



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

16 August 2011

Subject Heading:

**PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
– comments to advertised proposals**

Report Author and contact details:

Iain Hardy
Technical Officer
01708 432440
iain.hardy@havering.gov.uk

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Clean, safe and green borough	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Excellence in education and learning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity	<input type="checkbox"/>
Value and enhance the life of every individual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY

This report outlines the responses received to various advertised waiting restrictions, agreed in principle by the Committee, and recommends a further course of action in each case.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the proposals for items 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, be implemented as advertised.
2. That the proposals for items 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6, be implemented as advertised and their effects be monitored.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 At various meetings of the Committee, a number of requests for changes to existing or new parking restrictions were considered and were agreed in principle.
- 1.2 The proposals were subsequently designed and publicly advertised. This report outlines the responses received to the formal consultation of the proposals for each location and staff comments and recommends a further course of action in each case.

2.0 Proposed Restrictions

2.1 Belgrave Avenue - Plan No. QJ120/101

Proposal agreed by Committee on 14 December 2010.

It is proposed to introduce 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Belgrave Avenue from the red route boundary of the Southend Arterial Road in to Belgrave Avenue for 18.4 metres, extending into the unnamed service road fronting the Southend Arterial Road, for a distance of 10 metres.

Responses received

One response received from a resident of Belgrave Avenue who believes that if the proposals are implemented, the historic problems with shop users blocking driveways will only get worse.

Staff comments

As the restrictions are proposed in areas where parking should not be taking place, as outlined in the Highway Code, or could potentially affect vehicles turning in from the Southend Arterial Road, these proposals are felt necessary to promote road safety and traffic flow.

Recommended Action

That the proposal be implemented as advertised and the effects be monitored.

2.2 **Campion School - Plan No. QJ121/101.**

Proposal agreed by Committee on 14 December 2010.

It is proposed to introduce a 43.5 metre 'School Keep Clear' marking in Wingletye Lane fronting the main vehicular access to the Campion School site, which prohibits stopping from 8.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday inclusive.

Responses Received

One response received from The Bursar of Campion School outlining their full support for the proposals and stating that this action is long overdue.

Recommended Action

That the proposal be implemented as advertised.

2.3 **Norfolk Road - Plan No. QJ128/101**

Proposal agreed by Committee on 14 December 2010.

It is proposed to introduce a short stay parking bay for two vehicles in Norfolk Road to the side of 148 Upminster Road, operational from 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday. The bay will permit a one hour maximum stay, prohibiting a return to the bay within two hours

Responses Received

One response was received from a resident of Norfolk Road, who is in full support of the proposals, as the bays will assist shopkeepers and customers to park without receiving Penalty Charge Notices. Their only concern is that commuters will use the bays.

Staff Comments

As there is a one hour maximum stay period, commuters will not be able to use the bays.

Recommended Action

That the proposals be implemented as advertised.

2.4 **Dell Court -Ravenscourt Grove - Plan No. QJ130/101**

Proposal agreed by Committee on 14 December 2010.

It is proposed to introduce a nine metre long Ambulance Bay in the lay-by area fronting Dell Court, which prohibits stopping 'At any time' except for Ambulances

No responses were received.

Recommended Action

That the proposal be implemented as advertised.

2.5 **Mavis Grove - Plan No. QK017/1**

Proposals agreed by Committee on 16 November 2010

It is proposed to introduce six Pay & Display parking bays operational from 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive, with a maximum stay of two hours, on the southern side of Mavis Grove, between its junction with Station Lane and the entrance to Draper Court. It is also proposed to introduce 'At any time' waiting restrictions on both sides of the road to cover the vehicular entrances to Draper Court and Ripon House and to restrict the remainder of the unrestricted area of the road with an 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday waiting restriction.

Responses received

Two responses received.

The first is from a local resident who will be affected by the proposals and has requested double yellow lines across their driveways. They have for some time been increasingly experiencing problems with obstructive parking fronting the vehicle accesses to the property and enforcement action has taken place on a number of occasions. The resident is in support of the current proposals and has also suggested that a further area of Pay and Display parking bays be installed along the flank wall of No.2 Mill Park Avenue.

The second response was from the owners and freeholders of Ripon House, Numbers 27 – 39 Station Lane. They feel that the proposed restrictions will cause access and egress issues with the site and cause further trespassing on their land. It is felt that heavy goods vehicles leaving the site would find it difficult turning towards Station Lane, which would be dangerous and awkward for drivers. It would be preferred that none of the proposals be implemented but at the very least the end two Pay and Display parking bays be omitted. It is also felt that the proposed restrictions east of the site entrance are not needed as parking in this area is not a nuisance nor hazardous. The company criticises the Council over its approach accommodating motor vehicles through the Traffic Management and Planning Departments, feeling that the current proposals will

cause problems with commercial and residential waste collection and the best option, without cost would be to do nothing.

Staff comments

In respect of the resident's request for double yellow lines over their driveways, the area is currently unrestricted and the existing proposals will deal with the vast majority of the resident's parking issues.

In respect of the resident's suggestion to install a further Pay and Display area in Mavis Grove along the flank of No. 2 Mill Park Avenue, this request will be added to the Minor Parking Schemes Request list to be considered at a further Highways Advisory Committee.

In respect of the commercial response, it is possible that the proposals may result in drivers parking on their land but this would be for them to manage in an area where it is understood a permit system already operates. In regard to access for larger vehicles, computer simulated tracking has been undertaken of the largest heavy goods vehicle that can be used and it has been shown that such a vehicle can access and egress the site with all the proposed parking bays in situ.

Recommended Action

That the proposals be implemented as advertised and the effects be monitored.

2.6 Market Link - Plan No. ML01/01

Proposal agreed by Committee on 19 April 2011.

It is proposed to introduce 'At any time' waiting restrictions and a 4.00am to 8.00pm loading ban in all of Market Link, the area of Ducking Stool Court that is proposed to be readopted, and in The Mews, to the south-western boundary of Emma Court.

Responses received

Eight responses were received, one from TJ Hughes and five e-mails, of which one contained a petition signed by 39 residents of Emma House and Hazeleigh House and sent via Andrew Rosindell MP.

The response from TJ Hughes acknowledges the gap that has been left over the dropped kerb to the rear of the site to accommodate customer collections and deliveries. They want to ensure deliveries can be made without the drivers receiving Penalty Charge Notices.

The letter and petition outline objections on the grounds of the impact the proposals will have on families with children, their safety, accommodating the school run and accepting deliveries. It feared that deliveries to adjacent businesses will be undertaken late at night or early in the morning, waking

residents, that planning permission was granted without adequate parking and that disabled residents would find it impossible to be picked up and dropped off. There are concerns over the impact on moving property and receiving deliveries, conflict between residents and risk of accidents due to residents having to move out of the properties after 10.00pm.

All of the remaining responses outline objections on the basis of no explanation of why the restrictions are proposed, a female resident leaves home before the current restrictions start and comes home after they finish, they rely on their car for work and feels the proposals would only cause congestion in other residential areas. One resident fears the TJ Hughes will take in deliveries outside the proposed loading ban period and being able to park after 6.30pm and on Sundays is helpful to residents. The remaining response argues that the proposals would be quite contentious with car owners, as the flat have little or no parking facilities.

Staff Comments

Market Link is already restricted with 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday waiting and loading restrictions and all of the newer developments in the area have Section 106 Agreements within the planning conditions of the sites, prohibiting residents of the developments being eligible to have residents permits for any of the Romford Parking Zones.

These proposals will deal with obstructive parking throughout the week, caused by Market Traders, residents and Blue Badge holders. In addition, the proposals will improve traffic flow in to and out of the Market Place car park and emergency access to the town centre. It should be noted that removal companies are exempt from waiting and loading restrictions for the purpose of commercial and residential moving. The proposals also provide for loading and unloading to TJ Hughes during normal retail hours. However, it is acknowledged that these proposals will affect some residents.

Recommended Action

That the proposal be implemented as advertised and the effects be monitored.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

The total estimated cost of up to £10,750 for implementing the proposals as described above and shown on the attached plans can be met from the 2011/12 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs to implement a scheme should it be ultimately implemented. It should be noted that further decisions are to be made following a full report to the Committee and with the Cabinet Member approval process being completed where a scheme is recommended for implementation.

Overall costs will need to be contained within the overall revenue budget.

Legal implications and risks:

Waiting restrictions and parking bays require consultation and the advertisement of proposals before a decision can be taken on their introduction.

Human Resources implications and risks:

None.

Equalities implications and risks:

Parking restrictions in residential areas are often installed to improve road safety and accessibility for residents who may be affected by long-term non-residential parking.

Parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may be detrimental to others.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Drawings:

QJ120/101
QJ121/101
QJ128/101
QJ130/101
QK017/1
ML01/01