

# HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### **REPORT**

12 May 2015

Fairholme Avenue – TPC622 Proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions – comments to advertised
proposals

Report Author and contact details: Dean R Martin – Service Support Officer schemes@havering .gov.uk

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

Havering will be clean and its environment will be cared for	[X]
People will be safe, in their homes and in the community	[X]
Residents will be proud to live in Havering	[]

**SUMMARY** 

This report outlines the responses received to the advertised proposals to implement 'At any time' waiting restrictions between the Pay and Display parking bays and the common boundary of numbers 2 and 4 Fairholme Avenue and recommends a further course of action

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. That the Committee having considered this report and the representations made recommends to the Cabinet Member for Environment that the following measures be advertised:
  - a. The introduction of 'At any time' waiting restrictions between the Pay and Display parking bays and the common boundary of numbers 2 and 4, as shown on the drawing in Appendix A of this report;
  - b. That the effect of the scheme be monitored.
- 2. That Members note that the cost of this scheme can be funded from the 2015/16 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

#### REPORT DETAIL

#### 1.0 Background

- 1.1 Following reports of obstructive parking taking place on the south-eastern side of Fairholme Avenue, between the Pay and Display parking bays and the common boundary of numbers 2 and 4, at its meeting in February 2015, this Committee agreed in principle to introduce further 'At any time' waiting restrictions to cover relatively small area.
- 1.2 The proposals were subsequently designed and publicly advertised on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2015. A copy of the plan outlining the proposals is appended to this report as Appendix A. All those perceived to be affected by the proposals were advised of them by a letter and copy of the plan. Eighteen statutory bodies were also consulted and site notices were placed at the location.
- 1.3 At the close of consultation on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2015, no responses were received to the formal consultation.

#### 2.0 Staff Comments

2.1 As there were no responses received to the proposals, it is considered that they were well received and should be implemented as advertised.

#### **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

#### Financial implications and risks:

This report is asking the Highways Advisory Committee to recommend to the Lead Member the implementation of the above scheme.

The estimated cost of implementing the proposals as described above and shown on the attached plan is £500 including advertising costs.

The costs shown are an estimate of the full costs of the scheme, should it be implemented, a final decision would be made by the Lead Member with regards to actual implementation and scheme detail. Therefore, final costs are subject to change.

This is a standard project for StreetCare and there are is no expectation that the works cannot be contained within the cost estimate. There is an element of contingency built into the financial estimate. In the unlikely event of an overspend, the balance would need to be contained within StreetCare overall Minor Parking Schemes revenue budget.

#### Legal implications and risks:

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

#### **Human Resources implications and risks:**

It is anticipated that the enforcement activities required for these proposals can be met from within current staff resources.

#### Equalities implications and risks:

The proposals included in the report have been publicly advertised and were subject to public consultation. All residents who were perceived to be affected by the proposals have been consulted formally by letter and plan. Eighteen statutory bodies were also consulted and site notices were placed at the location.

At the close of public consultation no responses were received.

After careful consideration officers have recommended that the proposal be implemented as advertised and effects be monitored on a regular basis to ensure any equality negative impact is mitigated.

We recognise that parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may disadvantage some individuals and groups, particularly

disabled and older people, residents living locally and local businesses. However, parking restrictions in residential areas are often installed to improve road safety and prevent short-term non-residential parking, which will contribute to the safety and well-being of local residents.

There will be some physical and visual impact from the required signing and lining works. Where infrastructure is provided or substantially upgraded. Reasonable adjustments should be made to improve access for disabled people, which will assist the Council in meeting its duties under Equality Act 2010.

Staff will monitor the effects of these proposals and if it is considered that further changes are necessary, the issues will be reported back to this Committee and a further course of action can be agreed.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS** 

Appendix A

### Appendix A

