London Borough of Bromley

**PART ONE - PUBLIC** 

| Decision Maker:  | Environment Portfolio Holder   |           |         |
|------------------|--|-----------|---------|
|                  | For any Pre- Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on                     |           |         |
| Date:            | 1st October 2013   |           |         |
| Decision Type:   | Non-Urgent   | Executive | Non-Key |
| Title:           | MANOR PARK CLOSE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS                                       |           |         |
| Contact Officer: | Paul Nevard, Traffic Engineer<br>Tel: 020 8313 4425 E-mail: Paul.Nevard@bromley.gov.uk |           |         |
| Chief Officer:   | Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services                   |           |         |
| Ward:            | West Wickham   |           |         |

#### 1. Reason for report

This report outlines the background on the proposal for waiting restrictions to be introduced to Manor Park Close. The report explains the reason for the proposed changes, the consultation carried out with Ward Members and the proposed design of the scheme. The report seeks a decision from the Portfolio Holder on the most appropriate solution for Manor Park Close and authority to implement the changes.

## 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

#### That the Portfolio Holder agrees that:

2.1 Parking changes in Manor Park Close be implemented, as shown in the consultation plan ESD 10561-1, and as described in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4 of this report.

### Corporate Policy

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

#### <u>Financial</u>

- 1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: £500
- 2. Ongoing costs: Non-Recurring Cost:
- 3. Budget head/performance centre: TfL LIP funding for Local Parking Schemes 2013/14
- 4. Total current budget for this head: £50k, of which £37k is available as an uncommitted balance
- 5. Source of funding: Transport For London

#### <u>Staff</u>

- 1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
- 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 5 hours

#### <u>Legal</u>

- 1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory Government Guidance:
- 2. Call-in: Applicable:

#### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 12 households and visitors to Manor Park Close

#### Ward Councillor Views

- 1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
- 2. Summary of Ward Councillor's comments:
  - Councillor Brian Humphreys agreed with the proposals of 'At any time' waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to the junction and turning head. He requested that residents should be consulted on "At any time" waiting restrictions to Manor Park Close rather than a limited time waiting restriction (single yellow line).
  - Councillor Nicholas Bennett raised no objection to the residents being consulted on the proposals.
  - Councillor Jane Beckley raised no objections to the proposal or consultation.

# 3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 Manor Park Close is a small residential cul-de-sac located off Manor Park Road, West Wickham. The road is located within walking distance of the High Street and therefore can often experience an increased level of demand to park on street.
- 3.2 The Council has previously received a petition from residents about the level and manner of parking in this area. The concerns related to vehicles parked at the junction of Manor Park Close and Manor Park Road and along Manor Park Close which can interfere with the free flow of traffic. As a result, a consultation was carried out in 2009 on the proposal for "At any time" waiting restrictions to be added to the close. During the consultation some objections were received and as such the proposal was not taken forward. However, the residents were informed that the site would be monitored and it may be necessary to re-investigate the site if concerns continue to be raised and problems with access persist.
- 3.3 Following additional requests being received in early 2013, the site was investigated again. Site observations confirmed that on street parking on both sides of the road was creating an issue for larger vehicles and therefore restrictions to one side of the road may be prudent to ensure that access can be maintained. Furthermore, parking close to the junction and turning area of the cul-de-sac was also observed which could create further issues. It was noted that all residents had a form of off-street parking and therefore it was felt beneficial to consult residents on the proposal to add some restrictions to the close.
- 3.4 Following informal consultations with Ward Members on the proposals, a formal consultation was carried out in June 2013 with all those affected in Manor Park Close. The proposal plan shown on ESD 10561-1 was attached to the letter to residents.
- 3.5 Following consultation, a number of comments and objections were received. 16 households were informed of the proposal with 2 letters in support received and 2 letters objecting to the scheme. It is quite normal for residents to be split on such proposals and whilst some residents are strongly in favour of restrictions, some residents have raised objections. Specific objections to the scheme, with officer comments, are summarised below:

| Objection / Comments  | Officer Response  |  |
|---|---|--|
| While it is true that 'all properties have<br>off street parking'all without<br>exception rarely use their off-street<br>parking either because it is used as a<br>separate dwelling (as in the case of<br>#31) or they have way too many cars<br>to fit in their garage or driveway. | The proposal would allow some flank<br>boundary parking to Manor Park<br>Close. Therefore, parking would only<br>be prevented in the turning area in the<br>cul-de-sac, on top of the junction with<br>manor Park Road and one side of<br>Manor Park Close to ensure access<br>can be gained at all times.<br>Whilst there is no automatic right to<br>park on the highway, the Council tries<br>to provide as much on-street parking<br>as possible. However, there are<br>certain circumstances where waiting<br>restrictions are required. |  |

| Local trade will be affected, they have<br>customers who may park in MPC<br>sometimes the restaurant people do<br>too, especially since the red route<br>waiting is limited to 20 minutes I think.<br>The Italian and Indian restaurants will<br>also be affected. | It is not felt that adding restrictions in<br>the proposed location will affect trade<br>to the local shops. Some flank<br>boundary parking will remain that can<br>be used by residents, visitors or those<br>using the local area.   |
|--|--|
| There are already rules about parking<br>that prevent emergency vehicle<br>access, so why spend thousands on<br>restrictions, which can't be enforced<br>without additional cost to the taxpayer.<br>This proposal is not going to generate<br>revenue             | <ul> <li>"At any time" waiting restrictions are seen as the most appropriate way to prevent parking where access is a concern. Enforcement will be required however, the restrictions are often sufficient to prevent on street parking in these locations.</li> <li>The proposal has not been put forwarded to generate revenue. It is being proposed to address road safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic.</li> </ul> |
| My mum is registered disabled and<br>has severe mobility issues. She will no<br>longer be able to leave her house and<br>step out into the car to attend regular<br>hospital and doctor visits.  | The proposal is to introduce "At any<br>time" waiting restrictions, therefore<br>loading and unloading of vehicles is<br>permitted. Whilst the restrictions will<br>prevent vehicles being parked on-<br>street, a driver can pick up and drop off<br>passengers and/or load and unload a<br>vehicle. Consequently, being collected<br>would not be a problem.   |

3.6 Further to the above comments received from residents, the West Wickham Resident Association have also objected to the proposal. The West Wickham Resident Association has stated the following:

"As with many cul-de-sacs in West Wickham and indeed across the borough the road is too narrow to turn a vehicle whether or not a vehicle is parked, it will still be necessary for a refuse vehicle to reverse into the close. We therefore believe the proposal should be dropped."

## 3.7 Conclusions

The recommendation of this report is to introduce the proposed changes as per the consultation drawing shown on ESD 10561-1. Whilst it is noted that some residents object to the proposal it is felt that the changes will be of benefit to road safety, will help to improve sightlines at the Manor Park Road junction and also ensure that access can be gained at all times. The proposal still keeps a section of Manor Park Close unrestricted to allow some on-street parking and the restrictions will still allow the loading and unloading of vehicles. All residents have a form of off-street parking. Although the turning area at the end of the cul-de-sac is quite small,

keeping this section clear will also ensure that the majority of drivers will be able to enter and exit the close in forward motion at all times.

# 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Environment Portfolio Plan 2013-16 includes the key aim to "Promote safe and secure travel and parking".

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There will be a cost of approximately £500 to add the necessary road markings and the cost associated with advertising the necessary Traffic Management Order.
- 5.2 The cost will be met from the 2013/14 TfL funding for Local Parking schemes that has an allocation of £50k. An uncommitted balance of £37k is available to fund these works.

### 6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 It will be necessary to make amendments to the Traffic Management Orders to permit enforcement.

| Non-Applicable Sections: | Personnel Implications   |
|--------------------------|--|
| Background Documents:    | Consultation Plan: ESD 10561-1                                   |
| (Access via Contact      | Consultation letter to residents dated 24 <sup>th</sup> May 2013 |
| Officer)                 | Support for restrictions – various emails                        |
|                          | Petition in support of restrictions                              |
|                          | Objections to restrictions – various emails                      |
|                          | Objection letter from WWRA dated 26 <sup>th</sup> July 2013      |