

# Croydon Council

For general release

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>REPORT TO:</b>  | <b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b><br><br><b>26 April 2016</b>        |
| <b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>  | <b>23</b>   |
| <b>SUBJECT:</b>  | <b>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS</b>                              |
| <b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>   | <b>Jo Negrini, Executive Director Place</b>                                     |
| <b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>   | <b>Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>       |
| <b>WARDS:</b>  | <b>Croham, Coulsdon East, Norbury, Purley, Thornton Heath and Upper Norwood</b> |
| <b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b><br><br>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"><li>• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies</li><li>• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6</li><li>• The Croydon Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.</li><li>• Croydon Corporate Plan 2013 – 15</li><li>• <a href="http://www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/">www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/</a></li></ul> |   |
| <b>FINANCIAL IMPACT:</b><br><br>These proposals can be contained within available budget.  |   |
| <b>FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:</b> n/a  |   |
| <b>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</b><br><br>That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they:<br><br>1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions and the officer's recommendations in response to these in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overbury Crescent, New Addington</li><li>• Purley Vale, Stevens Place, Roke Lodge Road and Sylverdale Road, Purley and Kenley</li><li>• Ryecroft Road, Norbury</li></ul>  |   |

- Ingham Close and Ingham Road, Selsdon and Ballards
  - Biggin Hill, Upper Norwood
- 1.2 Agree the following:
- Overbury Crescent, New Addington – proceed with proposal
  - Purley Vale, Stevens Place, Roke Lodge Road and Sylverdale Road, Purley and Kenley – proceed with proposal
  - Rycroft Road, Norbury – proceed with proposal
  - Ingham Close and Ingham Road, Selsdon and Ballards – proceed with an amended proposal
  - Biggin Hill, Upper Norwood – proceed with proposal
- 1.3 Delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Highways, 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 Note: the officer to 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 Overbury Crescent, New Addington, Purley Vale, Stevens Place, Roke Lodge Road and Sylverdale Road, Purley and Kenley, Rycroft Road, Norbury, Ingham Close and Ingham Road, Selsdon and Ballards and Biggin Hill, Upper Norwood.

## 3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

- 3.1 **Overbury Crescent, New Addington** – A new bus route is being introduced in New Addington, which will use Overbury Crescent (between Arnhem Drive and Homestead Way). Parking on both sides of this section of the road would create an obstruction for buses and consequently it was recommended to introduce a single yellow line (operating from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday) in the section of road between Chertsey Crescent and the roundabout, and a double yellow line (operating at any time) in the section of the road between Chertsey Crescent and Homestead Way, to resolve these issues.
- 3.2 Three local residents have objected to the proposed restrictions in Overbury Crescent for a number of reasons including:-
- The proposed restrictions will have a huge impact on the ability of residents to park in the road and there is nowhere else for them to park.
  - The north side of the road is used for parking far more than the south side and placing restrictions on the north side is removing parking where it is needed most.
  - The proposed double yellow lines should be amended to a single yellow line as proposed in the other section of Overbury Crescent.
  - Why is a single yellow line restriction considered sufficient in one stretch of Overbury Crescent when the new bus route will operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

- 3.3 **Response** – The restrictions have been proposed to ensure access for buses along the recently amended route 64, which will operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, between Thornton Heath Pond and New Addington. It is not possible to run the amended route along Overbury Crescent without removing parking from one side of the road.
- 3.4 Whilst the restrictions may cause some inconvenience to residents, the majority of affected properties have off-street parking and the opposite side of the road will remain unrestricted in both sections of the road, in order to retain parking spaces. Double yellow line restrictions have been proposed on the north side of Overbury Crescent (between Homestead Way and Chertsey Crescent) rather than the south side as this is the inside of the bend where parking will cause a greater obstruction to sightlines.
- 3.5 A council officer who has regularly visited Overbury Crescent in connection with the proposed bus route has noted that there is little or no day-time parking and more evening parking in the section of Overbury Crescent between Homestead Way and Chertsey Crescent, whilst vehicles are parked during the day time in the section of Overbury Crescent between Chertsey Crescent and the roundabout. In view of this, it is considered reasonable to place “at any time” restrictions where parking overnight would cause an obstruction to buses and day-time, 8am to 6.30pm restrictions, where vehicles parking during the day could cause a difficulty. It is possible that these restrictions will need to be amended once the bus starts using this route if any obstruction problems occur.
- 3.6 In view of the fact that the restrictions are essential for the operation of the new bus route, it is proposed to proceed with the restrictions as originally proposed and shown in plan no. **PD – 289e**.
- 3.7 **Purley Vale, Stevens Place, Roke Lodge Road and Sylverdale Road, Purley and Kenley**
- 3.8 The Police Neighbourhood team requested yellow line waiting restrictions in Purley Vale on a right angled bend in the vicinity of Stevens Place and Roke Lodge Road. Parking close to the bend is creating potential obstruction to larger vehicles and compromising safety at this bend. In response it was recommended that double yellow line ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions should be introduced at this junction.
- 3.9 A local business occupier has objected to the proposed restrictions and suggested alternatives as detailed below.
- The public notice advertising the restrictions was invalid as it refers to a junction between Stevens Place and Roke Lodge Road which does not exist, the junction is actually between Stevens Place and Purley Vale.
  - Stevens Place should have restrictions for its entire length on the south-east side as parking on both sides would block the road.
  - Purley Vale should only have two metres of restrictions on the south-west side and three metres of restrictions on the north-east side at its junction with Purley Vale. The restrictions proposed are excessive and are outside a resident’s property.

- Sylverdale Road should only have four metres of restrictions on the north-west side and two metres of restrictions on the south-east side at its junction with Purley Vale/Roke Lodge Road.
  - Roke Lodge Road should only have two metres of restrictions on both sides at its junction with Purley Vale/Sylverdale Road. Sunnysdene Road has a two metre restriction at its junction with Purley Vale and there is no difference in this situation.
- 3.10 **Response** – The Council’s highway records indicate that Roke Lodge Road stretches from the railway line to a boundary that extends from the south-western corner of the of the property at No. 107 Purley Vale to the north-eastern corner of the open space adjacent to Stevens Place, where there is a junction between the two roads. The objector has highlighted that there is road sign next to the perimeter fence of the open space which shows that this section of the road is Purley Vale, however, it appears that this is incorrect and its removal will be arranged.
- 3.11 Rule 243 of the Highway Code states that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. Whilst the majority of parking restrictions proposed for this junction are not 10 metres long, the shortest restrictions proposed are five metres (approximately one car space) in length, as this is considered the minimum necessary to ensure adequate visibility and prevent obstruction. Restrictions of less than five metres, as suggested by the objector, would provide insufficient protection at this junction and result in vehicles parking too close and blocking sightlines. Although the objector is concerned about restrictions outside residents’ houses, all the affected frontages were notified of the proposals and no objections were received from them.
- 3.12 According to the Traffic Management Order, the restrictions at the junction of Sunnysdene Road and Purley Vale should also be five metres in length, although it is possible that the objector saw them when they were incomplete. The operational date for these restrictions was only recent (22 February) and a parked vehicle may have obstructed the lining contractor when the road markings were initially attempted.
- 3.13 It is not considered necessary to introduce restrictions along the entire south-east side of Stevens Place. Whilst the objector is correct that parking on both sides would block the road, there have been no complaints that this occurs from either the police (who requested the adjacent restrictions) or members of the public.
- 3.14 As the restrictions proposed are considered to be the minimum necessary to prevent obstructive parking at this junction it is proposed to proceed as shown in plan no. **PD-289h**.
- 3.15 **Ryecroft Road, Norbury** - A local resident requested yellow line waiting restrictions at the junction of Ryecroft Road and Jerviston Gardens. Jerviston Gardens is a narrow cul-de-sac leading to residential properties. The resident stated that vehicles are parking close to the junction on a regular basis, creating problems for access into Jerviston Gardens and sightline issues for drivers attempting to emerge into Ryecroft Road. Site surveys have confirmed there are often vehicles parked close to the junction. In order to avoid danger to road users

negotiating this junction and ensure access to Jerviston Gardens is maintained for larger vehicles including refuse trucks and emergency vehicles, it was recommended that double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions were introduced.

3.16 A resident has objected to the proposed restrictions on the following grounds.

- There are no parking problems in Ryecroft Road, which is a wide road with drives to most of the houses.
- There are no amenities to attract non-residents' cars to park there.
- There are numerous existing pieces of legislation governing obstruction and legal parking distance from corners which control any issues that might exist at the moment.
- The road is largely free of street furniture and road markings and it would be visually detrimental to have coloured road markings and signage.
- The proposed restrictions are a poor use of money. If the Council has money to spare there are innumerable things on which it could be spent. The resident goes on to suggest that these should include a better way of communicating new parking restrictions to residents (rather than a "scrappy piece of paper sellotaped to a lamppost in such a way that the tape makes it impossible to read the notice"), allowing residents to make objections electronically rather than writing a letter, making PDFs on the Council's website searchable so content can be found and overhauling the website search engine so that if a search is done, some meaningful results are returned.

3.17 **Response** – It is acknowledged that there are no reported parking problems in Ryecroft Road. However, these restrictions are being proposed in response to a problem affecting Jerviston Gardens and include Ryecroft Road in order to keep sightlines at the junction clear. As the majority of houses have driveways the proposed restrictions will have little or no impact on most residents, who park off-street.

3.18 Whilst there may be no amenities to attract non-residents to park in Ryecroft Road, site surveys have confirmed a problem with vehicles parking close to the junction with Jerviston Gardens.

3.19 Although the Police can serve a Fixed Penalty Charge Notice for obstruction to vehicles parked within 10 metres of a junction, regardless of any restrictions on the ground, their limited resources mean that they are unlikely to do so and would usually pass parking complaints to the relevant local authority for action. As a local authority, we have no powers to issue Penalty Charge Notices for obstruction and require a waiting restriction in order to carry out enforcement if a junction is obstructed.

3.20 Double yellow lines do not require signage as they always apply "at any time". The Council make every effort to reduce the visual intrusion of new restrictions by ensuring that they are the minimum required to deal with the problem.

- 3.21 When new parking restrictions are proposed, the details are advertised in the local press and on the Council's website. Directly affected frontages are sent written notification of the proposal and public notices are displayed on-street in a plastic cover and attached to signposts or lamp columns in the vicinity. In this case it appears that the public notice may have been in a less than perfect condition, possibly due to the weather (rain can permeate the plastic cover or get under the tape with which the notices are displayed) although it was legible enough for the objector to contact the Council and get the relevant details to allow them to object.
- 3.22 The public notice advertised when new restrictions are proposed clearly states that objections may be made by email or by post.
- 3.23 The points raised by the objector about the ability to search the website for the relevant information have been forwarded to the Ecomms team for action.
- 3.24 As the proposed restrictions are considered necessary to deal with an obstruction problem reported by a local resident, it is recommended to proceed with them as proposed and shown on plan no. **PD – 294a**.
- 3.25 **Ingham Road by Ingham Close, Selsdon & Ballards** – A request was received via a Ward Councillor for restrictions to be introduced at the Ingham Road / Ingham Close junction due to ongoing parking issues. Currently parking close to the junction is causing obstruction and safety concerns and this is compounded at the busy setting down and picking up periods for the nearby Selsdon Primary School. There are existing "at any time" waiting restrictions at the Ingham Road / Addington Road junction and it was recommended that similar restrictions at Ingham Close/Ingham Road are introduced.
- 3.26 Two residents have objected to the proposed restrictions for various reasons including:-
- The proposal will displace vehicles that will still need to park in the vicinity but with less available space. This will affect the ability of residents of Ingham Close to park.
  - Parking in the area concerned helps to slow traffic, which speeds up dangerously when fewer vehicles are parked. It also deters vehicles using the junction as a turning circle, which they also do at speed, hitting cars parked on the periphery of the junction.
  - There are no problems at this junction as heavy vehicles, fire engines and refuse trucks use it without difficulty.
  - The yellow lines will not prevent parents pulling up to drop/pick-up their children from the nearby school.
  - There is little through traffic at this junction.
  - The corner on the south side of Ingham Close is more of a 90 degree corner than is indicated in the Council's plan, whereas the northern corner is more of a sweeping bend, yet both sides are being treated the same, with restrictions coming to the same point in Ingham Close.
  - The yellow lines proposed for Ingham Close are excessive, will mean the unnecessary loss parking spaces and could result in unsafe parking elsewhere in the Close (e.g. in the turning circle at the end of the road).

- The restriction should be reduced to finish at the driveway entrance to No. 8 Ingham Close, which would enable spaces to be retained and prevent dangerous parking on the bend on the north side and on the 90 degree corner on the south side of the entrance to Ingham Close.
- 3.27 **Response** - It is acknowledged that the proposal would remove approximately three car spaces each from Ingham Close and Ingham Road. However, the remainder of the carriageway would remain unrestricted so residents should still be able to park in the vicinity.
- 3.28 The length of waiting restriction proposed for this location is not a long enough distance to encourage speeding and the removal of obstructively parked vehicles should help vehicles to manoeuvre safely without damaging parked cars.
- 3.29 There have been no reports of obstruction to refuse or emergency service vehicles at this location, although the removal of parking at the junction will undoubtedly improve ease of access for such vehicles.
- 3.20 The proposed restrictions would still allow vehicles to stop to drop off or pick up children at the local school, but should deter parking for longer periods.
- 3.21 Whilst it appears that there may be an issue with parking at the junction of Ingham Road and Ingham Close, as evidenced by the original complaint, the comments of the objectors indicate that the problem is low level and one that does not cause regular obstruction difficulties to residents or larger vehicles such as refuse trucks. In addition, as pointed out by one of the objectors, Ingham Close is a cul-de-sac with low levels of traffic which would be mainly confined to residents and their visitors. The comparatively light traffic levels mean the likelihood of conflict between passing vehicles is reduced. In view of these factors and the strength of feeling which has been expressed by the two objectors, it is proposed to reduce the waiting restrictions at this junction as shown in amended plan No. **PD - 289k**.
- 3.22 The restrictions on the north side of the Ingham Close/Ingham Road junction would be reduced to cover only the apex of the bend and the restrictions on the south side of Ingham Close would be reduced from seven to five metres. The restrictions on the south side of the junction in Ingham Road would be introduced as proposed as it is possible that the new restrictions in Ingham Close could displace vehicles to park in this adjacent area of Ingham Road where there is a vehicular access to the rear of properties, which should not be obstructed.
- 3.23 **Biggin Hill / Arkell Grove, Upper Norwood** – Officers met with residents last year regarding their concerns over parking at the Biggin Hill / Arkell Gove junction and the bend in Biggin Hill. Parking at these locations is causing safety and access concerns and surveys have confirmed this. In order to avoid danger to road users negotiating the junction, it was recommended to introduce seven metre lengths of double yellow line “at any time” waiting restrictions.

- 3.24 A local resident has objected to the proposed restrictions at the junction of Biggin Hill and Arkell Grove on the basis that the restrictions will remove spaces and result in a lack of parking for residents. The objector indicates that residents already experience parking difficulties and these are the source of disagreements between residents.
- 3.25 **Response** - Although the proposed restrictions will remove approximately four parking spaces, (two in Arkell Grove and two in Biggin Hill) these are immediately adjacent to a junction, where the Highway Code states that vehicles should not park. The proposed restrictions are considered to be the minimum necessary to remove obstructive parking from the junction and as the majority of the carriageway would remain unrestricted, residents should still be able to park nearby.
- 3.26 In view of the above factors, it is proposed to proceed with the restrictions as shown in plan no. **PD – 264f**.

#### 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. 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 £62k un-allocated to be utilised in 2016/2017 this is taking into account £13k that was committed in 2015/2106 against the 2016/2107 financial years spend.

##### 4.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

|  | Current<br>Financial<br>Year | M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast |            |            |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|
|  |                              | 2016/17                   | 2017/18    | 2018/19    |
|  | £'000                        | £'000                     | £'000      | £'000      |
| <b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>       |                              |                           |            |            |
| <b>Expenditure</b>                           | 100                          | 100                       | 100        | 100        |
| <b>Income</b>                                | 0                            | 0                         | 0          | 0          |
| <b><u>Effect of Decision from Report</u></b> |                              |                           |            |            |
| Expenditure                                  | 9                            | 0                         | 0          | 0          |
| Income                                       | 0                            | 0                         | 0          | 0          |
| <b>Remaining Budget</b>                      | <u>91</u>                    | <u>100</u>                | <u>100</u> | <u>100</u> |



|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expenditure                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b> |   |   |   |   |
| Expenditure                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <b>Remaining Budget</b>                      | 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 notices for schemes approved at the 16 December 2015 and 9 February 2016 meetings) including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £9,000.

4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2016/17.

## 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 2016/17.

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: Louise Lynch, Business Partner, Place Department.

## 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, Acting Council Solicitor and Acting 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. This can be varied according to the circumstances applying at different locations.

## **10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 The recommendation is to introduce the original proposals in Overbury Crescent and in Purley Vale, Stevens Place, Roke Lodge Road, Sylverdale Road, Ryecroft Road and Biggin Hill. 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. It is proposed to proceed with an amended proposal at the junction of Ingham Close and Ingham Road due to the objections from local residents.

## **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,  
Highway Improvement, 020 8604 7363 (Ext. 47363)

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,  
Highways Improvement, 020 8667 8229

**BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**