

Decision Maker: Environment Portfolio Holder

**For any pre-decision scrutiny by the Environment PDS
Committee on**

Date: 28 February 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: **BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE PARKING REVIEW: BICKLEY
EXTENSION**

Contact Officer: Lisa Allen, Team Leader - Traffic
Tel: 020 8313 4528 E-mail: lisa.allen@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies - Director of Environmental Services

Ward: Bickley

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Following feedback from residents and Ward Members, this report details the proposals to extend the existing Bromley Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into the Bickley area.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 That the Portfolio Holder approves the changes to the parking controls in the Bickley area, as set out in paragraph 3.4. (Plans outlining these proposals will be on display at the meeting.)
- 2.2 That authority to make further minor modifications, which may arise as a result of any further consultations or considerations, be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy. Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £34,500
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost. net nil
 3. Budget head/performance centre: TfL budget for Parking Schemes in Town Centres 2011/12
 4. Total current budget for this head: £225k is assigned for Parking schemes, the current uncommitted balance for 2011/12 is £106k
 5. Source of funding: Transport for London LIP funding
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): One.
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 75 staff hours to prepare and consult on this scheme.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-statutory - Government guidance.
 2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This scheme will mainly benefit local residents; businesses and shoppers to the Bickley area.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Cllr Smith is supportive of the proposed extension.

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Bickley area is a residential area, which also houses a small number of businesses. Bickley Rail Station is located to the south-east of the proposed CPZ extension. The provision of plentiful free parking means that this is a popular station for people travelling to London for both business and leisure purposes.
- 3.2 The Bromley Town Centre CPZ has not been reviewed on a large scale for approximately 10 years, with only minor changes to the existing CPZ within that time. Having spoken to all the Ward Councillors who cover the extent of the Bromley Town Centre 'A', 'B' and 'C' controlled zones, they did not feel there was a need to make any significant changes to the current zones. However, Bromley Council and the Bickley Ward Cllrs have received requests to extend existing parking restrictions into the Bickley area.
- 3.3 The Council consulted with residents and businesses in the Bickley area in December 2011, the extent of the consultation area is show on plan ESD-10916-1.

Results of Consultation

The results of the consultation are listed below on a road by road basis:

Road Name	Response Rate (%)	Do you have parking problems in your road	If you did have parking controls, which type of parking restriction would you prefer?
Amesbury Road	32 properties, 19 responses = 59%	Yes = 14 No = 5	CPZ = 14 Single Yellow Line (SYL) = 0 Undecided = 2
Beechfield Road	68 properties, 34 response = 50%	Yes = 14 No = 20	CPZ = 18 SYL = 1 Undecided = 13
Bird in Hand Lane	45 properties, 16 responses = 36%	Yes = 15 No = 1	CPZ = 5 SYL = 6 Undecided = 5
Cedar Road	42 properties, 26 responses = 62%	Yes = 14 No = 12	CPZ = 14 SYL = 2 Undecided = 8
Glen View Road	33 properties, 12 responses = 36%	Yes = 3 No = 9	CPZ = 7 SYL = 0 Undecided = 5
Lewes Road	16 properties, 11 responses = 69%	Yes = 10 No = 1	CPZ = 7 SYL = 0 Undecided = 4
Nightingale Lane	14 properties (part of road), 3 responses = 21%	Yes = 1 No = 2	CPZ = 2 SYL = 0 Undecided = 1
Page Heath Lane	22 properties, 13 responses = 59%	Yes = 11 No = 2	CPZ = 8 SYL = 4 Undecided = 2
Shawfield Park	41 properties, 28 responses = 68%	Yes = 20 No = 8	CPZ = 17 SYL = 5 Undecided = 6
The Glade	19 properties, 6 responses = 32%	Yes = 1 No = 5	CPZ = 1 SYL = 2 Undecided = 3

Westwood Close	5 properties, 3 responses = 60%	Yes = 1 No = 2	CPZ = 1 SYL = 1 Undecided = 1
Widmore Lodge Road	55 properties, 26 responses = 47%	Yes = 16 No = 10	CPZ = 20 SYL = 1 Undecided = 5

3.4 Recommendations

It is, therefore, recommended to implement an extension to the Bromley CPZ, as outlined below. However, if displacement parking becomes an issue in the future in the omitted roads, restrictions can be implemented at that time. All areas in Zones B and C currently have some free parking bays, so having some in this zone extension will be in keeping with the rest of the Bromley CPZ.

1) Omit the following roads from the scheme, as there was either a clear consensus against the proposal or no overall consensus:

- Beechfield Road
- Cedar Road
- The Glade
- Glenview Road

2) Extend the existing Bromley ‘C’ permit zone to include the following roads:

- Amesbury Road
- Widmore Lodge Road
- Lewes Road
- Nightingale Lane (part of)

3) With the remaining roads, install free parking bays and no other road markings, as this will help manage indiscriminate parking that is occurring and aid smoother traffic flows:

- Bird in Hand Lane
- Westwood Close
- Shawfield Park
- Page Heath Lane

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Policy T5 of the Unitary Development Plan states: “The Council will seek to improve the environmental quality, capacity and safety of local roads where appropriate, either by minor improvement or suitable traffic management schemes”.
- 4.2 Bromley’s agreed Parking and Enforcement Plan refers to the need ‘to regulate the location and use of on-street parking facilities where this is necessary to safeguard the efficiency and safety of the road network for all road users, to support the local economy, or to meet the needs of residents or other priority users.’
- 4.3 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 Vision – Quality Environment”, two stated issues to be tackled are: (i) Promoting safe parking provision; and (ii) Improving the road network for all users.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The estimated cost of each option is listed below and will be funded from the Transport for London budget for Parking Schemes in Town Centres for 2011/12, which has an allocation of budget of £225k and an uncommitted balance of £106k.

Details of estimated expenditure & Income	Proposal £'000
One-off implementation costs funded by TfL LIP	34.5
<u>Ongoing revenue</u>	
Estimated income from residents permits	(1.0)
Estimated administration costs for permits	1.0
	<u>0.0</u>

5.2 The additional parking restrictions in the Bickley Ward will have no significant effect on enforcement costs, as the Bromley Town Centre CPZ is already enforced.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

It will be necessary to make traffic orders under Sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1985, to give effect to the provisions referred to in this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Consultation Letters: Bromley Town Centre Parking Review: Bickley Extension, December 2011.