

# Croydon Council

For general release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  6 July 2016
<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>SOUTHWOOD AVENUE – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE COULSDON CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE, FREE AREA</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Jo Negrini, Acting Chief Executive and Executive Director of Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Coulsdon West</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b>  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>• Croydon Local Plan – Nov 2015</li><li>• Local Implementation Plan 2; 2.8 Transport Objectives</li><li>• Croydon's Community Strategy 2013-18; Priority Areas 1, 2 &amp; 3</li><li>• Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 – 18</li><li>• <a href="http://www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/">www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/</a></li></ul>	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPACT:</b>  These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
<b>FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:</b> n/a	
<b>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed extension of the Coulsdon free Controlled Parking Zone into Southwood Avenue.</li><li>1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to proceed with the original proposals.</li><li>1.3 Instruct that officers inform the objectors of the above decision.</li></ol>	

## 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 extend the Coulsdon free Controlled Parking Zone into Southwood Avenue, with a combination of free parking bays and single yellow lines operating 11am to 12 noon, Monday to Friday.

## 3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

### Objection 1

- 3.1 A local resident has objected to the scheme on the basis of the position of two of the proposed parking bays. The resident objects to the bay proposed outside No. 1 Southwood Avenue as the resident says that it is within 10 metres of the junction with Woodmansterne Road and this is not in accordance with rule 243 of the Highway Code. The resident also objects to the proposed bay outside No. 21 Southwood Avenue, which they suggest would interfere with the accessibility of the driveways of surrounding properties.

**Response** – The proposed bay outside No.1 Southwood Avenue is not within 10 metres of the junction with Woodmansterne Road, it is 10 metres from the junction with Woodmansterne Road. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states that drivers should not park within 10 metres of a junction “*except in an authorised parking space*”. Accordingly, it is possible for the Council to site parking bays within 10 metres of a junction, but we have not done so in this instance.

The layout of parking bays in Southwood Avenue generally replicates the existing pattern of parking in the road. The bay outside No. 21 is a single car space 5 metre length bay, which has more than adequate space to allow vehicles to manoeuvre in or out of the driveways either side and opposite.

### Objection 2

- 3.2 A resident has objected to the scheme on the following grounds.
- It will not resolve the main parking problem which is inconsiderate parking (vehicles parking directly opposite one another) which means that large vehicles are unable to pass. The only time access would be guaranteed would be between 11am and 12noon.
  - It will not prevent parking at the junctions with Woodmansterne Road and Bramley Avenue, where visibility is often restricted (not just between 11am and 12noon).
  - It will be awkward for elderly visitors who will need to move their cars elsewhere between 11 am and 12noon (the bays will be taken all day by commuters).
  - The road is too narrow to allow vehicles to park opposite each other at all times (not just 11am to 12 noon).

**Response** – This scheme was designed in response to a petition from residents (Minute A63/15 refers) which specifically requested a combination of parking controls and free parking bays. The same parking arrangements are already in operation in Woodmansterne Road, where similar problems (increased parking by commuters and driveway obstruction) were cited prior to the scheme’s introduction. The combination of free bays and waiting restrictions has been successful in dealing with the problems in Woodmansterne Road and there is no reason to think it would not be equally successful in Southwood Avenue.

Whilst the proposed waiting restrictions would not be in operation all day, they are designed to ensure that commuters, the main source of the original problem, are forced to park only in the free bays provided. These bays are staggered to ensure access for large vehicles and sited at a safe distance from junctions, to prevent obstruction to sight lines.

Although the waiting restrictions would require visitors to move their vehicles from the yellow lines during the hour when they apply, the majority of respondents (84%) were in favour when residents were consulted about the proposed scheme, which indicates that most residents do not think that their visitors would find this too inconvenient.

### **Objection 3**

- 3.3 A resident has objected to the scheme on the basis of the proposed position of two parking bays either side of their driveway. The resident states that if they reverse out of their drive and cars are parked in these bays, they can’t progress forward in either direction to turn. The resident requests that the Council considers moving one of the bays across or further up the road.

**Response** – It is Council policy to allow a minimum of 0.5 metres between bays and driveway entrances. In this case, the gaps between the proposed bays and the resident’s driveway would be in accordance with this, with a metre gap on one side and two metres on the other. The bays are single space 5 metre bays and should offer protection to a vehicle edging out of a driveway. A single yellow line on the opposite side of the road should keep it clear and ensure that the emerging vehicle can turn. Drivers should ideally reverse in and drive out of their driveways in accordance with Rule 201 of the Highway Code.

## **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 notice was 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 Police, 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. The police had no objections to the proposals. No comments were received from any of the other organisations.

## 5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £30,000 for the current financial year. 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 is £6k remaining for future spend.

### 1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2016/17 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000
<b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	100	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from Report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	30	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	3	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

### 2 The effect of the decision

2.1 The cost of extending the existing Coulsdon CPZ to include Southwood Avenue has been estimated at £3,100. This includes the re-location of the existing zone (Entry/Exit) signs, lining work and a contribution towards the legal costs.

- 2.2 This cost can be contained within the available capital budget for Controlled Parking Schemes under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2016/17.
- 2.3 The schemes costs were included in April's TMAC reports and so the above spend has already been accounted for.

### **3 Risks**

- 3.1 There is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate. However, this work is allowed for in the current budget.

### **4 Options**

- 4.1 The alternative option is not to introduce the free parking controls. This could have a detrimental effect on residents in that they would continue to suffer with parking issues in relation to obstruction, road safety and traffic flow problems.

### **5 Savings/ future efficiencies**

- 5.1 The current method of introducing parking controls is very efficient with the design and legal work being carried out within the department. The marking of the bays is carried out using the new Highways Contract and the rates are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.
- 5.2 Approved by: Zulfiqar Darr, Interim Head of Finance, Place & Resources.

## **6 COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

- 6.1 The Acting 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, implement and revoke Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council (so far as is 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 for and on behalf of Gabriel Macgregor, Acting Council Solicitor and Acting Monitoring Officer.

## **7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 7.1 There are no human resource 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. CUSTOMER IMPACT**

- 8.1 The proposed extension of the Coulsdon CPZ into Southwood Avenue is in response to a petition and known parking problems. Occupiers of all residential properties in the area were consulted to ensure that all those potentially affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views. Parking controls are only introduced in the area where the majority of residents are in favour of a scheme. The proposals are therefore likely to be seen as a positive move by the Council and should improve residents' views of the work carried out by the Borough.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

- 9.1 An initial Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and it is considered that a Full EqIA is not required.

## **10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 10.1 Parking schemes are designed so that the signing is kept to a minimum to reduce the environmental impact. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

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

- 11.1 There are no such considerations arising from this report.

## **12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Coulsdon CPZ (outer zone) to include Southwood Avenue following increasing concerns over the effects of commuter parking creating access issues and safety concerns.

## **13. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 13.1 The alternative would be not to introduce a parking scheme for these roads but this would not resolve the parking issues experienced by residents and road users.

---

### **REPORT AUTHOR:**

Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Orders Engineer  
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8762 6000  
(Ext. 47363)

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,  
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8726 6000  
(Ext. 88229)

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**