

# Croydon Council

For general release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  6 July 2016
<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS</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>Croham, West Thornton and Woodside</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:  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>• Mayfield Road, Croham</li><li>• Namton Drive, West Thornton</li><li>• Albert Road and Belmont Road, Woodside</li></ul>	

- 1.2 Agree the following:
  - Mayfield Road, South Croydon – not to proceed with the original proposal but to monitor parking along this section of the road for future review.
  - Namton Drive, West Thornton – proceed with proposal
  - Albert Road and Belmont Road, Woodside – 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 recommendation 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 Mayfield Road, Croham, Namton Drive, West Thornton and Albert Road and Belmont Road, Woodside.

## 3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

- 3.1 **Mayfield Road near Essenden Road, Croham** – Objections to proposals to introduce restrictions in Mayfield Road were considered by the committee on 16 December 2015 (minute A86/15 refers) who agreed not to proceed with the proposals but report back to committee in 6 months. The original proposal (as shown on **plan No. PD – 276f**) followed a request from a disabled resident for the extension of the existing double yellow lines due to obstruction problems with vehicles parking close to their driveway. Surveys showed that parking in the section of the road close to Essenden Road caused problems for through traffic on the approach to a double bend where Mayfield Road meets Carlton Road.
- 3.2 Following public notice five local residents objected to the proposed extension of the double yellow line in Mayfield Road for a number of reasons including:-
  - Extending the existing double yellow line will not decrease traffic flow or improve safety.
  - On street parking will increase on the east side of the road where parking will cause more issues to traffic flow in Mayfield Road.
  - The issue of obstruction when exiting Essenden Road is more than adequately dealt with by the existing double yellow line.
  - The extension of the double yellow line in Mayfield Road will reduce the number of free parking spaces.
  - The extension of the double yellow line will not help with driveway obstruction issues in Mayfield Road.
  - The existing vehicles being parked at this location slows traffic flow in Mayfield Road improving safety.

- The proposed extension of the double yellow line may exacerbate the speed of the traffic flow.
  - The publication of the proposed amendment has taken place at the peak of the summer months with local residents away on holiday etc.
- 3.3 **Response** – A site meeting took place between officers and local residents on 11 November and during the evening to discuss the parking issues. At the time there was a van parked close to the driveway which would have caused some difficulty in exiting the driveway. Parking by the driveway has been regularly monitored since the meeting of 15 December and only on 2 occasions were vans parking between Nos.119 and 121 Mayfield Road and for the vast majority of visits no vehicles were parking between the driveways. In view of this, the number of objections received and the fact that the parking may simply move further along the road, it is proposed not to extend the restrictions at the current time but to monitor parking along this section of the road for future review.
- 3.4 **Namton Drive, West Thornton** – A resident of Namton Drive contacted the Council concerned that vehicles parking within the turnaround circle towards the end of the road are causing obstruction and forcing vehicles to mount the opposite kerb to get past, damaging the verge on the central island. Surveys have shown that parking in the turning circle causes restrictions for larger vehicles including refuse trucks and consequently it was proposed to extend the existing double yellow line ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions, at either side of the entrance to the turning circle and around the central island, to reduce this problem.
- 3.5 A local resident has objected to the proposed restrictions on the grounds that they have lived in the area for many years and have not seen any evidence of an issue with safety, visibility or congestion. They request that the Council withdraws this proposal as they consider the restrictions unnecessary.
- 3.6 **Response.** Although the objector is unaware of the problem, more than one complaint has been received that large vehicles, and particularly refuse collection vehicles, have had problems negotiating the turning circle in Namton Drive due to parking near the entrance. This has forced them to mount the kerb on the opposite side, causing damage to the verge of the central island. The proposed restrictions are considered to be the minimum required to assist large vehicles to navigate the turning circle without driving across the verge. The restrictions should have a minimal effect on residents based around the central island, all of whom have off-street parking.
- 3.7 As the restrictions are necessary to assist refuse collection vehicles and prevent damage to the grass verge, it is proposed to proceed with them, as shown on plan No. **PD-297j**.
- 3.8 **Albert Road and Belmont Road, outside the Oasis Academy Arena School, Woodside** – The Oasis Academy Arena Secondary School is currently being constructed on the old Ryelands Primary School site in Albert Road by the Croydon Arena and is due to open in September 2016. As part of the development new pedestrian and vehicular entrances to the school are proposed and a new pedestrian

crossing point where there are proposed to be kerb build-outs and a raised carriageway. There have been on-going discussions between Officers and a Ward Councillor to ensure that the traffic and parking arrangements for the development are effective for the safety of pupils, visitors and road users. As a result, it was proposed to alter the existing School Keep Clear Markings and amend and introduce new “at any time” waiting restrictions to ensure that there is an appropriate balance between maintaining parking for local residents and ensuring the safety of pupils and other road users.

3.9 Four local residents have objected to the proposed restrictions in Albert Road for the following reasons:-

- The proposed upgrade of the single yellow line to a double yellow line will prevent a resident from stopping their car there whilst locking their garage, as the double yellow line will be in front of their dropped kerb.
- The proposed restrictions will remove approximately 10 parking spaces at a time when overnight on-street parking in the area is already extremely congested.
- The existing single yellow line restrictions are sufficient to deal with the level of traffic and cover the school arrival and departure times without affecting residents’ ability to park overnight. It is not necessary to change them.
- As Belmont Road will be one-way towards Albert Road, five metre lengths of double yellow lines are sufficient on both sides (there is no need for the lines on the north-west side to be eight metres long).

3.10 **Response** – The restrictions have been proposed to improve safety and preserve sightlines outside the new school.

3.11 It is accepted that the current single yellow line 8 to 9.30am and 2.30 to 4pm, Monday to Friday waiting restrictions opposite the School Keep Clear markings should be sufficient to deter parking during the busy school opening and closing periods and it is proposed to retain these restrictions rather than upgrade to ‘At any time’ as originally proposed.

3.12 In order to minimise the effects in on-street parking for the main school entrance an alternative to double yellow lines would be to include build-outs on both sides of the road to physically prevent parking and provide unhindered sight-lines for pedestrians beyond any parked vehicles.

3.13 One-way working is due to be introduced in Belmont Road so that traffic will travel towards Albert Road. In view of this it is proposed that the returns in Belmont Road can be reduced to 5 metres to reduce the impact in on-street parking for local residents.

3.14 An amended plan showing all the above changes are shown in plan no. **PD – 297k/1**.

#### 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 £51k un-allocated to be utilised in 2016/2017 this is taking into account £13k that was committed in 2015/2016 against the 2016/2017 financial years spend.

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

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000
<b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>				
<b>Expenditure</b>	62	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>53</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

##### 4.2 The effect of the decision

4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at all the sites originally on the public notice, 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 restrictions and the supply and installation of signs and posts where necessary 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: Zulfiqar Darr, Interim Head of Finance, Place & Resources.

## **5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

- 5.1 The Acting 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 (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 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 for and on behalf of 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 not to extend the double yellow lines in Mayfield Road following a 6 month monitoring of parking along this section of the road, to introduce the original proposals in Namton Drive due to continued damage to the central green and amended proposals for Albert Road and Belmont Road by the new Arena School to minimise the effects on restrictions for local residents whilst ensuring safety for pupils and other visitors to the School.

## **11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 11.1 Continuing with the original proposals for Mayfield Road and Albert Road is likely to have a negative effect for local residents whereas continued parking in Namton Drive is likely to result in further damage to the central green.

---

**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**