



HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

26 April 2016

Subject Heading:

TPC818 Woodlands Road (unmade part) and Reginald Road, additional resident parking - comments to advertised proposals

CMT Lead:

Andrew Blake-Herbert

Report Author and contact details:

Gareth Nunn
Engineering Technician
schemes@havering.gov.uk

Policy context:

Traffic & Parking Control

Financial summary:

The estimated cost of £800 for implementation will be met by 2016/17 revenue budget for Minor Traffic and Parking

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	[x]

SUMMARY

This report outlines the responses received to the formal consultation to introduce further resident parking provisions in Woodlands Road and Reginald Road and recommends a further course of action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1 That the Highways Advisory Committee having considered this report and the representations made, recommends to the **Cabinet Member for Environment** that the proposals to introduce further resident parking provisions in Woodlands Road and Reginald Road, as shown on the plan appended to this report at **Appendix A**, be abandoned.

2. Members note that the estimated cost of the proposed scheme, as set out in this report, would have been £800, which would have been met from the 2016/17 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

1.1 Following a request from a ward councillor for additional resident parking bays in the Woodlands Road area, proposals were designed with the intention to further parking provisions for residents. The proposals would also have simplified the existing restrictions in the roads.

1.2 On 5th February 2016, residents and businesses that were affected by the proposals were consulted by letter and plan. Eighteen statutory bodies were also consulted and site notices were placed at the location.

1.3 By the close of public consultation on 26th February 2016, 6 responses were received to the proposals. All the responses have been summarised in the table appended to this report at **Appendix B**.

2.0 Responses received

2.1 At the close of public consultation on Friday 26th February 2016, 6 responses were received, 1 response was in favour of the proposal and 5 responses were against the proposals. The 5 responses against the proposals are summarised in the table of response appended to this report at Appendix C.

2.2 A 16 signature petition was received from residents of Woodlands Road which also reinforces the strong views the majority of residents have against these proposals.

3.0 Staff Comments

3.1 Having received the responses to the consultation, it is apparent that the vast majority of residents in Woodlands Road and particularly in the unmade

section of the road do not feel there are any parking issues and are not in favour of the scheme. Therefore it is recommended that the proposed scheme be abandoned. The Ward councillor who raised this request is aware of and in agreement that the proposals are abandoned.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications:

The estimated cost of implementing the proposals as described above and shown on the attached plan is £800 which will be met from the 2016/17 Minor Parking Schemes budget.

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 in regards to actual implementation and scheme detail. Therefore, final costs may be subject to change.

This is a standard project for StreetCare and there 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 the StreetCare overall Minor Parking Schemes revenue budget.

Legal implications and risks:

Waiting restrictions and parking bays require public 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:

Parking restrictions have the potential to displace parking to adjacent areas, which may be detrimental to others. However, the Council has a general duty under the Equality Act 2010 to ensure that its highway network is accessible to all. Where infrastructure is provided or substantially upgraded, reasonable adjustments should be made to improve access. In considering the impacts and making improvements for people with protected characteristics (mainly, but not limited to disabled people, children, young people and older people), this will assist the Council in meeting its duty under the act.

The proposals included in the report have been publicly advertised and subject to public consultation. All residents 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.

The recommendation is for the proposal to be abandoned as per the staff comments section within this report. However whatever decision is made, staff will monitor the effects, especially relating to these groups, and if it is considered that further changes are necessary, the issues will be reported back to this Committee so that a further course of action can be agreed.

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

BACKGROUND PAPER

Appendix B

	Respondent	Summary of Comments	Staff Comments
1	A resident of Woodlands Road	Resident explains they have lived in Woodlands Road for 32 years and at no time have felt the need for a Residents Parking Scheme. the explain they have never had a problem with commuter parking and don't anticipate such a problem in the future.	Although the council still feel the proposals would have simplified the existing restrictions and provided further parking for residents. They acknowledge the residents responses and therefore recommend the proposals are abandoned.
2	A resident of Woodlands Road	Resident explains they have no problem with commuter parking and express what appears to be dissatisfaction that the road is unadopted.	Although the council still feel the proposals would have simplified the existing restrictions and provided further parking for residents. They acknowledge the residents responses and therefore recommend the proposals are abandoned. Traffic and Parking control officers are unable to comment on the roads entitlement to be adopted
3	A resident of Woodlands Road	Resident does not explain why they are against the scheme but expresses their dissatisfaction that there is no lighting, road maintenance etc. provided by the council.	Although the council still feel the proposals would have simplified the existing restrictions and provided further parking for residents. They acknowledge the residents responses and therefore recommend the proposals are abandoned. Traffic and Parking control officers are unable to comment on the roads entitlement to be adopted
4	A resident of Woodlands Road	Resident explains they have never had a problem with parking in the road. They also express their dissatisfaction that there are no pavements or lighting in the road despite paying council tax.	Although the council still feel the proposals would have simplified the existing restrictions and provided further parking for residents. They acknowledge the residents responses and therefore recommend the proposals are abandoned. Traffic and Parking control officers are unable to comment on the roads entitlement to be adopted

5	A resident of Woodlands Road	Resident explains they need access to the front of their house as they have carers visit daily. They also explain the road has no lighting, drainage and large potholes.	Although the council still feel the proposals would have simplified the existing restrictions and provided further parking for residents. They acknowledge the residents responses and therefore recommend the proposals are abandoned. Traffic and Parking control officers are unable to comment on the roads entitlement to be adopted
---	------------------------------	--	---