

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 16 DECEMBER 2014
AGENDA ITEM:	11
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS VARIOUS LOCATIONS
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Development and Environment
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Croham, Coulsdon East, Thornton Heath and Upper Norwood
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 to: 1.1 Consider the objections and comments received to the proposed parking restrictions in Bynes Road, the junction of Alder Croft and Rutherford Rise, the junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road, Apostle Way and Beulah Hill and the officers recommendations in response to these;	

- 1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in paragraph 3 to proceed with the amended proposal in Bynes Road and the original proposals at the junction of Alder Croft and Rutherford Rise, the junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road, Apostle Way and the service road in Beulah Hill, leading to Elizabeth Way.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 Inform the objectors of the above decision.

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 in Bynes Road, Sanderstead Road, the junction of Alder Croft and Rutherford Rise, the junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road, Apostle Way and the service road in Beulah Hill, leading to Elizabeth Way.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 Bynes Road and Sanderstead Road, Croham

- 3.2 The council received a letter from a resident of Bynes Road regarding heavy goods vehicles parking outside residential properties to deliver to the nearby school and the resident has also stated that lorries cannot manoeuvre around the bend in Bynes Road due to parked cars and would therefore like to see the existing 7am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday waiting restrictions extended.
- 3.3 45 objections have been received from local residents to the introduction of double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Bynes Road and Sanderstead Road.
- 3.4 Three letters of objection and another letter reproduced and signed by 42 local residents individually were received. The 42 signatories stated:

"I would like to object to the proposal to extend and create double yellow line at the junction of Bynes Road and Sanderstead Road. The safety concerns are unfounded and the loss of approximately ten parking spots in this area is totally unacceptable."

- 3.5 One objector, who also presented the 42 signed letters, owns a business at the junction of Sanderstead Road and Bynes Road and comments there is no problem exiting Bynes Road into Sanderstead Road. They use the junction frequently when parking customers' vehicles and road testing. The objector suggests the proposed double yellow line on the south side of Bynes Road should be reduced by a car length to minimise the impact on the loss of parking space.
- 3.6 Two objectors comment that finding a parking space is already extremely difficult and often results in parking in another road and walking distances, which is undesirable at night and impacts on less physically able neighbours. The parking issue is compounded by non-residents working locally.
- 3.7 **Response** – The purpose of the proposed waiting restrictions is to create an unobstructed free traffic flow for vehicles negotiating the bend in Bynes Road. Heavy goods vehicles delivering to a nearby school cannot manoeuvre around the bend safely due to parked vehicles.
- 3.8 It is acknowledged that the original proposal would reduce parking space significantly. In response to this concern it is recommended that the proposal to introduce "At any time" restrictions on the north side of Bynes Road and the east side of Sanderstead Road should be abandoned; however reducing the length of the proposed double yellow lines on the south side of Bynes Road would create difficulties for large vehicles as this is at the pinch point of the road.
- 3.9 For these reasons it is recommended to introduce an extension to the existing double yellow lines on the south side of Bynes Road only (as shown on Plan PD-239e).
- 3.10 The above objections and recommendation were previously presented to this committee at its meeting on 20 October 2014 (minute A32/14 refers) when a decision on the introduction of the amended proposal was deferred to this meeting.

3.11 Junction of Alder Croft and Rutherford Rise, Coulsdon East

- 3.12 Residents of Rutherford Avenue contacted their local councillor regarding vehicles parking too close to the junction of Rutherford Avenue and Alder Croft. Residents stated that the parked vehicles block motorists' sightlines, making it unsafe for motorists exiting a minor road into a major road. In view of this it was proposed that double yellow line "At Any Time" waiting restrictions should be introduced around the triangular area at the junction and also at the junction of Rutherford Avenue and Alder Croft as shown on the attached drawing number **PD - 245d**.
- 3.13 A local resident has objected to the above proposal on the following grounds.
- It is unusual for vehicles to be parked where the restrictions are proposed.
 - A resident parks a vehicle there on rare occasions to load/unload.

- Vehicles do not park on the sharp left turn into Rutherford Rise or the sharp left into Alder Croft, so restrictions there would serve no purpose.
- The length of yellow lines proposed on the west side of Alder Croft is more than the normal 10 metres.
- If restrictions are introduced they should cover no more than the hairpin left from Alder Croft into Rutherford Rise, no more than 5 metres in Rutherford Rise and 10 metres into Alder Croft on the left from Rutherford Rise into Alder Croft.
- At a site meeting recently, it was agreed that the best way to improve safety at this junction would instead be to direct traffic in Alder Croft turning right into Rutherford Rise to pass to KEEP LEFT of the traffic island.

3.14 Response

- According to the residents who complained to their local councillor, there is a problem with parking at this junction which causes an obstruction to sightlines.
- The 10 metre length mentioned in the report that proposed these restrictions referred to the yellow lines on Rutherford Rise from its junction with Alder Croft.
- The waiting restriction proposed for the west side of Alder Croft is longer than 10 metres in order to cover the entire bend in the road between the junction with Rutherford Rise and No. 1 Alder Croft. The restrictions as proposed are considered to be the minimum required to address the problem residents have highlighted.
- Although Officers who met the objector on site considered his ideas regarding the junction to be sound, it was explained that the level of expenditure required to make the changes would need to be justified on safety grounds and no personal injury accidents had occurred at the junction within the last five year reporting period.

3.15 In view of the above it is recommended to proceed with the waiting restrictions at the junction of Alder Croft and Rutherford Rise as originally proposed and shown in drawing number **PD-245d**.

3.15 Junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road, Coulsdon East

3.16 Concerns were raised by local residents, supported by a local councillor, regarding vehicles parking too close to the junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road. A site visit confirmed that sightlines at this junction are compromised due to parked vehicles and therefore, It was proposed that a 15m double yellow lines "At Any Time" waiting restriction be introduced into Byron Avenue and 10m double yellow lines "At Any Time" into Coulsdon Road junction as shown on the attached drawing number **PD - 245b**.

3.17 A local resident has objected to the above proposal on the grounds that there is no issue with vehicles parking close to the junction. The vehicles that do park in the vicinity (on the flat left bend from Byron Avenue into Coulsdon Road) do not park close to the junction or obstruct the view of traffic on Coulsdon Road. The objector feels that issues he has raised in relation to proposed waiting restrictions

at other junctions also apply to this one – that at a flat left bend junction, parking on the left hand side on the approach is not a problem and requires no more than a 5 metre restriction at most.

3.18 Response - According to the residents who complained to their local councillor, there is a problem with parking at this junction which causes an obstruction to sightlines and this is supported by a site inspection carried out by Officers. The restrictions proposed are considered to be the minimum required to address the problem residents have described.

3.19 For the above reasons it is recommended to proceed with the waiting restrictions at the junction of Byron Avenue and Coulsdon Road as proposed and shown in drawing number **PD – 245b**.

3.20 Apostle Way, Thornton Heath

3.21 A request was received from the St James the Great School in Windsor Road for the existing waiting restrictions in Apostle Way near its junction with Parchmore Road to be extended slightly due to vehicles parking too close to the junction. In response, 5m and 10m extensions of existing double yellow lines “At Any Time” were proposed as shown on the attached drawing number **PD – 245o**.

3.22 A resident of Coulsdon has objected to the proposed restrictions on the grounds that they are not necessary. The objector states that the existing double yellow lines on the north side of the road already extend to the point in the road where cars park and that no further extension is necessary. On the south side of the road the objector suggests that an extension of 5 to 7 metres would be adequate to increase the existing restrictions to the point where cars park on that side of the road and no further restriction is needed. The objector says that Apostle Way is heavily parked and used by residents of Parchmore Road and Windsor Road as well as customers of businesses in the vicinity. Therefore, any restrictions should be kept to the minimum necessary. The objector states that large vehicles have no need to use Apostle Way as it only serves Windsor Road and vehicles can access that road from either end.

3.23 **Response** – The proposed restrictions are intended to remove parking from a pinch-point in Apostle Way, near the junction of Parchmore Road and are considered to be the minimum required to address the issue highlighted by St James the Great School. Although the objector suggests that large vehicles have no need to use Apostle Way, school coaches have been using the road and experience difficulty negotiating the junction of Apostle Way and Parchmore Road, due to parked vehicles.

3.24 In view of the above it is recommended to proceed with the proposed extensions to waiting restrictions in Apostle Way, as shown in drawing number **PD- 245o**.

3.25 Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood

- 3.26 A complaint was received from a local resident that the grass verge adjacent to her property in Beulah Hill (in the service road leading to Elizabeth Way) was being damaged as drivers using the slip road had difficulty passing parked vehicles and were driving over the verge. The average width of the service road is only 5m; therefore, vehicles often use the grass verge in order to pass parked cars, damaging the verge as well as the parked cars. In view of this it was proposed that double yellow line "At Any Time" waiting restrictions should be introduced as shown on drawing number **PD – 245q** to protect the verge and parked vehicles at all times.
- 3.27 Two objections have been received to the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions in the service road on Beulah Hill. The objections are on the following grounds.

Objection 1

The resident is objecting on the grounds that there are insufficient parking places for people to leave their vehicles in Beulah Hill and that it would be unfair to further restrict where vehicles can park unless alternative parking places can be provided. The objector mentions that sub-divided properties have increased the number of people wishing to park in the vicinity without any increase in available parking space.

Objection 2

The resident is objecting on the grounds that residents do not have enough parking spaces currently and this proposal would reduce the amount of space available. The resident states that the restrictions on the verge side of the road are unnecessary, as vehicles do not park on that side and the restrictions on the other side of the road would decrease the available parking space. The resident would prefer that the grass verge was cut back instead.

- 3.28 **Response** – The purpose of the proposed restrictions is to prevent further damage to the grass verge and to cars parked in the service road. The damage is being caused due to vehicles parking on the side of the service road opposite the verge, narrowing the width of the carriageway. An auto-track test has been carried out which confirmed that any vehicles parked at the north-western end of the service road would force vehicles to drive over the grass verge to get past. Although this proposal will reduce the number of available parking spaces, the proposed restrictions are the minimum required to effectively address these issues.
- 3.29 Whilst vehicles are not currently parking on the verge side of the road, it is likely that they will do so if waiting restrictions are implemented on the opposite side. There is currently no funding to enable the verge to be cut back and brought up

to carriageway standard. In addition, previous experience suggests that if the kerb were to be re-aligned in this way, more vehicles would park at this junction. Therefore it is recommended to introduce the “At any time” waiting restrictions as shown in drawing number **PD – 245q**.

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 for parking restrictions in various locations. 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 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, Ambulance Service, Police, Freight and Road Haulage Associations will be 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

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 from. 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 £35k un-allocated to be utilised.

5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Revenue Budget				
available				
Expenditure	35	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0

<u>Capital Budget available</u>	0	0	0	0
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

5.2 The effect of the decision

5.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at the above locations in conjunction with the other schemes on the same notice, including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £8,800.

5.2.3 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets 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 budgets for 2014/15.

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

5.4 Options

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

5.5 Savings/future efficiencies

5.5.1 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.

5.5.2 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.

5.5.3 Approved by: Graham Oliver, Business Partner, Development and Environment.

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 & 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 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 recommendation is for an extension to an existing “At any time” parking restriction in Bynes Road and double yellow lines at the junctions of Alder Croft/ Rutherford Rise, Byron Avenue/Coulsdon Road, Apostle Way and in Beulah Hill at locations where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. 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 a new/extended 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: