For General Release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 October 2015
AGENDA ITEM:	9
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING BAYS
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Chief Executive and Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Coulsdon West, Fairfield and Selhurst

C This report is in accordance with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in:

- Croydon Local Plan Nov 2015
- Local Implementation Plan 2; 2.8 Transport Objectives
- Croydon's Community Strategy 2013-18; Priority Areas 1, 2 & 3
- Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 18
- www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/

FINANCIAL IMPACT

These proposals can be contained within available budget.

FORWARD PLAN 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 that they:

- 1.1 Consider the objections received in response to the public notice detailing the Council's proposal to introduce additional space for up to seven cars in the free parking bays in Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon, five new shared-use Permit / Pay & Display bays in Chatsworth Road, Croydon, three new bays in Edridge Road, Croydon and six new shared use parking bays in Gloucester Road, Croydon. See plans PD 301a, b, c, d & e, 301 j,k & I.
- 1.2 Proceed to introduce the above proposals with the exception of 2 bays in Chipstead Valley Road and one bay in Edridge Road and Chatsworth Road as detailed in section 3 of this report
- 1.3 Delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Highways, the authority to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).
- 1.4 Inform the objectors of the above decision.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider objections from the public following the formal consultation process on proposals to introduce space for up to seven cars in the free parking bays in Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon, five new shared-use bays in Chatsworth Road, Croydon, three new bays in Edridge Road, Croydon and six new shared use parking bays in Gloucester Road, Croydon.
- 2.2 The Executive Director is of the view that it is appropriate that the objections to the introduction of shared use parking is considered by TMAC because the original proposal was approved through this committee and objectors have been informed that the decision on whether to proceed with these proposal will be taken by the committee.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

3.1 Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon West

- 3.2 A request was received from a local resident for additional parking bays to be provided at Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon. The giving of public notice for approximately 7 additional free bays was approved by the Traffic Management Advisory Committee in April 2016.
- 3.3 Three people have objected to the proposed bays.
 - The first objector feels that the proposed bay at no. 183/185 will make it difficult to turn left out of Woodcote Lodge.
 - The second objector feels that the bay at 183/185 will cause a physical obstruction for drivers turning left out of Woodcote Lodge, and block the view of oncoming traffic for those turning right and that a similar problem will be caused by the bays at 189/191 for the traffic leaving the petrol station. They are also concerned that traffic turning right out of Vincent Road will have reduced visibility of traffic coming from the east. They highlight the current problems with queuing traffic obstructed by parked cars and that this section of road is particularly busy due to the presence of several local businesses.
 - The third objector is objecting to the proposal on the grounds that it would obstruct moving traffic on Chipstead Valley Road and cause a visual obstruction to drivers exiting Woodcote Lodge. They believe that there is no parking problem in the area.
- 3.4 **Response** Parking is very limited along this stretch of Chipstead Valley Road and officers recognise that residents may struggle to park here. In light of the objections received to the two bays at 183/185 and 189/191 and considering that Chipstead Valley Road is a 'B' road and a bus route it is recommended that these do not proceed. It is likely that encouraging parking at these locations may cause significant obstruction to site lines of manoeuvring vehicles as well as physically obstructing the road.

3.7 It is proposed not to proceed with the bays at 185/185 and 189/191 Chipstead Valley Road, illustrated on drawing no. **PD 301a.**

3.8 Chatsworth Road, Fairfield

- 3.9 A request was received from a resident of Chatsworth Road for additional parking bays to be implemented. This street is within the Croydon (Central Permit Area) CPZ. Many of the houses have been subdivided into flats resulting in a high demand for parking spaces. Officers identified potential locations for 5 new shared-use bays and this was agreed by this committee at the meeting of 26 April 2016 (minute A32/16 refers).
- 3.10 An objection was received to the proposed additional bay at 70/72. There is one existing bay at this location and the proposal would move the bay south by approximately 1.5m and introduce an additional bay adjacent to it.
- 3.11 The objection has been raised on the grounds that a new parking bay will obstruct the view from their front room and obstruct the view of their garden from the street. They believe that the bay will cast a shadow on the pavement at night. The objectors are concerned that the new parking bay will contribute to the obstruction of traffic in Chatsworth Road and that it will cause a hazard to cars leaving their drive.
- 3.12 Response Officers have revisited the site and acknowledge that it would be difficult for drivers to manoeuvre left out of the driveway around vehicles parked in the bays, if the additional bay went ahead at this location, particularly as there are bays on both sides of the road. Obstructing a view from a front room and garden and casting a shadow across the pavement are not considered relevant objections.
- 3.13 Due to the manoeuvring issues it is proposed not to proceed with the additional bay at 70/72 Chatsworth Road, illustrated on drawing no. **PD 301p**.

3.14 Edridge Road, Fairfield

- 3.15 A resident of Edridge Road requested that additional shared-use Permit / Pay & Display parking bays be provided on the road where residents frequently struggle to find space to park. Edridge Road is narrow with many dropped kerbs. As a result there are not many places where additional bays can be placed. Only three new bays were agreed by this committee at the meeting of 26 April 2016 (minute A32/16 refers).
- 3.16 An objection was received to the proposed parking bay at no. 75 Edridge Road. The objection was raised on the grounds that the bay would be placed across a dropped kerb, blocking access to a driveway.
- 3.17 **Response** The council never intended to put a bay at this location. An error was made when producing the electronic drawing. This bay should not proceed and the resident who objected has been notified of this outcome.
- 3.18 It is recommended to proceed with the additional bays outside no.77 & 113/115 Edridge Road but not to proceed with the additional bay at 75 Edridge Road,

3.19 Gloucester Road, Selhurst

- 3.20 A local resident requested that the council provide additional parking bays in the vicinity of Gloucester Road where, due to new and proposed housing developments, residents struggle to find available parking spaces. As a result officers proposed to introduce six additional shared use parking bays at various locations on Gloucester Road between St. James' Road and Swan Close agreed by this committee at the meeting of 26 April 2016 (minute A32/16 refers).
- 3.21 Three objections were received to these bays. Two of the objections related to the additional bay at 30-34 Gloucester Road and one related to the additional bay at 68/70 Gloucester Road.
 - The first objection was to the additional bay at 30-34, on the grounds that it is already difficult to manoeuver on and off the objectors driveway and that the situation will worsen if the proposed bay layout were to proceed. The objector is concerned that due to the high volume of traffic along Gloucester Road, the proposed parking configuration would limit places where vehicles could safely pass each other. He also highlights the new Milton House development which will have an entrance onto Gloucester Road, directly across from this bank of parking bays, and expresses concern for road safety at this point once the development is complete.
 - The second objection also relates to the additional bay at 30-34. The
 objector feels that the proposed change in the parking bays will reduce
 passing places and hence be detrimental to road safety, and that these
 issues will be exacerbated by the Milton House development. They are
 concerned about residents with dropped kerbs having less space to
 manoeuver on and off their driveways.
 - The third objection is to the proposed bays at 68/70 Gloucester Road.
 The objector has highlighted the problem of articulated lorries servicing the
 businesses near this location. The proposed bays will make it extremely
 difficult to manoeuver into the premises, as well as causing an obstruction
 for large vehicles which turn into Gloucester Road from Gladstone Road.
- 3.22 **Response** Officers have looked at the planning documents for the Milton House development and confirmed that the entrance across from the bays at 30-34 Gloucester Road will be used by vehicles visiting the development, including the refuse collection lorries, who's turning radius will require this bank of bays to remain as it is. It is proposed not to proceed with the additional bay at 30-34 Gloucester Road.
- 3.23 The proposed bays at 68/70 are likely to cause an obstruction to large vehicles at the Gladstone Road junction and accessing the local industrial premises. This was an oversight and it is recommended that these 2 bays not proceed.
- 3.24 It is proposed not to proceed with the additional bays at 30-34 and 68/70 Gloucester Road, illustrated on drawing no's **PD301j** and **PD 301k**.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections from the public following the formal consultation process on proposals to reduce the amount of free parking spaces in Fernwood, adjacent to the junction with Friars Wood and to introduce five additional shared use bays in Station Approach Road, Coulsdon. Once the notices were 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 placed in the London Gazette and a local newspaper (Croydon Guardian). Although it is not a legal requirement, this Council also fixes notices on lampposts and signposts in the vicinity of the proposed scheme 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, The Owner Drivers' Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport 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.

5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 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.

5.2 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S	- 3 year Forecast	
	2016/17	2017/18	20018/19	2019/20
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Revenue Budget available	400	400	400	400
Expenditure	100	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
Effect of Decision from Report				
Expenditure	2	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	98	100	100	100
Capital Budget available				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Effect of Decision from report				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

5.3 The effect of the decision

- 5.3.1 The cost of the above proposals including the legal process is estimated at £2,400.
- 5.3.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budget for 2016/17.

5.4 **Risks**

5.4.1 Whilst there is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate, this work is allowed for in the current budget for 2016/17.

5.5 **Options**

5.5.1 The alternative option is not to introduce the parking bays as set out in the report which would not benefit residents, customers (including disabled) and businesses.

5.6 Savings/future efficiencies

- 5.6.1 The current method of introducing/removing or amending parking bays is very efficient with the design and legal work being carried out within the department. The marking of the bays is carried out using maintenance rates through the new Highways contract and these are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.
- 5.6.2 Any signs that are required are sourced from the new Highways contractor where rates are competitive.
- 5.6.3 Although unquantifiable at this stage there may be additional income that arises from these changes, although any additional income will be of a small value.
- 5.6.4 Approved by: Zulf Darr, Interim Head of Finance, Place and Resources

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 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 such matters as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.
- 6.2 The Council has complied 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 by the members before a final decision is made.
- 6.3 Approved for and on behalf of Jacqueline Harris-Baker, 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 CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 A Full Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is appended to this report.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

9.1 There are no such impacts arising from this report.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

10.1 There are no such impacts arising from this report.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The recommendations are for additional bays to improve access for residents and customers to local businesses;

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 There are no other viable options to help, residents, businesses, disabled blue badge holders and visitors at these locations.

REPORT AUTHOR: Teresa O'Regan – Traffic Engineer

Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8762

6000 (Ext. 88260)

CONTACT OFFICER: David Wakeling, Traffic Design Manager

Infrastructure, Traffic Design, 020 8726 6000

(Ext. 88229)

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None.

APPENDICES: Appendix 1 – Chatsworth Road map

Appendix 2 – Chipstead Valley Road map

Appendix 3 – Edridge Road map

Appendix 4 – 108 to 110 Gloucester Road

map

Appendix 5 – Palmerston Road map

Appendix 6 – 68 to 80 Gloucester Road map