

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 12 July 2018
SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS
LEAD OFFICER:	Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (Job Share)
WARDS:	Addiscombe West, Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood, Fairfield, Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown, Shirley South, Waddon and Woodside
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: 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">• Croydon Local Plan – Feb 2018• 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.: n/a	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that the Acting Cabinet Member: 1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions and the officer's recommendations in response to these in: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Cross Road, Addiscombe West2. Stambourne Way, Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood3. Wellesley Road, Fairfield4. Southbridge Road, Fairfield/Waddon5. Lower Barn Road, Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	

6. Upper Shirley Road, Shirley South
7. Bevan Court/Fleming Court and Stapleton Gardens, Waddon
8. Davidson Road, Woodside

1.2 Agree the following, for the reasons set out in this report:

1. Cross Road, Addiscombe West - proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing no. PD 353a.
2. Stambourne Way, Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood – proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing no. PD 365g.
3. Wellesley Road, Fairfield - proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing no. PD 353f.
4. Southbridge Road/Tanfield Road/Brafferton Road/St. Andrew's Road/Keen's Road/Bramley Hill/Dering Road/, Fairfield/Waddon – proceed with the proposal but only to the northern junction with Dering road as shown in drawing no. PD 359d
5. Lower Barn Road, Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown – not to proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing no. PD 353l at the current time but monitor parking and damage to the verge for future review.
6. Upper Shirley Road, Shirley South – proceed with the proposal as shown in drawing no. PD 353g.
7. Bevan Court/Fleming Court/Coldharbour Road and Stapleton Gardens, Waddon – proceed with the proposals as shown in drawing no. PD 359k and PD 353n.
8. Davidson Road, Woodside – extend the proposed restrictions as shown in amended drawing no. PD 353q.

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 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Cross Road, Addiscombe West, Stambourne Way/Shelford Rise, Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood; Southbridge Road/Tanfield Road/Brafferton Road/St. Andrew's Road/Keen's Road/Bramley Hill/Dering Road and Wellesley Road, Fairfield; Lower Barn Road, Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown, Upper Shirley Road, Shirley South, Bevan Court/Fleming Court/Coldharbour Road and Stapleton Gardens, Waddon and Davidson Road, Woodside.

- 2.2 The outcome of the formal consultation was reported to the Executive Director of Place as required by the delegation from the Leader dated 6 June 2016 in relation to Traffic Management Orders. On xxx July 2018 the Executive Director of Place referred the matter to this committee on the basis that she considered it appropriate to do so.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

Cross Road, Addiscombe West

- 3.1 Concerns were raised that local residents parking their vehicles opposite the contra flow cycle lane in the one-way section of Cross Road were causing vehicles to drive into the cycle lane to pass. As the existing waiting restrictions operate from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday, in this part of the road, it was proposed to upgrade these restrictions to operate “at any time” to prevent vehicles parking in or opposite to the cycle lane.
- 3.2 Three residents have objected to the proposed upgrade of the existing restrictions on the following grounds:
- Old and disabled people will have difficulty being dropped off or picked up by car because of these restrictions, which will force them to walk further. They may not know of the restrictions as residents were not notified and the only notification was via street notices on lamp posts.
 - The cycle lane is inappropriate and rarely used by cyclists.
 - Problems are caused by the Orca cycle lane separators, as drivers are concerned about going around these. The objector states that they have been incorrectly placed and should be within and not at the boundary of the cycle lane.
 - The broken white line demarcating the cycle lane shows that it is advisory, and therefore vehicles can enter it if it's unavoidable. So the reasoning behind the proposed restrictions – to prevent vehicles entering the cycle lane - is flawed.
 - The proposed restrictions will make overnight parking more difficult for residents with parking permits, who are already encountering problems due to additional parking resulting from new developments in the area. If the proposed restrictions go ahead the CPZ should be extended so that parking bays are in force 24 hours a day.

3.3 Response

- Drivers are permitted to stop on double yellow line restrictions to drop off or pick up a passenger or to load and unload goods, so the proposed restrictions will not prevent this. All affected frontages in the relevant section of Cross Road were notified of this proposal in writing, in addition to the public notices displayed.
- In 2010 Croydon Council became a “Biking Borough”. This is an initiative by the Mayor of London that aims to ensure that cycling is recognised as a major transport mode across the capital, from central London to the outer boroughs.

The Council seeks to provide safe, convenient and clearly identified cycle facilities to make cycling easier and to encourage more people to this efficient, quiet, healthy and non-polluting sustainable form of transport. Cross Road contraflow scheme was implemented as part of this initiative, to increase the number of trips made by bicycle and provide a relatively quiet and safe route with practical destinations for the less confident cyclist. This contra-flow cycle lane allows cyclists to travel against the flow of the one-way street and the Orca separator units and bollards provide light segregation and delineate the contraflow cycle lane and enable cyclists to navigate safely. Whilst the Orcas are not intended to be driven over, doing so should not cause any issues.

- As the objector has highlighted, some of the Orcas may not have been sited correctly. This has been passed on to the Highway Improvements Team, who will discuss this matter with the Orca product supplier who installed this product in Cross Road and ensure any necessary adjustments are made to comply with the TSRGD guidelines. The team wish thank the resident for bringing this matter to their attention.
- Whilst the regulations allow drivers to enter an advisory cycle lane if it's unavoidable, this is not a safe or desirable situation for cyclists using the lane. The introduction of the proposed restrictions should remove the obstruction that causes vehicles to enter the cycle lane and also prevent vehicles parking within the cycle lane after 5pm, thereby improving road safety for both motorists and cyclists.
- The proposed upgrade to the waiting restrictions will only apply in the one-way section of Cross Road (between Leslie Grove and Lower Addiscombe Road). The waiting restrictions in the remainder of the road and in the side roads will continue to operate up to 5pm, Monday to Saturday, allowing overnight and Sunday parking where necessary.
- Residents of the new development at the junction of Cross Road and Cherry Orchard Road are excluded from the CPZ and unable to purchase permits to park within the zone during its operational hours. Outside of the CPZ hours, when restrictions are not in operation, non-permit holders may park. However, it is not possible to impose a 24-hour controlled parking scheme on an area without carrying out a consultation that shows there is majority support for such a change. In order to consider consulting residents, the council would require an indication that there was support for change in the form of a petition signed by at least 50% of households in Cross Road. It is not possible to carry out such a consultation on the basis of an individual request.

3.4 In view of the above it is proposed to proceed with the proposals as shown in drawing No. PD 353a.

Stambourne Way/Shelford Rise, Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood

3.5 A request was received from a local resident for parking restrictions to be introduced at the junction of Shelford Rise and Stambourne Way. Cars frequently park close to the junction which is on a bend, making it difficult to observe approaching traffic.

3.6 One objection, from a resident further along Stambourne Way, has been received. The objection has been raised on the grounds that:

- The restrictions, if introduced would push parking further down the hill, increasing the likelihood of an accident.
- He wants traffic calming measures on Stambourne Way
- He has not seen any evidence of accidents at the location where lines are proposed.

3.7 **Response** – There is always the potential to displace parked cars to another location with the introduction of restrictions. The proposed restrictions are only at the junction with Shelford Rise, therefore displacement of vehicles should be kept to a minimum. A 20 mph speed limit was recently introduced into Stambourne Way (and Shelford Rise), which should have the effect of reducing traffic speeds. A lack of accidents at this location is not considered relevant – the resident who originally requested the restrictions has had several near misses at this junction.

3.8 It is proposed to proceed with the original proposal as illustrated on drawing number PD 359g.

Wellesley Road (between Station Road and Newgate), Fairfield

3.9 Complaints were received that parked vehicles in this section of Wellesley Road were causing an obstruction to traffic flows in the evenings and on Sundays, which was impacting on bus services and the emergency services. As waiting restrictions in this section of the road currently operate from 7am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday, it was recommended to upgrade these restrictions to operate “at any time”.

3.10 A resident has objected to the proposed upgrade of these restrictions on the following grounds:

- It would make it difficult for residents to offload groceries or receive deliveries.
- It would be impossible to park in the evenings, especially for disabled people.
- It would cause a problem for young kids and babies in prams that need offloading.

3.11 **Response**

- Drivers are permitted to stop on double yellow line restrictions to drop off or pick up a passenger or to load and unload goods, so the proposed restrictions will not affect these activities.
- Whilst the Council acknowledges the possible inconvenience which these restrictions would cause residents, it is not possible to ignore obstructions to traffic flow on a busy through-route, particularly when buses and emergency services are affected.
- A disabled resident can park for up to three hours on double yellow lines providing their Blue Badge and clock are displayed and the clock set to their arrival time. Those disabled residents with real difficulties can apply for a disabled bay, which the Council would attempt to provide as near as possible to their property.

3.12 Due to the above factors, it is proposed to proceed with the proposals as shown in drawing No. PD 353f.

Southbridge Road/Tanfield Road/Brafferton Road/St. Andrew's Road/Bramley Hill/Keen's Road/ Dering Road, Fairfield/Waddon

3.13 Officers have noticed that vehicles regularly park on Southbridge Road outside of the current operational hours of the single yellow line. Southbridge Road is part of the A236, is narrow, and an inappropriate place to park. It was proposed to change the 7am -7pm Monday – Saturday restrictions to “at any time” waiting restrictions on Southbridge Road, and on Tanfield Road, Brafferton Road, St. Andrew's Road, Keen's Road, Bramley Hill, and Dering Road at the junctions adjacent to Southbridge Road.

3.14 Thirteen objections have been received to this proposal. A petition has also been submitted against the proposal.

3.15 The first objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) was raised on the grounds that:

- They would no longer be able to load/unload with the proposed changes
- Visitors in evenings and weekends will no longer be able to park for free on the side roads which have been included as part of the scheme.

3.16 The second objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) was raised on the grounds that:

- Since moving to the area almost 10 years ago there has been a steady squeeze on parking spaces from dropped kerbs, disabled bays, a new school, and new residential developments.
- They like to load/unload shopping and children outside their house.
- Their father-in –law regularly visits and needs to park close to their house.
- It is often difficult to find a parking space – they sometimes have to drive for up to 40 minutes to find an available space.
- They are concerned that the proposals will have a negative impact on the shops in Southbridge Road.
- The proposed restrictions represent a lack of regard for those who pay a lot of money to park in the area.

3.17 The third objection was raised on the grounds that:

- It is already difficult to park near their house.
- The proposed restrictions will make parking during weekends and evenings especially difficult.

3.18 The fourth objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) has been raised on the grounds that they have a lot of heavy equipment related to their business which

needs to be loaded/unloaded. The proposed changes would mean having to carry the equipment further to their car.

3.19 The fifth objection (from a resident of St. Andrew's Road) was raised on the grounds that:

- The proposed changes would affect visitors to their flat as they don't have a private parking area.
- They will no longer be able to receive deliveries or have maintenance done to their property.

3.20 The sixth objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) has been raised on the grounds that:

- Parking is already difficult in the area
- They already park on yellow lines during evenings and weekends as there are no parking bays available.
- Construction of the new school on Southbridge Place is already contributing to a squeeze on the number of parking spaces available.

3.21 The seventh objection was raised on the grounds that:

- This is a residential area.
- Local people want to keep the single yellow line.
- Double yellow lines would have a negative impact on the community and local businesses.

3.22 The eighth objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) was raised on the grounds that residents will no longer be able to load and unload outside their homes.

3.23 The ninth objection was raised on the grounds that:

- It will result in the loss of four parking bays on Keen's Road.
- The proposal will not make the street any safer

3.24 The tenth objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) was raised on the grounds that:

- Restrictions are unnecessary as traffic flows freely at the moment and there have been no incidents to substantiate the changes.
- Residents need to be able to unload, drop off, and pick up.
- Residents pay council tax and for residents and visitors parking permits.

3.25 The eleventh objection (from a resident of Southbridge Road) has been raised on the grounds that the problems suffered by residents are not caused by residents stopping on the road to unload their cars, but by the number of HGVs using the road. HGVs should be prevented from using the road.

- 3.26 The twelfth objection (from residents of Brafferton Road) has been raised on the grounds that:
- Despite paying for residents' permits, they regularly have problems parking in Brafferton Road.
 - They often have to park on the single yellow line at night and have received PCNs in the morning when there is no available bay to move to.
 - They cannot see any benefit which justifies the proposed double yellow lines.
- 3.27 The thirteenth objection has been raised on the grounds that:
- They regularly have to park on single yellow lines when no space is available in the evening.
 - It is unacceptable not to notify residents of proposals.
 - Double yellow lines will cause chaos and stress for residents.
- 3.28 A petition was received against the proposed scheme, including 142 names, many from the streets directly affected by this proposal, some from the same addresses. There were also signatories from other parts of Croydon, and from other London boroughs.

The cover sheet of the petition contained the following text:

"We the residents, object to the amending of single yellow line restrictions between the junction with Lower Coombe Street and the junction with South End and surrounding areas, to "at any time" double yellow line restrictions on both sides.

RE: THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES' TRAFFIC ORDERS (PROCEDURE) REGULATIONS 1996

- 1) There has not been a consultation with the residents
- 2) No letters have been sent to the residents to inform them of the order
- 3) This will dramatically impact on family life
- 4) We need to be able to unload shopping especially with children in the car
- 5) We need Supermarket Deliveries and Parcels
- 6) We need family and friends to visit with free parking at weekends and evenings
- 7) Services will be unable to deliver to properties
- 8) There is not enough parking for residents already
- 9) We pay Road Tax and Parking Permits, yet we cannot park near our homes
- 10) We need to be able to drop off Children, ill or Disabled people
- 11) It will affect local businesses

- 12) To sum up, you will be depriving residents of basic needs and access to every day services therefore isolating them.
- 3.29 As for Paragraph 6 of the order, there is no foundation that there is a problem now so therefore there is no need to change the single yellow lines already in situ. Southbridge Rd was not built for heavy traffic so why is the council allowing lorries, buses and transporters to use the road when they should use the main road. This is a residential area with families who need everyday access to their houses for unloading and deliveries therefore your priority should be the residents as they are the ones paying council tax, parking and visitors passes, may I suggest that you re-route the heavy vehicles to the main road and leave Southbridge Rd and surrounding areas as they are.”
- 3.30 **Response** – When carrying out a formal consultation, the Council are legally obliged to advertise their schemes in the local paper. They are also advertised on the Council’s website. Public notices were also placed on street to inform residents about the scheme. There is no obligation to write to individual residents.
- 3.31 Many of the objections contained comments relating to residents loading/unloading, picking up or setting down, and receiving deliveries. It appears that there is some confusion about the proposed restrictions. There are no plans to alter the current loading arrangements, they will remain as 7am-10am & 4pm-7pm Mon-Fri and residents can continue to load/unload etc. as usual. Tradespeople calling to residents’ homes have the option of applying for a parking dispensation if appropriate. Visitors/residents will still be able to park for free in shared use bays during the evenings and on Sundays, the parking charges structures are not being changed.
- 3.32 This area, while it is not in the Central Permit Zone, is effectively in the town centre with the associated demands on parking, such as an increasing number of residential developments and extra schools. Residents or visitors who cannot park on the streets in the immediate area have the option of parking further away if they wish. This area is well serviced by public transport, with numerous bus routes running along South End, right by Southbridge Road. There are four national rail stations within walking distance, as is the tram line through central Croydon.
- 3.33 Southbridge Road is a busy ‘A’ road (part of the A236) and part of a vital link between the southern part of the town centre and Purley Way/Mitcham/West London. There are currently no plans to change the classification of the road and/or restrict the access of heavy vehicles.
- 3.34 No parking bays are being removed Keen’s Road (nor any other roads). The highway code already prohibits parking within 10m of a junction, the conversion of the single yellow lines at the junction of Keen’s Road and Southbridge Road will allow a little more room to manoeuvre for vehicles exiting the one-way-street.
- 3.35 However, due to the level of objections that have been received and the fact that currently the main evening / Sunday parking problem is at the southern end of

the road approaching the junction with South End it is recommended to introduce double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions only to the second (northernmost) junction with Dering Road as illustrated on drawing number PD - 359d and to monitor parking for future review.

Lower Barn Road, Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown

- 3.36 Complaints were received that vehicles parking on Lower Barn Road, opposite the junction of Barn Crescent, were forcing large vehicles to mount the kerb and damage the grass verge when entering Barn Crescent, in order to make the corner. Consequently, it was proposed to place a 26 metre length of double yellow line opposite the junction, in order to reduce damage to the verge.
- 3.37 Three objections have been received to the proposed restrictions, two from individual residents and one in the form of a petition signed by 72 residents, citing various objections to the proposal. A Ward Councillor has also written in support of the objectors, pointing out that there is no evidence that the double yellow lines will prevent large vehicles mounting the kerb and damaging the grass verges.
- 3.38 **Response** – In view of the strength and number of objections to this proposal it is not proposed to progress it at this time. The issue will be monitored for future review and other solutions considered as appropriate.

Upper Shirley Road, Shirley South

- 3.39 Local residents were concerned that parking in their road caused traffic congestion during busy periods. Surveys showed that parking on the east side of the road was particularly disruptive to the traffic flow and a potential cause of delays to bus services. In order to remove the obstructive parking it was proposed to introduce a combination of 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday restrictions on both sides of the road north of the junction with Oaks Road, and "at any time" restrictions on the east side of the road adjacent to Sandpits Road.
- 3.40 Three residents of Upper Shirley Road have praised the scheme but objected to the proposed removal of the parking space outside the shop at No. 144 Upper Shirley Road and its replacement with double yellow lines.
- 3.41 **Response** – There are currently three free and unrestricted parking bays marked in Upper Shirley Road slip road outside Nos. 144 to 148 Upper Shirley Road. It is not proposed to remove any of these parking spaces and the proposed double yellow lines will only extend up to the bay markings.
- 3.42 Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the restrictions as shown in drawing No. PD 353g.

Bevan Court/Fleming Court/Coldharbour Road – Waddon

- 3.43 The Council's waste management section drew attention to the problem of access to Fleming Court and Bevan Court. These two culs-de-sac are too narrow to accommodate both parked vehicles and the refuse lorry. There are concerns that in an emergency a fire-engine or an ambulance would also struggle to access these streets.

- 3.44 Nine objections have been received, one to the proposed restrictions in Fleming Court and eight to the proposed restrictions in Bevan Court.
- 3.45 The objections to the proposed restrictions in Fleming Court was raised on the grounds that:
- He would have to park his vehicle further away, raising questions about its security.
 - If the restrictions go ahead there will only be space for four cars in the cul-de-sac.
- 3.46 The first objection to the proposed restrictions in Bevan Court was raised on the grounds that:
- The restrictions go too far – they should only be introduced along the half of Bevan Court closest to Coldharbour Road.
 - Introducing the restrictions would leave visitors with nowhere to park.
- 3.47 The second objection to the proposed restrictions in Bevan Court was raised on the grounds that
- The proposals would make it impossible to park outside or close to his home.
 - It would make it extremely difficult to go about his daily business.
 - Most residents are disabled and removing parking spaces would be detrimental to their little community.
- 3.48 The third objection was raised on the grounds that:
- The vehicles displaced by the restrictions will cause congestion on other roads.
 - They believe that the restrictions should only be places in the first half of Bevan Court.
- 3.49 The fourth objection was raised on the grounds that:
- The proposal will cause great inconvenience to residents, especially those that area disabled.
 - A lot of Bevan Court residents have cars.
 - The restrictions should only be implemented along the section of the cul-de-sac closest to Coldharbour Road.
 - Cars will be displaced onto other roads.
- 3.50 The fifth objection was raised on the grounds that:
- The restrictions should only be introduced in the half of Bevan Court closest to Coldharbour Road.
 - Implementing the parking restrictions would cause congestion on

neighbouring roads due to vehicles being displaced from Bevan Court.

3.51 The sixth objection was raised on the grounds that:

- The objector is disabled and the medical professionals who visit on a regular basis will have nowhere to park.
- The restrictions should only be implemented in the first half of Bevan Court.

3.52 The seventh objection was raised on the grounds that:

- Many residents will have nowhere to park.
- Restrictions should only be introduced in the section of Bevan Court closest to Coldharbour Road.
- Some disabled residents would be adversely affected as health care providers may be less likely to find parking spaces close by.

3.53 The eighth objection was raised on the grounds that:

- The restrictions, if introduced, would mean that the objector's visitors would have problems finding a parking space.
- Restrictions should only be painted in the section of Bevan Court closest to Coldharbour Road.

3.54 **Response** – Introducing waiting restrictions will always have the potential to displace vehicles to other streets. These restrictions would leave a number of potential parking spaces at the ends of the cul-de-sac (possibly four in each of Bevan Court and Fleming Court, depending on how people park).

3.55 Able bodied visitors would have the option of parking further away or using public transport. Disabled residents or visitors can use their blue badges to park for up to 3 hours on yellow lines without loading restrictions. Disabled residents could possibly apply for disabled parking spaces which could be introduced at the end of the cul-de-sac.

3.56 While acknowledging the potential inconvenience which these restrictions would cause for residents, it cannot be ignored that Bevan Court and Fleming Court were constructed with minimal capacity for parked cars and it would not be appropriate to continue to allow parking to continue along the narrowest parts of the cul-de-sac.

3.57 Restricted access for refuse collection may be considered a relatively minor issue. However, it highlights the potential problem for ambulances and fire engines accessing the road in the event of an emergency. The danger of emergency service vehicles being unable to access these streets far outweighs the perceived inconvenience to resident.

3.58 It is recommended to proceed with the proposal as illustrated on drawing number PD 359k.

Stapleton Gardens, Waddon

3.59 A local resident was concerned about damage caused to vehicles mounting the footway in the east to west arm of Stapleton Gardens in order to pass parked cars, which is displacing kerbs and also causing a safety concern for pedestrians. As both the footway and carriageway are too narrow to accommodate parking, “at any time” restrictions were proposed along the length of this section of Stapleton Gardens.

3.60 A resident has objected to the proposed restrictions in Stapleton Gardens for the following reasons.

- The restrictions would force most residents to find parking spaces in other roads, leaving them vulnerable to theft and damage.
- The objector suggests that the restrictions have only been proposed due to vehicles parking opposite a particular driveway, restricting access, and that this should be dealt with by putting a “keep clear” marking outside that driveway instead.
- The objector suggests that footway parking should be considered for this road, as currently vehicles receive a Penalty Charge Notice when they park on the footway.

3.61 **Response**

- Whilst the restrictions may mean that some residents have to park elsewhere, they are confined to the east to west section of Stapleton Gardens. The north to south section of the road will remain unrestricted and Coldharbour Road, which is immediately adjacent to Stapleton Gardens, is also mainly unrestricted and should give residents opportunities to park nearby. Although the Council sympathises with the resident’s concern about theft and damage to their vehicle, this is no more likely to happen in adjacent roads than in Stapleton Gardens itself.
- The reasons for the proposal of these restrictions is detailed above and is not related to problems of access to a specific driveway.
- The width of the footway in Stapleton Gardens ranges between 1.6 metres at its widest and 1.3 to 1.4 metres at its narrowest points. It is the Council’s practice when introducing a footway parking scheme to ensure that a width of at least 1.2 metres of clear footway should be left for pedestrians, and in this case the width of the footway could not accommodate footway parking and leave the required width.

3.62 It is therefore recommended to proceed with the proposed markings as illustrated on drawing number PD 353n.

Davidson Road, Woodside

3.63 Residents of Sutton Gardens requested yellow lines at the junction with Davidson Road to improve safety and access when using the junction. In order to ensure sightlines were clear, it was proposed to introduce double yellow lines operating “at any time” at this junction.

- 3.64 A resident of Davidson Road has written in support of the scheme but requested that the restrictions should be extended across their dropped kerb.
- 3.65 As there is a possibility that the proposed restrictions will displace vehicles and make them more likely to obstruct the neighbouring driveway, it is proposed to extend the proposed restrictions across the objector's dropped kerb, as requested.
- 3.66 Accordingly, it is recommended to extend the proposed markings as illustrated on drawing number PD 353q.

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 £61 un-allocated to be utilised in 2018/2019 this is taking into account £24k that was committed in 2017/2018 against the 2018/2019 financial years spend.

4.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Available Revenue Budget</u>				
Expenditure	76	100	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from Report</u>				
Expenditure	15	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>61</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

<u>Available Capital Budget</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

4.2 The effect of the decision

- 4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at all the sites originally on both public notices, including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £15,000.
- 4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2018/19.

4.3 Risks

- 4.3.1 The cost per restriction is reduced by introducing a number of parking restrictions in one schedule and therefore spreading the legal costs. 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.

4.4 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 No further savings have been quantified, although new parking restrictions do make an income contribution to the revenue budget. The introduction of these proposals would increase the potential to recover income in this way.

Approved by: Felicia Wright, Head of Finance – Place

5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 5.1 Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provides the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.

- 5.2 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.
- 5.3 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as 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. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
 - the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
 - the national air quality strategy.
 - the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
 - any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.
- 5.4 Recent High Court judgment confirms that the Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.
- 5.3 Approved by Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate law, for and on behalf of Jacqueline Harris-Baker, Director of Law and Monitoring Officer

6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 6.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.
- 6.2 Approved by: Sue Moorman, Director of Human Resources.

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 recommendations are for new 'At any time' waiting restrictions at locations across the Borough where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. At each location surveys have been undertaken which confirm that road safety issues exist and double yellow lines would encourage the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 11.1 Instead of double yellow line waiting restrictions the alternative would be single yellow line daytime restrictions. However, as most of the above locations are at junctions and other locations where parking could create obstruction at any time, double yellow lines are more appropriate as they reduce obstructive parking at all times.

REPORT AUTHOR:

Teresa O'Regan– Traffic Engineer,
Highway Improvements, 020 8726 6000 Ext.
88260
Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Orders Engineer,
Highway Improvements, 020 8604 7363 Ext.
47363

CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,
Highway Improvements, 020 8726 6000 Ext.
88229

BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972