

Croydon Council

For General Release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 26th APRIL 2016
AGENDA ITEM:	15
SUBJECT:	PETITION PROPOSED ONE WAY WORKING WITH CYCLE CONTRFLOW THE CRESCENT/ BEACONSFIELD ROAD
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	SELHURST
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 2016-17- Competing as a place- Manage need and grow independence- Protect the priorities of our residents and customers- Caring City, Improving health and wellbeing by reducing congestion	
LOCAL AREA AGREEMENTS(LAA) Targets – These are not applicable for this report	
FINANCIAL IMPACT The estimated cost of implementing the schemes as recommended in this report is £30,000 to be met from the Council's 2016/17 Local Implementation Plan allocation for accident prevention schemes.	
KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: Not a key decision	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- 1.1 Note the petition for one-way working in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road.
- 1.2 Agree, that subject to changes to traffic, if parking controls are introduced in this area following informal consultation as outlined in agenda item 16 (response to petition from Gloucester Rd residents requesting parking controls with recommendations to informally consult residents in the area on possible parking controls), that residents of The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road be informally consulted on one-way working in these roads.
- 1.3 The results of any consultation on one-way working be reported to a future meeting.
- 1.4 Note that the Highways Improvement Manager, Streets Directorate, will inform the instigator of the petitions of these decisions.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 A petition signed by 55 residents of The Crescent, 27 residents of Beaconsfield Road and 12 residents of Saracen Close has been received. The petition is requesting help to reduce traffic flow and road rage problems in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road.
- 2.2 This report seeks agreement to the informal consultation and if appropriate proceeding to give public notice for the introduction of one-way working with cycle contraflow in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road, Selhurst.
- 2.3 These proposals are in response to a petition from local residents to provide one-way working to mitigate traffic congestion and road safety concerns in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road (part). This will encourage motorists to use the arterial routes and not use side roads as short cuts. This may increase journey times for drivers. The estimated total combined cost of these works is £30,000.
- 2.4 The Council recognises problems with congestion and head on conflicts in residential streets and will endeavour to resolve this for residents and drivers. However, by simply implementing a one-way street for all traffic this then impacts on the network of routes available for drivers and cyclists in some cases, implementing one-way streets can force cyclists to use busy junctions or streets nearby, which they could otherwise have avoided.
- 2.5 The Council is a "Biking Borough" and as such has made a commitment to increase the number of journeys made by cyclists, in line with the Mayor of

London's Transport Plan. This includes the provision of a safe network of quieter routes for cyclists to use.

- 2.6 This can be achieved through the introduction of one-way working with a cycle contraflow, which allows pedal cycles to travel safely against the flow of one-way traffic. The cycle contraflow is indicated clearly with traffic signs and road markings. Details can be seen on the drawing within this report.

3. PETITION

3.1 The Crescent /Beaconsfield Road

A petition signed by 94 residents of The Crescent, Beaconsfield Road and Saracen close has been received.

The petition states:

I have collected a petition signed by the residents of The Crescent asking for it to become a one way street. I have also collected a petition from residents of Beaconsfield Road asking for their road to become a one way street in the opposite direction in order to support traffic flow. I have contacted The Brit School on this matter and they are in support of the petition. Whilst collecting signatures for the petition it was very apparent how concerned residents are about how dangerous The Crescent is to cross in the mornings and early evenings, due to the amount of traffic in both directions.

The result of the two way traffic in The Crescent is that resident's vehicles have frequently been damaged as traffic tries to squeeze through inadequate space, drivers often unwilling to give way.

3.2 Officers Response

A solution to reducing congestion and conflict in the road is to introduce a one-way working with cycle contraflow in The Crescent and part of Beaconsfield Road.

The Crescent

Introduce one way working with a cycle contraflow, operating in a southbound direction with entry from Whitehorse Road and no entry from Northcote Road except for cyclists. This would prevent through traffic from using The Crescent in a northbound direction and remove traffic conflicts and congestion on this road. See drawing and HWY/TRS/1261/THE CRESCENT/01

- 3.3 The Crescent is wide enough to safely allow cyclists to continue to use the road in both directions. It is therefore proposed that pedal cycles be exempt from the one-way working and a cycle contraflow be provided along The Crescent the one-way working will be for motorised vehicles only. This would prevent extraneous through traffic in northbound direction, but enable cyclist to continue using the road in both directions. See drawing HWY/TRS/1261/THE CRESCENT/01

3.4 Beaconsfield Road

To introduce one way working in Beaconsfield Road, operating in a westbound direction, starting from the junction of Guildford Road with no entry from Whitehorse Road (with exception of pedal cycles). This will prevent

extraneous through traffic from using Beaconsfield Road in an eastbound direction and remove traffic conflicts and congestion on this road. See drawing See drawing HWY/TRS/1261/BEACONSFIELDRD/021 and

- 3.5 Beaconsfield Road is wide enough to safely allow cyclists to continue to use the road in both directions. It is therefore proposed that pedal cycles be exempt from the one-way working and a cycle contraflow be provided along Beaconsfield Road the one-way working will be for motorised vehicles only. This would prevent extraneous through traffic in northbound direction, but enable cyclist to continue using the road in both directions.
- 3.6 The introduction of the one way system in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road is estimated to cost £30,000.
- 3.7 Funding for the design, consultation process and implementation is available within the "LIP" (Local Implementation Plan) funding for 2016-2017 provided by Transport for London (TfL).
- 3.8 The Council aims to introduce one-way workings where local residents and ward councillors have raised concerns as to road safety problems caused by through traffic movements or where this traffic causes unnecessary congestion and head on traffic conflicts. The introduction of one-way workings may increase traffic on surrounding roads.
- 3.9 The proposed one way working will be subject to detailed design processes and road safety audit to ensure that they meet the needs and safety requirements of those using them.
- 3.10 A number of illuminated signs are required for the proposed one-way workings as shown on the attached drawings.
- 3.11 Previous experience has shown that in densely parked roads such as Beaconsfield Road and The Crescent parking controls can alleviate the need for one-way working. This was shown recently when residents requested one-way working in Dennett Road but the conflict issues were largely resolved following the introduction of parking controls especially during the daytime period when flows are greatest.
- 3.12 A petition has been received from residents of nearby Gloucester Road requesting parking controls and the recommendation at this meeting (agenda item 16) is to consult residents not only in this road but the surrounding area including Bullrush Close, Sydenham Rd, Owen Close, Northcote Road, Tugela Road, Beaconsfield Road, Guildford Road, The Crescent and Saracen Close on parking controls.
- 3.13 It is therefore proposed to delay any consultation on one-way working in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road until after residents have been consulted on parking controls. Should parking controls be subsequently be introduced in these roads the need for one-way working may be reduced. Depending on this a decision to consult on one-way working may not be needed or could wait for a suitable time period to determine whether there is a long-term improvement in traffic conflicts.

3.14 **BACKGROUND**

In August 2014 the Cabinet Committee approved a report authorising the informal consultation on the introduction of one-way working with cycle contraflows in The Crescent and Beaconsfield Road.

The breakdown of the results were as follows:

3.15 The Crescent

143 questionnaires were delivered to residents. 24 responses were received back from residents representing a 17% response rate.

In favour of proposal (13) 54%

Against the proposal (11) 46%

3.16 Beaconsfield Road

162 questionnaires were delivered to residents. 36 responses were received back from residents representing a 22% response rate

In favour of the proposal (11) 30%

Against the proposal (25) 70%

3.17 It was agreed not to proceed with the one-way working due to a lack of support from local residents.

4. **CONSULTATION**

4.1 Local residents who live on the road where the one-way working is proposed will receive a set of informal consultation documents, including a letter, plan and questionnaire, inviting their views on the proposal to introduce one-way working in their road. This will also be available on the council's web site.

4.2 It is a legal requirement under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 that the Secretary of State is informed in writing of the proposal to establish one-way workings and the Chief Officer of the Police is consulted.

4.3 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, Cyclists Touring Club, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK, The Owner Drivers Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport and bus operators are consulted separately at the same time as the public notice is issued. Up to 27 Bodies in total are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposal.

4.4 Subject to the informal consultation indicating that it is appropriate to proceed, the necessary public notices will be published in the local paper and posted on the Croydon Council web-site in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

5 FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current year	Medium Term Financial Strategy – 3 year forecast		
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Revenue Budget				
Expenditure				
Income				
Effect of decision from report				
Expenditure				
Income				
Remaining budget				
Capital Budget				
Expenditure	150			
Effect of decision from report				
Expenditure	20			
Remaining budget	130			

5.2 The effect of the decision

These schemes are funded by Transport for London (TfL) from the Council's 2016/17 Local Implementation Plan allocation for Accident Prevention Schemes. A decision to proceed will result in that allocation is spent partially or wholly, subject to successful outcome of consultations.

5.3 Risks

There is a risk that if the one-way scheme 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 prove impossible then the funding would need to be returned.

5.4 Options

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

5.5 Savings/ future efficiencies

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

Approved by: Louise Lynch, Business Partner, 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, Acting Council Solicitor and Acting 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 The introduction of one-way working will reduce traffic congestion, improve road safety and provide environmental benefits for local residents

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 9.1 The introduction of a short section of one-way working with cycle contraflow at the above site will reduce the opportunity for vehicular conflicts and congestion, which will provide environmental benefits to those in the locality. However, the scheme will require the introduction of a number of illuminated signposts, which will have a negative design impact in terms of the street scene and result in terms of the street scene and result in additional energy usage and light pollution. Cycle contraflows maintain access for cyclists and benefits more sustainable modes of transport.

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 regulate the traffic movement in the above sites to avoid vehicular conflict and congestion which will benefit residents and local road users. By inclusion of cycle facilities in the one way working a quiet road network avoiding busy road and junctions is preserved for safer cycling.

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 problematic for residents living on the roads.

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