

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date 17 September 2013

REPORT

Subject	Heading	
---------	---------	--

TPC312- Chase Cross Road, proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions.

Report Author and contact details:

Sarah-Jane Rogers 01708-432787 schemes@havering.gov.uk

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

Clean, safe and green borough	[X]
Excellence in education and learning	[]
Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity	[X]
Value and enhance the life of every individual	[X]
High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	

SUMMARY

This report outlines the responses received to the advertised proposals for proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Chase Cross Road, which was agreed in principle under the Head of Streetcares delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That the Committee, having considered the representations made, recommends to the Cabinet Member for Community Empowerment that:
 - a. the minor parking scheme set out in this report to implement 'At any time' waiting restrictions, as shown on the attached drawing TPC312-Chase Cross Road, be implemented as advertised.
 - b. the effect of the scheme be monitored
 - c. Members note that the estimated cost of this scheme as set out in this report is £1.000 which can be funded from the 2013/14 Minor Parking Schemes revenue budget.

REPORT DETAIL

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Following a Traffic Liaison Meeting held on the 29th September 2011 a representative from the Metropolitan Police requested that we look at implementing a scheme in Chase Cross Road opposite the parade of shops.
- 1.2 On the 18th October 2011 Highways presented a report to the Highways Advisory Committee for safety improvements to the area. It was then noted at this meeting that a resident was concerned about parking conditions in the vicinity of the shops and crossing. It was noted that the Parking Team would review the parking restrictions at this location.
- 1.3 On the 20th October 2011 a Ward Councillor contacted a Highways Engineer stating that residents were concerned about the parking situation in the area of the shops in Chase Cross Road and that they were requesting waiting restrictions to stop the bottle neck effect that was taking place.
- 1.4 On 15th November 2011 a request for 'At any time' waiting restrictions in the section of Chase Cross Road, between the zebra crossing and the bus stop lay-by was taken to the Highways Advisory Committee and was deferred.
- 1.5 On the 15th May 2012 the Committee agreed to remove this item from the deferred list by 8 votes in favour with 1 abstention.
- 1.6 In February 2013 at a Traffic Liaison Meeting a representative from the Metropolitan Police raised the issue again about parking opposite the parade of shops on Chase Cross Road.

Highways Advisory Committee, 17th September 2013

- 1.7 As a result of the further representation from the Police, the Head of StreetCare chose to exercise his delegated powers to progress proposals to introduce waiting restrictions in this area. These proposals were placed on calendar brief and being unchallenged, were formally advertised. These proposals are appended to this report as Appendix A, drawing TPC312-Chase Cross Road.
- 1.8 The proposals are to introduce 'At any time' waiting restrictions to cover the unnamed road opposite 266 Chase Cross Road, extending into Chase Cross Road, on its southern side, between the unnamed road opposite 266 to the lay-by fronting 284 and extending into the unnamed road fronting the Chase Cross Road residential addresses, on its northern side for 10 metres either side of its junction with the unnamed road opposite 266.
- 1.9 Due to the significant response received to the advertised proposals, the Head of StreetCare considered that it would be more appropriate for the responses to be considered by this Committee and that the Committee decides on a further course of action.
- 1.10 This report outlines the responses received to the statutory consultation for the proposed waiting restrictions in Chase Cross Road and recommends a further course of action.

2.0 Outcome of Public Consultation

- 2.1 On the 24th May 2013, residents of 36 addresses in the area perceived to be affected by the proposed scheme were advised by letter enclosing a plan, detailing the proposals. Eighteen statutory bodies were also consulted and site notices were placed in Chase Cross Road.
- 2.2 At the close of the public consultation on the 14th May 2013, 11 responses were received along with a 558 person petition organised by the owner of the Olive Tree Café.

2.3 Responses to the public consultation

Response 1: A request by a member of the public requesting waiting restrictions and why they were needed as every morning there are vehicles parked on the opposite side to the shops, this along with other vehicles cause a tailback of traffic which can stretch all the way back to the traffic lights. It must be noted that this request was received one day after the consultation period had ended.

Response 2: The resident is in favour of the proposals, but feels the residents should not be penalised for parking in the service road.

Response 3: A Transport for London representative is in favour of the proposals, as they will eliminate the bottleneck in Chase Cross Road.

Response 4: A Transport for London representative is in favour of the proposals, as there are often reports of minor hold up to the bus services due to vehicles parking and the buses waiting for a gap in the oncoming traffic to proceed.

Highways Advisory Committee, 17th September 2013

Response 5: In agreement with the proposals, as residents have been asking for them.

Response 6: Metropolitan Police are very much in favour of the proposals, as they have received many complaints, mostly from residents about the manner of parking. The section of road in question often sees vehicles parked on both sides of the carriageway, usually by large van type vehicles, which restrict the traffic flow and cause conflict between vehicles trying to pass. The parked vehicles also restrict the visibility between passing drivers and pedestrians trying to use the zebra crossing, making it more likely for a collision to occur.

Response 7: A business owner is objecting to the proposals, as opening the road would encourage drivers to speed and cause road accidents and impact on local residents with displacement parking. Businesses will cease as it will impact trade to the parade of shops. It was suggested that other solutions such as development of the verge on Chase Cross Road opposite the parade of shops to include parking bays.

Response 8: A resident objecting to the 'At any time' Waiting Restrictions within the vicinity of the shops.

Response 9: A resident is objecting to the proposals as they saw it in the 'Living' magazine and feel that Havering Council are always telling us how committed they are to local businesses, but placing parking restrictions will cut down trade and possibly make it impossible for them to continue trade.

Response 10: The Member of Parliament for Romford wrote in to say they visited the Olive Tree Café to discuss the proposals and to view the traffic issues. The MP agrees with the statement made in the letter distributed by the council on the fact the congestion does occur, but the accident that occurred on Chase Cross Road was merely to do with a speeding vehicle, which is currently hindered by the presence of vehicle on both sides of the road.

The MP believes that there are alternative arrangements which could be made that would both serve the aims of the council in reducing congestion, ensuring speeding is still controlled and also ensuring ample parking for all local businesses. It was pointed out the grass verge area opposite the parade of shops could be converted into parking facilities.

Response 11: A Councillor- has stated that there is a better way forward, which would be beneficial to both the council and to all the local residents. It is felt that in terms of the solution to the problems that are currently being faced, including road safety and sight lines, the introduction of any restrictions to parking would be advantageous. However, one suggestion from the councillor that they considered to be sensible and cost-effective approach would be the introduction of two wheel bay parking on the opposite side of the road to where the proposed restrictions would be placed.

The petition that was submitted was signed by 558 signatories objecting to the proposed to introduction of the 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Chase Cross Road.

3.0 Staff Comments

From the 36 addresses we consulted, 11 responses were received, equating to a 30% return rate.

16% of the responses were in favour of the 'at any time' Waiting Restrictions whilst 14% not including the 558 person petition were against the proposals for the 'At any time' Waiting Restrictions.

The majority of the respondents objecting to the proposals were requesting that the grass verge located opposite to the parade of shops be converted into footway parking bays. This option would be costly to the Council, as engineering works need to take place to build out the area due to the steep incline in the verge.

The proposals were designed due to the high numbers of complaints the council were receiving from motorists and from the Metropolitan Police, regarding obstructive parking and sight lines being hindered by parked vehicles. Comments have also been received from Streetcare Officers reporting congestion problems whilst driving through the area.

Before the proposals were designed, staff requested information via TFL regarding the number of accidents that took place within the vicinity of the parade of shops. The data that is available up to May 2013, subject to change shows that there was one recorded personal injury accident in the area where the restrictions are proposed

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications and Risks

This report is asking HAC to recommend to Lead Member for Community Empowerment the implementation of the above scheme

The estimated cost of implementing the proposals as described above and shown on the attached plan is £1,000 including advertising costs. This cost can be met from the 2013/2014 Minor Parking Schemes revenue 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 – as regards actual implementation and scheme detail. Therefore, final costs are 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

Highways Advisory Committee, 17th September 2013

would need to be contained within the Streetcare overall Minor Parking Schemes revenue budget.

HR Implications and Risks

The proposal can be delivered within the standard resourcing within Streetcare, and has no specific impact on staffing/HR issues.

Legal Implications and Risks

Legal resources will be required to give effect to the proposals.

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. 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 and young people, older people), this will assist the Council in meeting its duty under the Act.

There will be some visual impact from the required signing and lining works but it is anticipated that this work will improve road safety and access for disabled people, older people and parents with prams.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix A

