

# Croydon Council

For General Release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b> <b>7<sup>th</sup> July 2015</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>CONSULTATION RESULTS ONE WAY WORKINGS EXCEPT CYCLES –OAKLEY ROAD, FERNDALE ROAD,DUNDEE ROAD,BELMONT ROAD, GRASMERE ROAD</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Jo Negrini Executive Director of Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>WOODSIDE</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b> The benefits of the recommendation as set out below is in line with Croydon's Community Strategy of creating a connected and sustainable city and improving the environment and also The Croydon Plan 2013-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Competing as a place</li><li>- Manage need and grow independence</li><li>- Protect the priorities of our residents and customers</li><li>- Caring City, Improving health and wellbeing by reducing congestion</li></ul>	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPACT</b> The estimated cost of implementing the schemes is estimated as £12,000. This is fully funded via Transport for London Local Implementation Plan allocation.	
<b>KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:</b> Not a key decision	

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they agree to:

- 1.1 Consider and note the petition received from residents and the responses to the informal consultation and agree to proceed with the proposals to introduce one-way workings with the exemption for pedal cycles for the roads listed below for the reasons given in Section 3 of this report.

Oakley Road-Woodside  
Ferndale Road-Woodside  
Dundee Road-Woodside  
Belmont Road-Woodside

- 1.2 Consider and note the responses to the informal consultation received from residents of Grasmere Road and agree not to proceed with the proposals to introduce one way workings for this particular road.

- 1.3 Authorise the General Manager of Operations and Infrastructure (Highways and Parking) be given the delegated authority to give public notice of the proposals in 1.1 and subject to receiving no material objections, to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to introduce the above proposals

- 1.4 Note that any material objections received will be reported back to a future meeting of the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for consideration and onward recommendation to the Cabinet Member.

## **2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 This report seeks a recommendation to proceed with the introduction of one way working (except cycles) due to outcome of the informal consultation in

Oakley Road-Woodside  
Ferndale Road-Woodside  
Dundee Road-Woodside  
Belmont Road-Woodside

- 2.2 Due to the responses to the informal consultation the recommendation is not to proceed with the introduction of one way working (except cycles) in Grasmere Road-Woodside

Proposals are shown in the drawing numbered HWY/TRS/1264/002/01 attached to this report

### 3. DETAIL

- 3.1 Consultation on these proposals was in response to requests from local residents and local Ward Councillors to provide one-way working to mitigate traffic congestion and road safety concerns in these roads.
- 3.2 On the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2015 (min A10/15) the Traffic Management Advisory Committee resolved to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they approve a report authorising the informal and statutory consultation and the making of the necessary Traffic Management Orders for the roads listed below, subject to any material objections being received, for the introduction of one-way working except cycles:-  
Oakley Road-Woodside  
Ferndale Road-Woodside  
Dundee Road-Woodside  
Belmont Road-Woodside  
Grasmere Road-Woodside
- 3.3 The informal consultation concluded in April 2015 and the responses showed there was limited support for the schemes for Dundee Road and Grasmere Road while there was support for the schemes in Oakley Road, Belmont Road and Ferndale Road. However, for the scheme to be workable, in terms of accessibility and traffic circulation, Oakley Road, Ferndale Road, Dundee Road and Belmont Road would need to be made one way in alternate directions.

Grasmere Road is considered separately as area wide traffic circulation is less dependent on this road for access and egress.

### 4. CONSULTATION

#### Informal Consultation

- 4.1 In April 2015 an informal consultation document including a questionnaire and plan were delivered by officers to residents of Oakley Road, Ferndale Road, Dundee Road, Belmont Road, Grasmere Road (including St Luke Close, Cumberland Road, Southcote Road, Tudor Road and a section of Albert Road) The document was also available on the Council's website, inviting views and representations on the introduction of one way working in the above roads.

The breakdown of the informal consultation results are shown in the tables below:

Road Name	No. of Questionnaires sent	Responses Received		For		Against	
		Number received	% of returns	Number received	% of returns	Number received	% of returns
Oakley Road	98	21	21%	14	67%	7	33%
Ferndale Road	100	26	26%	16	61%	10	39%
Dundee Road	95	44	46%	18	41%	26	59%
Belmont Road	96	31	31%	18	58%	13	41%
Total For Area	389	122	31%	66	55%	56	45%

Road Name	No of Questionnaires sent	Responses received		For		Against	
		Number received	% of returns	Number received	% of returns	Number received	% of returns
Grasmere Road St Lukes Close Cumberland Road Southcote Road Tudor Road Macclesfield Road Estcourt Road	600	87	15%	34	39%	53	61%

4.2 A typical response rate for informal consultation for one way workings is normally around 20%-25%.

4.3 A petition signed by 144 residents has been received in the following terms:

We, the undersigned, object to making Grasmere, Belmont, Dundee, Ferndale and Oakley Roads one way. We believe that:

1. The introduction of double yellow lines will drastically reduce the availability of parking spaces
2. The introduction of a one way system will cause more congestion
3. The introduction of a cycle contraflow into narrow roads will be unsafe
4. The introduction of double yellow lines at the junction of the above roads and Portland Road is excessive
5. The system has not shown the full effect for the traffic flow in the affected area.
6. The proposed system will have a severe impact on accessibility to shops and services
7. Access to the new school (950 pupils) will be severely hampered by reduced access/entry points
8. Emergency services could be delayed by the restricted access

Dundee Road 44 residents have signed  
 Grasmere Road 24 residents have signed  
 Ferndale Road 69 residents have signed  
 Belmont Road 7 residents have signed.

Three residents who have signed the petition have also completed the informal consultation response document.

4.4 Officer response to the points raised in the petition is below.

1. The introduction of double yellow lines will drastically reduce the availability of parking spaces.  
 Response: This proposal is to introduce one way workings with cycle contraflows. It does not include the introduction of any yellow line parking restrictions.

2. The introduction of a one way system will cause more congestion.

Response: The introduction of one way systems will remove any potential for head to head conflicts which currently cause congestion. Both sides of the roads in question are often fully occupied by parked vehicles. This reduces the width of road available and there is little opportunity for vehicles to pass each other. There are very few or no passing places and therefore vehicles may need to reverse back to a passing place, or onto the main road, to allow opposing car traffic to pass. The one way systems will eliminate the need for motorists to do this and there will be less congestion, not more.

3. The introduction of a cycle contraflow into narrow roads will be unsafe.

Response: Cycle contraflows are used in similar streets both in the borough of Croydon and also throughout London. The City of London has recently introduced many similar facilities. Each road where a contraflow is proposed is subject to a road safety audit and if any issues come out of this audit these will either be designed out where possible, or the contraflow will not be introduced.

4. The introduction of double yellow lines at the junction of the above roads and Portland Road is excessive.

Response: This proposal is to introduce one way workings with cycle contraflows. It does not include the introduction of any yellow line parking restrictions.

5. The system has not shown the full effect for the traffic flow in the affected area.

Response: The traffic flow is very clear to understand and is shown on drawing HWY/TRS/1264/002/01 attached to this report. The impact on motorists is that they must now choose the next street along to the one they may have used in the past. The benefit they will experience is less delay as there will be no oncoming vehicles.

6. The proposed system will have a severe impact on accessibility to shops and services.

Response: If there is less congestion then it is unlikely that local amenities are less accessible.

7. Access to the new school (950 pupils) will be severely hampered by reduced access/entry points.

Response: Access and egress will be easier due to reduction in congestion.

8. Emergency services could be delayed by the restricted access.

Response: with the introduction of one way systems emergency services are less likely to find themselves opposed by oncoming traffic. The proposal would therefore improve response times in attending an emergency. In the event of an

emergency an authorised vehicle (eg police/fire engine) has an exemption to travel against the one way system using its sirens and emergency lights.

### **Statutory Consultation**

- 4.5 The legal process to introduce one way workings (with/without cycle exemptions) 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 affixes notices to lamp columns or similar street furniture 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.
- 4.6 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, the Cyclists Touring Club, 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 are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposals.
- 4.7 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 made. Any relevant objections received are reported back to this Committee for a recommendation as to whether the scheme should be introduced as originally proposed, amended or abandoned. The objectors are then informed of the decision.

## 5 FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

### 5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current year	Medium Term Financial Strategy – 3 year forecast		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Revenue Budget</b>				
Expenditure				
Income				
<b>Effect of decision from report</b>				
Expenditure				
Income				
<b>Remaining budget</b>				
<b>Capital Budget</b>	12			
Expenditure	12			
<b>Effect of decision from report</b>				
Expenditure				
<b>Remaining budget</b>	0			

### 5.2 The effect of the decision

These schemes are funded by Transport for London (TfL) from the Council's 2015/16 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Accident Prevention Schemes. A decision not to proceed will result in the allocation provided to Croydon not being spent and will need to be reallocated.

### 5.3 Risks

There is a risk that if the one-way schemes cannot be implemented, for example, by negative outcome of feasibility studies or consultation, funding would then have to be reallocated. This would be subject to the agreement of TfL. Should this occur the funding would need to be returned.

### 5.4 Options

Should the schemes not be agreed then the option to do nothing remains.

### 5.5 Savings/ future efficiencies

There are no savings or future efficiencies arising from this report.

Approved by: (Dianne Ellender, on behalf of head of Finance, Place Department)

## **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 vary 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 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor, Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor and 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, Resources Department.

## **8. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

- 8.1 There are no Equalities impacts arising from the proposals.

## **9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 9.1 Reducing congestion makes the local environment a more pleasant place to live or travel through and encourages walking/cycling.

## **10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT**

- 10.1 There are no crime and disorder reduction impacts in this report.

## **11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED DECISION**

- 11.1 To take into account the views of local residents who do wish for one way working in the roads above. To reduce congestion and improve road safety for all using these roads. To ensure access for cyclists by complying with the Road Traffic Regulation Act to "secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic".



## **12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 12.1 To introduce one-way workings in the opposite direction. This would not necessarily reduce the problem of through traffic. To introduce parking restrictions along the above roads. This would be impractical for residents living on the roads. The do-nothing option does not resolve congestion caused by head to head conflicts.

---

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

Sue Ritchie, Senior Engineer, Network Improvement Team  
0208 726 6000 ext 63823  
Russell Birtchnall, Engineer, Network Improvements Team  
0208 726 6000 ext 62178

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

None

9