

Croydon Council

For general release

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT TO: | TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 3 MARCH 2015 |
| AGENDA ITEM: | 19 |
| SUBJECT: | OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS BEAUMONT ROAD AND COLDHARBOUR ROAD |
| LEAD OFFICER: | Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Development and Environment |
| CABINET MEMBER: | Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment |
| WARDS: | Upper Norwood and Waddon |
| 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 received to the proposed parking restrictions in Beaumont Road and Coldharbour Road and the officer's recommendations in response to these; 1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in paragraph 3 to amend the proposed | |

restrictions in Beaumont Road but proceed with the original proposal in Coldharbour Road;

- 1.3 Delegate to the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Highways & Parking Services the authority to make the necessary Traffic Management Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to implement recommendations 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 objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Beaumont Road and Coldharbour Road.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 Beaumont Road – Upper Norwood

- 3.2 A request was received from Ward Councillors (following a meeting with Officers) for parking restrictions to be introduced at the junction of Beaumont Road with Bradley Road where parked cars are causing obstructions. “At any time” waiting restrictions, extending for 10 metres from the junction were proposed to alleviate this problem.

- 3.3 A resident has objected to the introduction of waiting restrictions outside their property and requested that the proposed restrictions are shortened to allow them to continue to park there.

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

- 3.5 The recommendation of this review is to reduce the length of the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions from 10 metres to 7 metres on the north side of Beaumont Road outside No. 2, as shown in plan number **PD 258f**.

3.6 Coldharbour Road, Waddon

- 3.7 A complaint was received from a local resident about obstructive parking on the bend in Coldharbour Road opposite Coldharbour Way. This is a 90 degree bend with the Coldharbour Way junction off the concave side. An engineer visiting the site observed that vehicles park around the bend, almost completely blocking the view of oncoming traffic, particularly for motorists coming from the direction of Purley Way. The proposed introduction of double yellow lines around the apex of the bend will improve visibility and safety.

- 3.8 A resident has objected to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines at this location. The resident states that to their knowledge, there have never been any accidents at this bend and therefore, they do not understand why the restrictions are necessary. The resident also states that their property has a dropped kerb, but that it is not used as the resident feels it is too dangerous to reverse out of the driveway because visibility is poor. Consequently, the resident's vehicle is parked outside the driveway on the bend. The resident also mentions that the other occupant of his home, who is also the driver of the vehicle, is disabled and cannot walk far.
- 3.9 The resident suggests that the reason that vehicles park on the bend is because too many properties have been allowed to have dropped kerbs, but many do not have the space to accommodate a car in their driveways. In addition, the resident suggests that the dropped kerbs are too close together to allow cars to park between them. The resident says that the introduction of the restrictions will force them to park their car further away from their home.
- 3.10 **Response** – The purpose of the proposed waiting restriction is to improve visibility and safety on a bend where obstructive parking takes place. Although there have not been any traffic accidents on this bend within the last three-year reporting period, a local resident has complained about the obstruction of sightlines and an engineer visiting the site has agreed that parking at this location blocks the view of oncoming traffic. The resident objecting to the introduction of these restrictions has also stated that their driveway cannot be used as they cannot reverse out safely, due to poor visibility.
- 3.11 Drivers should ideally reverse in and drive out of their driveways in accordance with Rule 201 of the Highway Code. Nevertheless, the introduction of the proposed restrictions would improve visibility and enable the resident to use their driveway. This would also make parking more convenient for the disabled driver the resident has mentioned.
- 3.12 All applications for dropped kerbs and footway crossovers must satisfy a number of criteria, including a requirement that the off-street parking space is sufficient to accommodate the applicant household's vehicle. However, if a crossover is already in place when residents move into a property, it is possible that the existing off-street space will not be large enough for their car. Providing that waiting restrictions are not in operation outside a driveway, residents are permitted to park their vehicles outside their dropped kerbs, which means that on-street space outside a driveway can still be used and a dropped kerb does not necessarily prevent vehicles parking.
- 3.13 For these reasons it is recommended to introduce the proposed restrictions in Coldharbour Road, as shown on plan no. **PD 258h**.

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 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 £11k un-allocated to be utilised in 2014/2015. If all applications were approved there would remain £65k un-allocated to be utilised in 2015/2016.

4.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

| | Current Financial Year | M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2014/15 £'000 | 2015/16 £'000 | 2016/17 £'000 | 2017/18 £'000 |
| <u>Revenue Budget available</u> | | | | |
| 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 |

4.2 The effect of the decision

4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at the above locations (in conjunction with the restrictions on the same public notice) including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £9,200.

4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2014/15 and 2015/16.

4.3 Risks

4.3.1 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 and 2015/16.

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

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 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.

4.5.2 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.

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

5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

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

6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

6.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

6.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of Human Resources, Chief Executive Department.

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.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 8.1 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.

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.

10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 The recommendation is to introduce the originally proposed double yellow lines around the apex of the bend in Coldharbour Road and a slightly reduced length of double yellow lines on the west side of the junction of Beaumont Road and Bradley Road. These proposals will improve visibility and safety at locations where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. Surveys have been undertaken which confirm the parking problems and justification to introduce new restrictions.

11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 11.1 The alternative to new 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