctions with Greenwood Road, Elmwood Road and Hartley Road.

3.9.2 The first objector states that, living near the junction, they would be losing parking space near their home, which they desperately need as they have very young children. They suggest that the restrictions be changed to Monday to Friday, 8am – 9.30pm and 2.30pm – 4pm and reduced to 8 metres.

- 3.9.3 The second objector acknowledges that there are problems with parking close to junctions but that the proposed 10 metre restrictions are grossly excessive. They suggest a length of 3 metre restrictions at the junctions in order to minimise the loss of parking in this road that is characterised by mainly terraced housing of which many are split into flats and where many households own more than one vehicle. They added that the Council should at the same time deal with the serious problem of abandoned vehicles in the road and also consider introducing a residents' parking scheme in the area.
- 3.9.4 **Response** – The proposal has been re-examined in response to the objector's comments and observations
- 3.9.5 The Monday to Friday, 8am – 9.30pm and 2.30pm – 4pm restrictions as suggested would be much more expensive to implement and manage as it would need much more intensive enforcement. Double yellow line restrictions do not require additional signing and are also simpler and more effective in terms of compliance and enforcement.
- 3.9.6 In view of the above, it is recommended to proceed with the proposed double yellow line "At any time" waiting restrictions but with amendments - reducing the length from 10 metres to 7 metres at all the junctions.

3.10 Rolleston Road / Bynes Road, Croham

- 3.10.1 Three objections have been received to the introduction of double yellow line "At any time" waiting restrictions in Bynes Road at its junctions with Rolleston.
- 3.10.2 The first objector states that the length of the proposed restrictions is too extensive in such a residential road and that the potential loss of up to 8 parking spaces would result in residents having difficulty finding a parking spot near their home. They suggest restrictions just on the corner itself and believe the 10 metre restrictions are not justified.
- 3.10.3 The second objector is very critical of the Council consultation methods, is entirely opposed to the proposals and urges that they be abandoned them as they would have a negative effect on local residents, businesses as well as road safety. They feel that the length of the restrictions is too extensive.
- 3.10.4 The third objector also feels that the proposals are unnecessary, would impact negatively on their business and local residents and therefore, should be scrapped.
- 3.10.1 **Response** – The proposals have been re-examined in response to the objectors' comments and observations
- 3.10.2 In view of the parking congestion in the area and the fact that a one-way working scheme being implemented in Bynes Road, it is recommended to amend the proposed restrictions by reducing the length from 10 metres to 7 metres at this junction and then proceed with them.

3.11 Breakfield and Ullswater Crescent, Coulsdon East

3.11.1 Two objections have been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Breakfield and Ullswater Crescent.

3.11.3 The first objector from Ullswater had already written to the Council to implement a scheme to lessen the difficulties they are experiencing within the Business Park where they are located, as rail commuters take up most available spaces by 7.30am before the former arrive at work. They object to these proposals as they would worsen the already bad parking conditions in business estate. They want the Council to implement as a priority, a parking scheme in favour of the occupiers of business premises in the Business Park over train commuters.

3.11.4 The second objector from Breakfield feels they are being treated unfairly having the proposed restrictions outside their premises but not others. They also feel that the parking problems on the business estate are caused by rail commuters taking up most available spaces by 7.30am before occupiers of the business premises arrive at work. They also want the Council to implement a parking scheme in favour of the occupiers of business premises in the Business Park over train commuters.

3.11.5 **Response** – The proposals have been re-examined in response to the objectors’ comments and observations.

3.11.6 The issues raised by both objectors regarding the impact of commuter parking are already being dealt with by the Council and will be present in the next Traffic Management Cabinet advisory Committee this October. The proposals for Breakfield are only at points on the road where larger vehicles have difficulty negotiating.

3.11.7 In view of the above, it is recommended to proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in both Ullswater and Breakfield as shown on drawing number PD – 231d.

3.12 Oaklands (around green, inside edge), Kenley

3.12.1 An objection has been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Oaklands on the inside of the bend on the road.

3.12.2 The objector acknowledges that there are parking problems in Oaklands caused by commuters between 7am and 8pm weekdays. However, they feel that the proposal would be “disastrous” for residents and so are suggesting that a residents’ only parking scheme be introduced.

3.12.3 **Response** – The proposals have been re-examined in response to the objectors’ comments and observations.

3.12.4 A residents’ only parking scheme would be more expensive to for the Council to implement and administer and also for the residents who would be required to purchase a parking permit.

3.12.5 Surveys have shown that on the majority of days only one or two vehicles park in a potentially obstructive position and due to the level of concern expressed by the resident it is proposed that the parking conditions should be monitored for future review.

3.13 Carberry Road (upgrade of existing restrictions), Upper Norwood

3.13.1 Three objections have been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Carberry Road.

3.13.2 All three objectors state that the current daytime waiting restrictions have been working well and want to know it is being proposed to make them more restrictive.

3.13.3 They believe that residents, businesses and their customers would be negatively affected and want the proposal scrapped.

3.13.4 **Response** – The “At any time” waiting restrictions are being introduced to prevent parking obstruction about which the Council have received complaints. The Council has a duty to ensure that access is maintained at all times to premises in the road so that people and property can be reached in cases of emergency and for deliveries and refuse collection.

3.13.5 In view of the above, it is recommended to proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in both Carberry Road.

3.14 Gonville Road by entrance to School, West Thornton

3.14.1 An objection has been received to the introduction of double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Gonville Road (cul-de-sac end).

3.14.2 The objector states that they require their driveway to be kept clear at all times as they have a disabled child and so do not want the restrictions outside their home.

3.13.4 **Response** – Complaints received, confirmed by site surveys, indicated that the entrance to nearby school is being obstructed by parked vehicles. The proposed restriction is intended to prevent this and would in fact be beneficial to the objector as it would deter people parking across their driveway. Although the objector would also be unable to park there, they and others would still be able to stop there for loading/unloading goods and picking up/dropping off passengers.

3.13.5 In view of the above, it is recommended to proceed with the proposed double yellow line “At any time” waiting restrictions in Gonville Road as shown on drawing number PD- 31p

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections received from the public following the giving of public notice of the proposals. Once the notices were published, the public had up to 21 days to respond.
- 4.2 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 notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed schemes to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.
- 4.3 Organisations such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK and bus operators are consulted separately at the same time as the public notice. Other organisations are also consulted, depending on the relevance of the proposal. No comments were received from any of these organisations.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2014/15 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2015/16 £'000	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000
<u>Revenue Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	50	50	50	50
<u>Capital Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Remaining Budget</u>				
	0	0	0	0

5.2 The effect of the decision

- 5.2.1 The cost of introducing the double yellow lines at various locations in 3 batches, as originally advertised, including advertising the Traffic Management Order, has been estimated at £23,600. Part of the legal costs (equating to £2,000) has already been met in the budget for 2013/14.

5.2.2 The remaining costs can be contained within the available revenue budget for 2014/15.

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 budget.

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

5.4 Options

5.4.1 The alternative option is to not introduce the parking restrictions. This could have a detrimental effect on obstruction, road safety and traffic flows and goes against the wishes of residents and businesses, which could result in the Council receiving complaints due to obstructive parking affecting access and loading facilities.

5.5 Savings/ future efficiencies

5.5.1 The current method of introducing parking controls 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 yellow lines is carried out using maintenance rates through the Highway Division's annual contractor and these are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.

5.5.3 Any signs that are required are sourced from the department's Direct Service Operator where rates are competitive.

5.6 Approved by: Tim Flood, on behalf of Head of Finance and Deputy S151 Officer Chief Executive's Department.

6. COMMENTS OF 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 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.

6.3 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor, Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

7.1 It is anticipated that the additional enforcement of the new parking restrictions can be undertaken using existing resources.

7.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Interim 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 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.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The recommendations are for new parking 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 the parking problem and justification to introduce new restrictions.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 The alternative to double yellow line waiting restrictions would be single yellow line daytime restrictions. However, as the locations are at junctions or 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: Chuks Nwaodume – Senior Traffic Engineer
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8726 6000
(Ext. 88245)

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972: