

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 29 April 2015
AGENDA ITEM:	10
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO VARIOUS WAITING RESTRICTIONS
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	ASHBURTON, BROAD GREEN, KENLEY, SANDERSTEAD, THORNTON HEATH 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 Beech Avenue, Furze Road, Houlder Crescent, Lower Road/Silverdale Road junctions, Oakfield Road, Pagehurst Road, Sissinghurst Road, St Mary's Road, Stoats Nest Road, Tenterden Gardens, Tenterden Road and Wydehurst Road	

and the officer's recommendations in response to these.

- 1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in paragraph 3 to proceed with the original proposals in Beech Avenue, Furze Road, Lower Road/Sylverdale Road junctions, Oakfield Road, St Mary's Road and Stoats Nest Road but to reduce the restrictions in Houlder Crescent, Pagehurst Road, Sissinghurst Road, Tenterden Gardens, Tenterden Road and Wydehurst Road as detailed.
- 1.3 Delegate to the General Manager of Operations and Infrastructure (Highways and Parking) 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 Beech Avenue, Furze Road, Houlder Crescent, Lower Road/Sylverdale Road junction, Oakfield Road, Pagehurst Road, Sissinghurst Road, St Mary's Road, Stoats Nest Road, Tenterden Gardens, Tenterden Road and Wydehurst Road.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 Tenterden Road Junctions - Pagehurst Road, Sissinghurst Road, Tenterden Gardens, Tenterden Road and Wydehurst Road - Ashburton

- 3.2 Local residents contacted one of their Ward Councillors regarding vehicles parking too close to the junctions of Sissinghurst Road with Wydehurst Road and the Tenterden Road junctions with Tenterden Gardens/Wydehurst Road and Pagehurst Road, affecting motorists' sightlines. The residents also stated that cars park too close to the entrance to Ashburton Park, even though there are "Keep Clear" markings in place, creating an obstruction. A site investigation confirmed that motorists park close to the junctions as well as the park's entrance. Therefore, it was proposed to introduce double yellow line "at any time" waiting restrictions at the junctions and the entrance to Ashburton Park.
- 3.3 A Ward Councillor and six local residents have objected to the extent of the proposed restrictions on the grounds that they will take away too much on street parking from residents. The residents suggest that the restrictions are not required as the roads are quiet and not used by through traffic. They also suggest that the introduction of these restrictions would encourage more residents to

create off-street parking areas, which is detrimental to the environment. One resident is concerned that the proposed restrictions will make it more likely that vehicles will park opposite their driveway and make it more difficult to use. Another resident is concerned that long vehicles (such as those that use the road to enter Ashburton Park to set up the fun fair) will have more difficulties with access. The Councillor suggests that restrictions of 5 metres at junctions rather than 10 metres would be as safe and more preferable for residents in the area. One resident is opposed to double yellow lines altogether and suggests that a single yellow line restriction or resident only parking should be considered as the roads are quiet at weekends and after 7pm. This resident is also concerned that the restrictions may contribute to vehicles speeding.

3.4 **Response** - Following the receipt of these objections, a review of the proposal was undertaken to take account of the objectors' 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 at each junction, as shown in plan number **PD – 261b/1**. The restrictions at the entrance to the park will remain as proposed as they are less than 10 metres in length.

3.6 **Oakfield Road – Broad Green**

3.7 Cyclists had contacted the council regarding cars parking on the contra-flow cycle lane in the one-way section of Oakfield Road (between its junctions with Stanton Road and St James's Road) during the evening. The one-way system operates from north-east to south-west (from St. James's Road towards Stanton Road) and the contra-flow cycle lane operates in the opposite direction. The cycle lane is currently marked with a single yellow line to prohibit parking between 9.00am and 5.00pm, Monday to Saturday. However, cyclists reported that after 5pm parked vehicles force them towards the middle of Oakfield Road where they are confronted with vehicles entering Oakfield Road from St James's Road, resulting in near misses. In response, it was proposed to upgrade the existing single yellow line protecting the cycle lane to a double yellow line 'at any time' waiting restriction.

3.8 A representative of the Croydon and District Masonic Centre in Oakfield Road has objected to the proposed introduction of the double yellow lines. The objections are that the new restrictions will impact on their ability to receive deliveries at the centre, that elderly and disabled visitors to the centre will be affected and that a new development in the area will place additional pressure on the amount of available parking space in the area. The objector has suggested that consideration should be given to providing disabled bays outside the Masonic Centre.

3.9 **Response** - Vehicles are permitted to stop on both single and double yellow line waiting restrictions for the purpose of loading/unloading and the maximum time

allowed for this is 40 minutes. Consequently, deliveries to the Masonic Centre premises should be unaffected if the proposed restrictions go ahead.

- 3.10 Disabled badge holders are able to park for up to three hours on yellow lines providing that a valid Blue Disabled Badge and clock are displayed and the clock is set to the time of arrival. In addition they can also park without payment or time limit in controlled parking zone bays in the vicinity of the Masonic Centre, providing that their badges are clearly displayed. The Masonic Centre also has off-street parking at the rear of its premises and a larger car park in Stanton Road for members, where priority could be given to disabled parking spaces to assist visitors to the centre.
- 3.11 The Parking Design Team regularly reviews the provision of disabled parking bays throughout the borough, although any new bays are unlikely to be located in the section of Oakfield Road where double yellow lines are currently proposed, as these would obstruct the cycle lane.
- 3.12 Developments of 10 residential units or more should automatically be excluded from the controlled parking zone, which means that residents of such developments are not entitled to parking permits for the area. Controls may also be placed on the number of permits available to developments with less than 10 residential units. This means that the impact of the new development on the availability of parking spaces in the area of the Masonic Centre should be limited.
- 3.13 In view of the above, it is recommended to introduce the waiting restrictions as originally proposed and shown on the attached plan no. **PD – 261e**.

3.14 Lower Road/Sylverdale Road junctions – Kenley

- 3.15 A request was received from Transport for London (TfL) to introduce waiting restrictions at the junctions of Sylverdale Road and Lower Road, where they meet the A22, Godstone Road. TfL is proposing a Highway Improvement Scheme incorporating the whole length of the A22 within Croydon's boundary, which involves a number of measures. TfL had received a number of complaints from motorists regarding visibility from the side roads and obstruction of the carriageway caused by parked vehicles. A site investigation confirmed that cars are parked very close to the junctions of Lower Road and Sylverdale Road at all times. In view of this it was proposed to introduce 10 metre double yellow lines and 25m double yellow lines to the "Give Way" markings and 10m double yellow lines "At Any Time" at the junction of Lower Road with Godstone Road, to allow vehicles to manoeuvre safely around parked cars.
- 3.16 Three residents of Sylverdale Road and one from Godstone Road have objected to the proposed restrictions on the grounds that the parking spaces available for local residents will be reduced and that they already find it difficult to park close to their homes. Residents cite several reasons for their difficulties including parking by commercial vehicles, builders' vehicles and parents dropping children at the

nearby school. One resident suggests that a residents' parking scheme should be introduced.

3.17 Response - Whilst it is acknowledged that the removal of parking spaces will cause some inconvenience to local residents, the proposed restrictions are considered to be the minimum required to protect sightlines and prevent obstructive parking at the junctions.

3.18 Although there may be parking problems in the area few complaints have been received and no petition requesting a resident parking scheme has ever been submitted. If such a petition were to be received, indicating widespread demand, the introduction of a resident parking scheme in this area would be considered.

3.19 In view of the above it is recommended that the originally proposed restrictions should be introduced as shown in plan no. **PD-261j**.

3.20 Stoats Nest Road, Kenley

3.21 Complaints were received from local residents regarding parking along Stoa's Nest Road that impedes traffic flow between the bend and the A23, Brighton Road. The residents requested that "at any time" waiting restrictions should be introduced by the bus stop north-west of the junction with Windermere Road to reduce obstructive parking and congestion. A site investigation showed that motorists park along both sides of Stoa's Nest Road, making it difficult for vehicles to manoeuvre around the "pinch point" and causing congestion. Consequently a 20m length of double yellow line "at any time" waiting restrictions was proposed, adjacent to the bus stop on the north-east side of the road.

3.22 Four households in Stoats Nest Road and two in Windermere Road have objected to the proposed restrictions on the following grounds:-

- The restrictions do not fit the criteria given for their introduction in the public notice advertising the proposals.
- The restrictions will increase speeding.
- The restrictions will prevent unloading.
- The restrictions will make parking more difficult for residents of Stoats Nest Road – they receive verbal abuse when parking in adjacent roads and additional developments in the vicinity will make spaces harder to find.
- The restrictions should not be placed adjacent to homes and should be put on the other (even) side of the road, which is more congested with parked vehicles that mainly belong to a car sales person or to people who do not live on the road.
- The main problem in Stoats Nest Road is traffic queuing whilst waiting to exit onto Brighton Road. Traffic lights at the junction of Stoats Nest Road and Brighton Road would be a better proposal to deal with rush hour congestion and enable vehicles to exit Stoa's Nest Road into Brighton Road more easily;

- There is a box junction marked on Stoats Nest Road at the junction with Windermere Road and this should allow vehicles to pass. If drivers are blocking the box junction then CCTV cameras should be used to enforce it.
- Traffic entering Stoats Nest Road from Brighton Road is free flowing so the proposed restrictions are not needed.

3.23 Response

- As proposed waiting restrictions are advertised in batches of twenty or more locations at a time, a generalised reasoning is given for their introduction, to cover the differing circumstances that may exist at different locations. These include increasing visibility, removing obstructive parking and providing improved access for all road users, especially pedestrians, the emergency services and public service vehicles. The reason that is most appropriate to this location is improved access, as the new restrictions will provide a passing place at a “pinch point” in the road and assist buses (public service vehicles).
- The 20 metre length of waiting restriction proposed for this location is not a long enough distance to encourage speeding. If the objector had experienced a speeding problem in the road prior to this proposal, then this should have been reported and addressed separately, as this proposal is primarily to create a passing point for opposing traffic.
- The waiting restrictions would not prevent people stopping to load/unload goods, so delivery vehicles/residents unloading their shopping would not be adversely affected.
- It is acknowledged that the proposal would displace parking from the odd-numbered side of Stoats Nest Road. However, as the location of the proposed restrictions is a “pinch point”, it is not ideal for parking. Parking spaces are available in Windermere Road and any abusive or threatening behaviour experienced by residents when parking in adjacent roads should be reported to the police or local Safer Neighbourhoods Team.
- When Traffic Engineers investigate parking complaints and consider potential solutions, they try to minimise the impact on residents as much as is possible. At this location, the majority of vehicles park on the even-numbered side of the road, opposite properties, so the decision was taken to place restrictions on the odd-numbered side of the road, where fewer vehicles park and fewer residents would be affected.
- Officers are not aware of any reports of vehicles blocking the box junction in Stoats Nest Road. The pinch point is to the north-west of the Windermere Road box junction, next to the bus stop.
- The carriageway in Brighton Road, adjacent to its junction with Stoats Nest Road, is already marked “Keep Clear” to assist vehicles exiting Stoats Nest Road on to Brighton Road. The installation and maintenance of traffic signals is the responsibility of Transport for London and any requests for additional signals should be directed to them. However, at this location the problem reported by residents was a “pinch point” in Stoats Nest Road and this proposal is intended to address that issue only.

- Residents have complained that traffic entering Stoats Nest Road from Brighton Road becomes backed up due to the “pinch point” and the proposed restrictions are required to alleviate this.

3.24 For the reasons detailed above it is recommended to proceed with the proposed waiting restrictions, as shown on plan no. **PD – 261k**.

3.25 Beech Avenue – Sanderstead

3.26 Officers met with residents to discuss their concerns about the level of commuter parking in the road, particularly on the bend, which obstructs residents accessing their driveways and conflicts with opposing traffic during the daytime. In order to deter commuter parking it was proposed to introduce a single yellow line waiting restriction operating from 11am to 12 noon, Monday to Friday.

3.27 Three local residents have objected to the proposed restriction on the following grounds:-

- The restriction does not go far enough, as parking will still take place on both sides of the road for the majority of the day. The residents suggest that double yellow lines operating “at any time” or a single yellow line with a longer restricted period would be more effective. One of the residents lives near the bend in the road and says this causes particular difficulties when exiting their driveway. The resident suggests that a double yellow line restriction is required at the bend and a double or single yellow line opposite, to enable safe egress.
- The restriction has not been introduced for safety reasons but to remove commuter parking from the area. This will displace the commuter vehicles into other roads. The area should be looked at as a whole. Commuter parking in the Purley Oaks area of Sanderstead is a huge and growing problem. Two nursery schools in the vicinity also mean that parents/child minders are dropping/collecting children and this is a real safety issue.

3.28 **First objection response** - It is Officers’ experience that a one hour restriction is effective in deterring the majority of commuter parking as it prevents vehicles being parked in a location in the morning and left all day whilst the driver continues his/her journey by public transport.

3.29 Whilst double yellow lines or a longer restricted period on a single yellow line would be equally effective in preventing commuter parking, they would also prevent residents and their visitors parking outside their homes for the majority of the day, which is unlikely to receive support.

3.30 The introduction of a longer restriction could be considered if a petition on this issue were received, signed by the affected households. However, as only three residents have objected (and only two of these live in Beech Avenue) it appears that the others are satisfied with the Council’s original proposal, which was discussed with residents at a site meeting.

3.31 **Second objection response** - Although roads to the south-east of Purley Oaks station suffer from commuter parking and a high proportion of residents do not have off-street parking, few complaints have been received from residents and no petitions from that area have been presented to the Council.

3.32 A recent consultation on the possible introduction of a controlled parking scheme was carried out with residents in the area to the north-west of the station (Braemar Avenue, Brantwood Road and Grange Road) in January 2015, following the receipt of a petition from that area. The results were reported to this committee on 03 March 2015 (agenda item 16 refers) and it was recommended that should the majority of residents in the Braemar Road area vote in favour of parking controls, the parking situation on the south-east side of the station should be assessed. However, the result of the consultation showed that the majority of

respondents were not in favour of the introduction of a controlled parking scheme and it is not the Council's policy to impose such a scheme without support from residents.

3.33 In the absence of support for a wider scheme and for the other reasons detailed above, it is recommended to introduce the proposed single yellow line restriction in Beech Avenue, as shown on plan no. **PD- 261L**. The new restriction will be monitored for future review.

3.34 St Mary's Road – Sanderstead

3.35 Complaints were made by residents to their local Ward Councillor regarding parking problems in St Mary's Road near the junction of Sanderstead Road. The residents' main concern was that a large number of cars were parking at a "pinch point" in the road, at the end of the existing single yellow lines, making it difficult for motorists to pass safely. In response it was proposed to extend the existing single yellow line waiting restriction by 15m.

3.36 A local resident agrees with the restriction in principle but is concerned that it will displace commuters and increase problems in adjacent roads. The resident suggests that pay and display parking should be introduced in St Mary's Road and that this would raise revenue from commuters using Purley Oaks Station during the daytime and from theatre goers in the evening. The resident is concerned about the growing problem of commuter parking in the Sanderstead/Purley Oaks Station area and feels that the Council should be taking a "global" view of the problem rather than "nibbling away" at it by extending waiting restrictions.

3.37 **Response** - It is acknowledged that the proposed extension of the existing waiting restriction at this location may cause some limited displacement of vehicles. However, the proposed restriction is the minimum required to alleviate the problem reported by residents and enable vehicles to pass.

3.39 As explained in paragraphs 3.25 and 3.26 of this report, the Council has attempted to deal with the wider problem of commuter parking in the Sanderstead/Purley Oaks station area, but has been unable to pursue a controlled parking scheme due to a lack of support from residents. Legislation prohibits the introduction of parking schemes merely for the purpose of raising revenue.

3.40 In view of the reasons detailed it is proposed to proceed with the originally proposed restriction in St Mary's Road, as shown on plan no. **PD – 261g**.

3.41 Furze Road – Thornton Heath

3.42 Telephone calls were received from residents, requesting the Council to introduce waiting restrictions at the junctions of Livingstone Road with Norbury Road and

Furze Road with Norbury Road to discourage parking too close to the junctions and causing access difficulties. In response double yellow line waiting restrictions were proposed at both junctions.

3.43 A resident has objected to the restrictions in Furze Road as they will prevent them from parking outside their house. The resident states that the problem is mainly in Livingstone Road and Norbury Road and the restrictions in Furze Road are not required.

3.44 **Response** – When restrictions are proposed at junctions in response to complaints about obstructive parking it is the usual practice of the Parking Design Team to extend those restrictions across driveways near the junction to protect access. In this case, the driveway in question is very close to the junction and to continue to permit parking there would cause an obstruction issue for vehicles turning into Furze Road. For this reason it is proposed to proceed with the original proposal as shown in plan no. **PD – 261o**.

3.45 Houlder Crescent – Waddon

3.46 A request was received from a resident via their Ward Councillor to install waiting restrictions at the corners of Houlder Crescent to stop parking close to the junctions. Following a site investigation, it was proposed to install 10 and 15 metre lengths of “At Any Time” double yellow lines at these locations.

3.47 A petition has been received signed by 31 residents representing 20 of the 40 households in Houlder Crescent. The petition states that “parking on these corners does not obstruct turning vehicles or limit manoeuvrability. This is a residential road and I have lived here for 27 years. There has been: no major accidents, scrapes, bumps or minor incidents. Majority households occupy 2-3 cars each and we park on the corners safely for each neighbour to manoeuvre as they please. We require the corners of Houlder Crescent to park; especially during the hours of 5pm to 9am and all weekend when families visit. Therefore the waiting restrictions will cause more issues. We all object to the Order and request for it not to go ahead or an alternative to be proposed.”

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

3.49 The recommendation of this review is to reduce the length of the proposed “At any time” waiting restrictions to 14 metres at the bends adjacent to Nos. 5 and No. 6 Houlder Crescent (7 metres on either side of the apex of each bend). This compromise would improve access and road safety with the minimum loss of parking spaces and is shown in plan no **PD – 261p/1**. The restrictions at the bend adjacent to No. 36 Houlder Crescent will not be amended as they are already at a 7-metre length on either side of the apex of the bend. It is also not proposed to amend the restrictions adjacent to Nos. 33 and 35 Houlder Crescent as this would negate their effectiveness.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections 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

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. 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 £71k un-allocated to be utilised in 2015/2016.

5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2015/16 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000
Revenue Budget available				
Expenditure	100	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 restrictions on the same public notice) including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £9,200.
- 5.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2015/16.

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 2015/16.
- 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: Dianne Ellender, Head of Finance and Deputy Section 151 Officer, Place 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

7.2 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 HR, Resources 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 to introduce the originally proposed waiting restrictions in Beech Avenue, Furze Road, Lower Road/Sylverdale Road junctions, Oakfield Road, St Mary's Road and Stoats Nest Road. These proposals will improve visibility, access 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. The recommendation is also to implement reduced restrictions in the Tenterden Road/Tenterden Gardens area and in Houlder Crescent, following a review of the original proposals in response to objections.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 12.1 The alternative to new double yellow line waiting restrictions proposed in the relevant locations 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.
- 12.2 The alternative to the new single yellow line waiting restrictions in Beech Avenue would be double yellow lines or a single yellow line with a longer restricted period. These alternatives were rejected for the reasons detailed in paragraphs 3.28 to 3.30.

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)