

Croydon Council

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 16 December 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	6
SUBJECT:	PETITIONS: ASHCROFT RISE – REQUEST FOR FOOTWAY (PAVEMENT) PARKING EXEMPTION PEMDEVON ROAD – REQUEST FOR RESIDENTS’ PARKING
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Development and Environment
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Broad Green and Coulsdon East
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 agree:</p> <p>1.1 To delegate to the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Highways and Parking Services the authority to give notice and subject to receiving no material objections to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) to extend the Croydon (North Permit Area) CPZ into Pemdevon Road.</p>
--

- 1.2 Note that any material objections received on the giving of public notice will be reported to a future Traffic Management Cabinet Advisory Committee for Members' consideration.
- 1.3 For the reasons detailed in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.10 not to proceed with the request for the Council to introduce an exemption in respect of Ashcroft Rise from the London-wide ban against footway (pavement) parking.
- 1.4 To the Council's continued enforcement of the ban against footway parking in Ashcroft Rise accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 as amended.
- 1.5 Inform the petitioners of these decisions.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 A petition, signed by 27 residents of Pemdevon Road has been received requesting a residents' permit parking scheme for the road.
- 2.2 A petition signed by 20 of the 21 households in Ashcroft Rise has been received by the Council. The petition is requesting the introduction of a scheme exempting the enforcement of the London-wide ban against footway parking.

3. DETAIL

Pemdevon Road – Request for Residents' Parking

- 3.1 A petition signed by 27 residents of Pemdevon Road has been received. The petition states:

“We, the residents of Pemdevon Road are facing intolerable problems of traffic flows and parking our own cars in our street. We ask that the council carries out a consultation exercise, which asks if residents want parking bays with permits”
- 3.2 A similar petition was received from residents of neighbouring Sutherland Road and reported to the previous Traffic Management Advisory Committee meeting on 20 October 2014 (minute A26/14 refers).
- 3.3 There is insufficient parking for residents of Pemdevon Road because of spill over demand from residents of neighbouring roads who would not pay for permits to park in their road where parking controls are in force. Often, large business vans are parked in Pemdevon Road for several days and this loss of parking space forces its residents, especially those coming back from work at late hours, to park a very long distance away from their home and most of the time even in another street entirely.
- 3.4 The road a one-way link road from Mitcham Road to London Road through Sutherland Road and this makes it very busy and the congested parking causes delays and disruptions because there is less space for vehicles to manoeuvre.
- 3.5 The Croydon (North Permit Area) CPZ has already been extended into Midhurst Avenue (2011) and Fairholme Road (February 2014), and imminently Dennett

Road. The Council last carried out a similar consultation in the area in July 2013 but there was only support for a scheme to be introduced in Fairholme Road at that time.

- 3.6 Due to the likely displacement of parking into uncontrolled roads in the area which are already suffering parking stress, it is proposed to consult occupiers in Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road and Greenside Road simultaneously as soon as practicable on a possible controlled parking scheme – this recommendation was agreed in the report to 20 October 2014 meeting following the petition from residents of Sutherland Road. The proposed consultation area is shown on **Plan No. PD-249d**.
- 3.7 The current procedure for consulting residents includes a joint informal (questionnaire) and formal (public notice) consultations. Neighbouring roads have 8 hour maximum stay for Pay & Display users and 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday parking controls and news controls should match these.

Ashcroft Rise – Request for Footway Parking

- 3.8 A petition signed by 20 of the 21 households in Ashcroft Rise has been received. The signatories represent 95% of the total number of households in the road. The petition states:

“On behalf of my neighbours who responded (20 of the 21 houses in the cul de sac) I enclose a petition requesting that London Borough of Croydon as the Highway Authority, grant us an exemption from the usual prohibition on pavement parking”

- 3.9 Ashcroft Rise is a relatively narrow road with average carriageway width of 5 metres and footway width of 1.8 metres. This means that normal kerb side parking with all wheels on the carriageway is only possible on one side. Parking directly opposite another parked vehicle would result in complete obstruction of vehicular access in the road.
- 3.10 Drivers understand that the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 as amended prohibits parking with any wheel on the footway except where there are signs indicating that the ban is exempted and parking is therefore permitted. The petitioners are requesting that the Council applies the exemption in Ashcroft Rise.
- 3.11 Officers have undertaken a careful assessment of the feasibility of a scheme exempting the London-wide ban against footway parking in the road as requested by the petitioners and concluded that it is unsuitable for such a measure. The primary reason for this conclusion is the road width as detailed in paragraph 3.5 above.
- 3.12 Other considerations include the fact that all residents have off-street parking for at least 2 vehicles, costs of introduction and future maintenance of any such scheme, insufficient capacity of the Parking Design Team to add new locations to the list of over 150 locations to consider for and dozens of existing schemes to review and update as necessary.

- 3.13 It is recognised that the overwhelming majority of households in Ashcroft Rise support the introduction of a scheme exempting the enforcement of the ban against footway parking in the road. However, the road has failed to fulfil the criteria based on an objective assessment of its suitability for such a scheme. Consequently, it is recommended to reject the petition and inform the petitioners of the decision.
- 3.14 Drivers parking on a road with insufficient width for parking on both sides are expected to park legally on one side only or elsewhere so as not to restrict free flow of traffic or access particularly for larger vehicles such as fire engines, ambulances, dustcarts and for removals.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 When introducing new controlled zones informal consultation takes place by way of a questionnaire to residents. . Currently this is in conjunction with formal consultation.
- 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, Croydon 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.
- 4.3 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.
- 4.4 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 a decision as to whether the scheme should be introduced as originally proposed, amended or abandoned and objectors informed of the decision.
- 4.5 No consultation was required in respect of the request for footway parking in Ashcroft Rise.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £40k for the current financial year. 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 this funding

would be fully utilised. There are no financial impacts arising from the request for footway parking in Ashcroft Rise.

5.1 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	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Capital Budget available</u>	0	0	0	0
Expenditure	0	104	120	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	0	70	80	0
<u>Remaining Budget</u>	0	34	40	0

5.2 The effect of the decision

5.2.1 The cost of introducing controlled parking into Pemdevon and Sutherland Road areas is estimated at £155,000. The above financial implications have already been accounted for in a previous TMAC report.

5.2.2 These costs can be funded from the Council's 2015/16 and 2016/17 Local Implementation Plan allocation for local schemes for which bids are being prepared for the next two financial years.

5.3 Risks

5.3.1 Whilst there is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimates, this work is allowed for in the current budgets for 2015/16 and 2016/17. Additionally there is a risk that the LIP funding is not agreed which will put pressures on budgets in that year.

5.4 Options

5.4.1 The alternative options are not to introduce controlled parking which would not benefit the residents in these areas.

5.5 Savings/future efficiencies

5.5.1 The current method of introducing parking controls is very efficient with the design and legal work being carried out within the department. The marking of

the bays and yellow lines is carried out using maintenance rates through the new Highways contract and these are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.

- 5.5.2 Any signs that are required are sourced from the new Highways contractor where rates are competitive.
- 5.6 Approved by: Graham Oliver, Business Partner, Development and Environment.

6. COMMENTS OF THE COUNCIL SOLICITOR, AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 6.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Section 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provides 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 such matters as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.
- 6.2 The Council needs to 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 There are no legal impacts arising from the request for footway parking in Ashcroft Rise.
- 6.3 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor, Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor & Monitoring Officer.

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 Controlled Parking Zones require minimal signage as repeater signs are not

required. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

9.2 There are no environmental impacts arising from the request for footway parking in Ashcroft Rise.

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.

10.2 There are no crime and disorder impacts arising from the request for footway parking in Ashcroft Rise.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The recommendations are for residents of Pemdevon Road and Sutherland Road areas to be consulted on the possibility of parking controls following a petition are to give priority access to parking space to residents over non-residents of the area.

11.2 The recommendations to turn down the request for the introduction of exempt footway parking scheme in Ashcroft Rise is because a scheme is not feasible.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 In respect of Pemdevon Road, the alternatives to the above measures would include not consulting residents over potential parking schemes to overcome parking problems caused by non-residential parking including commuters. Not consulting residents would not give them the opportunity to vote for parking controls to relieve parking stress in these congested areas.

12.1 In respect on Ashcroft Rise, the alternative options considered and rejected were: (a) widening the carriageway - impractical due to space and cost constraints as it would involve removing the footway on at least one side of the road; (b) introducing parking restrictions - would be very unpopular with residents and visitors.

REPORT AUTHOR

Chuks Nwaodume

Senior Traffic Engineer

CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design
Manager

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None