

Croydon Council

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CABINET COMMITTEE 9 February 2011
AGENDA ITEM:	11
SUBJECT:	LIMPSFIELD ROAD – OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PAY & DISPLAY BAYS
LEAD OFFICER:	Executive Director of Community Services
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Phil Thomas, Cabinet Member for Environment and Highways
WARDS:	Sanderstead
<p>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>The Cabinet Committee is recommended to:</p> <p>1.1 Consider the objections received to the formal consultation on the proposed 1 hour maximum stay Pay & Display Bays in Limpsfield Road, Hamsey Green and officers responses as detailed at paragraph 3 of the report.</p> <p>1.2 Agree not to introduce Pay & Display bays but to monitor parking in the service roads for future review.</p> <p>1.3 Inform the objectors of the decisions.</p>	
<p>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</p> <p>This report is inline with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough’s roads as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parking Plan, Part III – Local Strategy and Parking Controls. • The Croydon Plan; Transport Chapter. • The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies • Croydon’s Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6 	
<p>LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT (LAA) TARGETS:</p> <p>This report is in line with objectives to promote public transport and reduce congestion on the Borough’s roads as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon’s New Local Area Agreement GOL Reference 34 	

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

These proposals can be contained within available budget.

FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:

For general release

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 Fourteen objections and comments have been received to the proposals to introduce 25 Pay and Display Bays (first 30 minutes free) in the service roads either side of Limpsfield Road, Hamsey Green.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

- 3.1 There are around 26 businesses along this stretch of Limpsfield Road of which responses have been received from 7, 2 of which support the proposals. The other responses have been received from residents (5), the Sanderstead Residents Association and a Ward Councillor. The objections have been summarised below starting with the most frequent point.

- 3.2 **Objection 1** (7 responses) – One hour is insufficient time for a number of the businesses, 2 hours is more appropriate preferable the first 1 hour being free.

Response – The purpose of the bays is to provide short-term parking to enable a high turn-over of spaces and prevent long term parking which is currently limiting spaces for customers. The proposals would leave spaces for approximately 16 vehicles to park in both services roads outside the bays for longer parking durations. Longer term parking is also available in the Good Companions PH car park and in the side roads.

- 3.3 **Objection 2** (7 responses) – Parking in side roads would increase under these proposals increasing parking problems for local residents and compounding congestion issues.

Response – Parking in the side roads is likely to increase as the long-term parking facilities in the service roads will be reduced. However, the majority of households in the close proximity to Hamsey Green have off-street parking and should not be adversely affected by the proposals. Driveways can be enforced if there are obstruction issues and, if necessary, consideration can be given to yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions.

- 3.4 **Objection 3** (6 responses) – Proposals are likely to have a detrimental affect on businesses in Hamsey Green with customers going to other areas to shop where parking is free.

Response – The proposals are aimed at improving parking opportunities by reserving spaces for parking events up to 1 hour. 30 minutes free parking with a

ticket should ensure that customers are not deterred from parking for these businesses.

3.5 **Objection 4** (4 responses) – The proposals will affect parking for residents.

Response – Space for approximately 16 vehicles will be available in the service roads for long term parking. Unrestricted parking is available in the nearby side roads and along sections of Limpsfield Road.

3.6 **Objection 5** (1 response) – A business is objecting on the grounds that all the free spaces will be taken by residents.

Response – The 16 or so spaces remaining are likely to be taken by local residents and business users restricting spaces for customers wishing to park for longer term parking. Unrestricted spaces in the side roads will be available for customers wishing to park for longer term parking if all these spaces are taken.

3.7 **Objection 6** (1 response) – The same business is objecting on the grounds that the proposals are all about revenue and not about traffic flow.

3.8 **Response** – If the scheme was proposed purely on grounds of revenue then a free 30 minute period would not be included. The main purpose of the scheme is to improve parking availability for short-term parking by reducing space for long-term parking.

3.9 **Objection 7** (1 response) – The same business is stating that there are 29 shops and only 25 parking bays.

Response – There is a limit to the number of bays that can be introduced along this section of Limpsfield Road. More bays could have been included in the proposals but this would reduce the number of spaces available for long-term parking. Additional parking is available in the Co-op (for Co-op customers) and Good Companions PH car parks.

3.10 **Comment 8** (1 response) – Resident only bays are needed.

Response – Permit parking bays are only available within Controlled Parking Zones. A CPZ would not be appropriate for this area which is a local shopping centre rather than a district centre. Free unlimited parking is available in nearby residential side roads.

3.11 **Objection 9** (1 response) – The scheme will not generate income for the Council.

Response – These types of schemes generally pay for themselves within 4 years of implementation through income received from Pay & Display tickets and the issue of Penalty Charge Notices.

3.12 **Objection 10** (1 response) – The Pay & Display proposals will not re-vitalise the local businesses.

Response – The proposals are designed to create more spaces for short-term parking thereby improving parking opportunities for customers and therefore revitalise local businesses.

- 3.13 **Comment 11** (1 response) – One business is in favour of the proposals but requests better parking facilities for disabled users.

Response – Unlimited free parking will be available for disabled Blue Badge Holders within the proposed bays and therefore facilities for disabled parking should improve.

- 3.14 It is noted that there have been 14 objections to these proposals which indicates the sensitivity surrounding Pay & Display parking in this area. The main objections are that 1 hour parking is not sufficient for some of the businesses, there will be additional parking in side roads and that customers will avoid Hamsey Green in favour of centres with free parking.

- 3.15 The proposal for Pay & display bays originated from a petition sent in by one of the businesses which was signed by 127 customers. The petition stated; 'After 9am generally 95% of all legal parking spaces are occupied by either business owners or their staff leaving any visitors to the village with a severe lack of legal parking options'. Two of the businesses have sent letters of support for parking controls.

- 3.16 However, due to the level of objections it is proposed not to introduce Pay & Display bays in the service road in Limpsfield Road, Hamsey Green at the present time but to monitor parking for future review.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections from the public following the formal consultation process. Once the notices were published the public had up to 21 days to respond.

- 4.2 The legal process required that formal consultation take 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 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age Concern, The Owner Drivers' Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport and bus operators were consulted under the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Additional bodies, up to 27 in total, are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposals.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial considerations arising from this report.
- 5.2 Approved by: Tim Flood on behalf of Department Head of Finance.

6. COMMENTS OF THE COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 6.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Section 6 and 124 of 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, the Act imposes a duty on the Council (so far as practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). Section 6 provides that the power can be used to avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road. This would include preventing obstructive parking and general road safety. The Council must also have regard to such matters as 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 prior to a final decision being made.
- 6.3 Approved by: Melissa Clarke, Corporate Solicitor on behalf of the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 7.1 There is no such impact arising from this report.
- 7.2 Approved by: Chris Baldwin, HR business partner, on behalf of the director, Human Resources & Organisational Effectiveness.

8. CUSTOMER IMPACT

- 8.1 The request for additional parking bays has been requested by a local business to help improve parking for customers to local businesses. Many of the objections that have been received are from other businesses and residents who feel that the proposal will be detrimental to the shopping parade. The proposal not to introduce the bays is therefore likely to be seen as a positive move by the Council.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

- 9.1 The Council considers that Articles to the Human Rights Act 1998 do not apply to the ordinary parking of vehicles on the highway but rather static meetings, marches, public processions and demonstrations. Likewise, the Council are not looking to restrict or deny the right of motorists to park in Limpsfield Road,

Hamsey Green, simply to require them to get a ticket to do so and thus enable as many people as possible access to parking.

10. EQUALITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL AND DESIGN, CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION AND CYCLING CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 There are no such considerations arising from this report.

11. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/DATA PROTECTION CONSIDERATIONS

11.1 This report is readily available on the Council's Web site and copies are available at the Central Library. Where letters from the public requesting parking controls and objecting to them are received in confidence the Council will not disclose the letters under its duty of confidentiality. However, where the letters are not received in confidence, the Council will disclose the letters of objection subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.

CONTACT OFFICER: David Wakeling, Traffic Design Manager
Infrastructure, Traffic Design

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None



© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. - Croydon Council. Licence No: 100019257 2010

CROYDON COUNCIL

LIMPSFIELD ROAD - SOUTH CROYDON Proposed Short-Stay Parking Bays

COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT
TOM JEFFREY - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
3rd FLOOR DAVIS HOUSE
ROBERT STREET
CROYDON CR0 1QQ

INFRASTRUCTURE - TRAFFIC DESIGN			
Scale: 1:1000	Drawn IGW	Checked DJW	Rev. 00
Date:	OCTOBER 2010		Drawing Ref. PD 073