

For a meeting of the

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

to be held on

THURSDAY, 17 JULY 2008

At

7:30 pm

in the

Salon, York House, Richmond Road, Twickenham

Gillian Norton, Chief Executive

Committee Members:	Councillor Mumford (Chair), Councillor Seymour (Vice-Chair), Councillor Cardy, Councillor Head, Councillor Hodgins, Councillor McLeod, Councillor Stanier, Councillor Warren and Councillor Khosa (in place of Councillor Elloy).
---------------------------	---

Co-opted Members:	Peter Dolan, Michael Gold, Tony Goodall and James Page.
--------------------------	---

Committee Administrator:	Alastair Round ☎ 020 8891 7813; a.round@richmond.gov.uk
---------------------------------	---

WARD:

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
3. **MINUTES**
None.
4. **REPRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC (IF ANY)**

Please contact us if you need this in Braille, large print, audio tape or another language.

Democratic Services, York House, Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3AA. Tel: 020 8891 7813. Minicom: 020 8831 6001

5. EXECUTIVE DECISIONS CALLED IN (IF ANY)

A. ST MARGARET'S PARKING STUDY (PAGES 1 - 6)

**St Margaret's &
North Twickenham**

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16, the Chief Executive (as Proper Officer) has called in the following cabinet member decision, having been requested to do so by two Members of the Environment and Sustainability Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

"I hereby:

(a) approve the making of the Permanent Traffic Management Orders to implement an extension to the St Margarets South controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the following roads:

Bridge Road
Winchester Road

(b) approve that a review of the new CPZ extension be undertaken after six months of operation with the extent of the consultation associated with that review determined in liaison with local ward councillors taking into account the views expressed by members of the Transport Consultative Group on 18 June 2008."

The reasons for the call-in were as follows:

1. "The due processes and consultations were flawed."
2. "That the review in 6 months time be open to all the residents who were originally consulted; and that the extent of consultation should not be circumscribed by local councillors and the Transport Consultative Group."

The report of the Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking is **attached**.

**6. PROVISION OF WHITE LINES AT VEHICLE CROSSOVERS
(PAGES 7 - 10)**

All

This report revisits the issue of the use of white line markings in front of vehicle crossover.

Report of the Assistant Director of Environment is **attached**.

PLEASE NOTE:

1. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to be held on **Thursday 11 September 2008 at 7:00 pm.**
2. In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Members attending the meeting are requested to declare any interests orally at the start of the meeting and again immediately before consideration of the matter. Declarations of interest should be made for all items on the agenda including those for which the Member is not present. Any Member not present at the start of the meeting should declare any interests at the first suitable opportunity. Members are reminded to specify the agenda item number to which it refers, whether the interest is personal or prejudicial and the nature of the interest.
3. Members are also reminded of the requirements of Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 that they should declare and not vote on specified matters if they are two months or more in arrears with their Council Tax payments.
4. For those members of the public with hearing difficulties induction loops have been fitted in the Council Chamber, Terrace Room, Salon and Room 7. In addition, there is an infra-red system installed in the Terrace Room. Neck loops and stetholoops are available in the Reception Office.

York House
Twickenham
TW1 3AA

9 July 2008

This agenda is printed on recycled paper.

Nese keni veshtersi per te kuptuar kete botim, ju lutemi ejani ne receptionin ne adresen e shenuar me poshte ku ne mund te organizojme perkthime nepermjet telefonit.

Albanian

এই প্রকাশনার অর্থ বুঝতে পারায় যদি আপনার কোন সমস্যা হয়, নিচে দেওয়া ঠিকানায় রিসেপশন-এ চলে আসুন যেখানে আমরা আপনাকে টেলিফোনে দোভাষীর সেবা প্রদানের ব্যবস্থা করতে পারবো।

Bengali

જો તમને આ પુસ્તિકાની વિગતો સમજવામાં મુશ્કેલી પડતી હોય તો, કૃપયા નીચે જણાવેલ સ્થળના વિશેષાને પર આવો, જ્યાં અમે ટેલિફોન પર ગુજરાતીમાં ઇન્ટરપ્રિટીંગ સેવાની ગોઠવણ કરી આપીશું.

Gujarati

اگر در فهمیدن این نشریه مشکل دارید، لطفاً به میز پذیرش در آدرس قید شده در زیر رجوع فرمایید تا سرویس ترجمه تلفنی برایتان فراهم آورده شود.

Farsi

إذا كانت لديك صعوبة في فهم هذا المنشور، فنرجو زيارة الإستقبال في العنوان المعطى أدناه حيث بإمكاننا أن نرتب لخدمة ترجمة شفوية هاتفية.

Arabic

اگر آپ کو اس اشاعت کو سمجھنے میں کوئی مشکل ہے تو، براؤزر کے نیچے دیئے ہوئے ایڈریس کے استقبالیے پر جا کر ملیئے، یہاں ہم آپ کیلئے ٹیلیفون انٹرپرائزنگ سروس (ٹیلیفون پر ترجمانی کی سروس) کا انتظام کر سکتے ہیں۔

Urdu

ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਪਰਚੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਮਝਣ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਸ਼ਕਲ ਪੇਸ਼ ਆਉਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਗਏ ਪਤੇ ਉੱਪਰ ਰਿਸੈਪਸ਼ਨ 'ਤੇ ਆਓ ਜਿੱਥੇ ਅਸੀਂ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਤੇ ਗੱਲਬਾਤ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਇੰਟਰਪ੍ਰਿਟਰ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਾਂ।

Punjabi

Civic Centre, 44 York Street, Twickenham, TW1 3BZ
42 York Street, Twickenham, TW1 3BW
Centre House, 68 Sheen Lane, London SW14 8LP
Old Town Hall, Whittaker Avenue, Richmond, TW9 1TP
Or any library

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****DATE: 17 JULY 2008****REPORT OF: CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC, TRANSPORT AND PARKING****SUBJECT: ST MARGARETS PARKING STUDY****WARDS: ST MARGARETS AND NORTH TWICKENHAM****1. Summary**

- 1.1 In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16, the Chief Executive (as Proper Officer) has called in the following cabinet member decision, having been requested to do so by two Members of the Environment and Sustainability Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

I hereby:

(a) approve the making of the Permanent Traffic Management Orders to implement an extension to the St Margarets South controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the following roads:

Bridge Road
Winchester Road

(b) approve that a review of the new CPZ extension be undertaken after six months of operation with the extent of the consultation associated with that review determined in liaison with local ward councillors taking into account the views expressed by members of the Transport Consultative Group on 18 June 2008.

- 1.2 The reasons for the call-in were as follows:

1. "The due processes and consultations were flawed."
2. "That the review in 6 months time be open to all the residents who were originally consulted; and that the extent of consultation should not be circumscribed by local councillors and the Transport Consultative Group."

2. Recommendation

That the Committee either:

- 2.1 Note the decision made by the Cabinet Member; or
- 2.2 Refer the decision back to the Cabinet Member for further consideration;
- 2.3 Specifically decide upon which of the two consultation options set out in paragraph 4.4 you prefer in the knowledge that the Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking is prepared to accept either option;
- 2.4 Note and agree the proposed further consultation for The Mews and the service road off Bridge Road.

3. Purpose of Report going to Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 3.1 This scheme was put forward to the Transport Consultative Group on 18 June 2008 and was subsequently approved by the Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking for implementation.
- 3.2 St Margarets has been the subject of a parking study over the last 12-15 months. In June 2007, the Council undertook a first stage consultation exercise in St Margarets in line with its CPZ consultation procedures seeking the views of residents and businesses on whether they would wish to see a CPZ introduced in the area. The results of this consultation showed support for a CPZ in some roads in the Moormead area of St Margarets plus Orchard Road. This formed the basis to consult on proposals to introduce a CPZ operational between 10am and 4.30pm, Monday to Friday. Given the close proximity of the existing St Margarets South CPZ to the boundary for the proposed CPZ, it was considered practical to propose the CPZ as an extension to this existing CPZ. The results of the consultation showed support for the CPZ extension in Bridge Road and Winchester Road.
- 3.3 The report seeks to provide a response to the two issues which formed the reasons for call in.

4. Response to call in issues

- 4.1 The following comments are made in response to the specific reasons for the call in.
- 4.2 **“The due processes and consultations were flawed.”**

The first reason for call-in is very general and it is therefore not possible to provide a specific response. However, from the discussion at the TCG on 18 June 2008 six particular issues were raised and these are addressed below.

Issue No 1

“Results of the first stage June 2007 consultation showed a large majority against the introduction of a CPZ in St Margarets and the decision should not have been made to progress the study to a second stage consultation.”

The consultation was undertaken in line with the Council's CPZ policy and procedures. The first stage consultation involved 43 roads and 2256 properties and was analysed on a road by road basis. While the first consultation showed an overall majority responding against a CPZ, the results showed support for a CPZ in the Moormead area and Orchard Road. The zone boundary was therefore reduced in response to the first consultation to include those roads that wished to be included, while leaving the other roads out and further consulting.

The two roads included in the proposed implementation of the CPZ extension show a majority in support. It was explained in the consultation letter that the Cabinet Member will consider proposals in full or in part on a street by street basis.

Issue No 2

"Results of the second stage results continue to show a majority against the CPZ".

As with the first stage consultation, the results were analysed on a road by road basis. The results showed support for a proposed extension in Bridge Road and Winchester Road and the Cabinet Member decided in line with the Council's CPZ policy to implement the CPZ extension in these two roads.

Issue No 3

"Extending the CPZ to Bridge Road and Winchester Road will result in displacement to all other roads in the Moormead area."

The Council is aware that the introduction of the CPZ extension could result in the displacement of vehicles to roads not included in the extension. The Council will review the introduction of the CPZ extension after six months of operation.

Issue No 4

"Why has Sidney Road been excluded from the CPZ when the majority of respondents are in favour on Question 1 and further support is shown in Question 2?"

The results on Question 1 show a marginal number in favour of the CPZ extension (out of 54 who returned their questionnaires 27 (50%) voted in favour with 26 (48%) voting against with one (2%) undecided.

The results from Question 2 show that a further eight residents would support the CPZ extension if adjacent roads had the CPZ extension introduced. With the exception of Winchester Road, the adjacent roads did not vote in favour of the CPZ and these were Kenley Road, Moormead Road and South Western Road.

Issue No 5

"There is a discrepancy in the number of properties in Winchester Road. The figure for the first stage consultation shows that there were 71 properties and the second stage shows 90 properties."

The Council uses a property database to establish the number of properties in each road. Prior to undertaking a consultation, the Council will request an up to date list of all properties to ensure that any amendments since the last consultation have been included. This discrepancy is currently being investigated and a response will be provided at the meeting.

Issue No 6

“Addresses in The Mews were not consulted on the proposals.”

The properties in The Mews all have St Margarets Road addresses but are not part of the existing CPZ. The address database originally identified three addresses in The Mews, Nos 2, 3 and 4 and all three were sent a letter explaining the proposals for the proposed extension. The letter explained the formal consultation process which included the invitation to make representations to the proposals during the consultation period. (This is contained within Appendix A of the report to TCG on 18 June 2008). An audit of the properties show that there are in fact six properties all occupied as at 8 July 2008. These proposals did not include any proposed parking controls for The Mews.

No specific representations were received from the properties in The Mews. However, given the proposed inclusion of Bridge Road in the CPZ, it is recommended that The Mews properties are further consulted together with No 14 Bridge Road regarding the immediate inclusion of The Mews into the CPZ by way of an experimental traffic order or whether they wish The Mews to remain as present outside the CPZ with its position further considered as part of the six month post-implementation review.

There is an unnamed service road on the opposite side of Bridge Road to The Mews. This flanks No 1 Bridge Road and provides rear access to Nos 157 – 165 St Margarets Road. This is public highway and it is proposed to further consult the immediately adjacent properties on its inclusion in the CPZ in a similar manner to The Mews.

4.3 **“That the review in 6 months time be open to all the residents who were originally consulted; and that the extent of consultation should not be circumscribed by local councillors and the Transport Consultative Group.”**

4.4 The six month review will involve monitoring the initial operation of the new controls to see how they have worked and whether any restrictions are necessary. While it is possible to speculate as to what operational issues might arise following implementation, officer advice at TCG was to await operational experience before defining the extent of any consultation considered with the review, and then agreeing that extent with the ward councillors. This would enable the review to be properly focussed where there are perceived to be issues. If the Committee are unhappy with this approach and wish to predetermine the extent of the consultation then officers would advise that the second stage consultation area is selected together with any other adjacent roads where particular issues have emerged. You are accordingly asked to specifically decide between these two options. The Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking has advised that he would be prepared to accept either option.

5. Financial implications

- 5.1 A budget of £70,000 was approved by Cabinet on 14 April 2008 to cover consultation, design and implementation costs of the St Margarets South CPZ Extension with a further £30,000 approved to undertake a review during the 2008 financial year, should the scheme be implemented.

6. Policy implications / considerations

- 6.1 The proposed policies are reflected within the Unitary Development Plan and the Community Plan. This consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's CPZ policy, which was approved on 17 July 2006 and in discussion with the ward members and Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking.

7. Background Papers

Report to Transport Consultative Group dated 18 June 2008
Report to Cabinet dated 17 July 2006 (CPZ policy)

8. Contacts

Graham Beattie
Manager for Transport and Highways
020 8891 7310
Graham.Beattie@richmond.gov.uk

Michael Potter
Principal Engineer
020 8487 5295
m.potter@richmond.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****DATE: 17 JULY 2008****REPORT OF: ANDREW DARVILL ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT****SUBJECT: PROVISION OF WHITE LINES AT VEHICLE CROSSOVERS****WARDS: ALL****1. Summary**

This report revisits the issue of the use of white line markings in front of vehicle crossover.

2. Recommendation

Committee is recommended to advise the Cabinet Member for Traffic, Transport and Parking and the Cabinet Member for Environment on its view relating to white lines at vehicle crossovers.

3. Purpose of Report going to Scrutiny Committee

The Council's current position is not to provide a white line in front of vehicle crossover. At the request of a member of the committee, the matter is to be revisited.

4. Details

4.1 In recent years the issue of vehicle crossovers and front garden parking has been the subject (or included along with other items) in a number of reports to this committee.

4.2 Prior to 2003 white lines were often used to highlight the presence of a drop crossing. The lines were not enforceable with 'parking tickets' and simply advised motorists of the presence of a crossover.

4.3 In September 2003 a report was considered by this committee (previously referred to as Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee) regarding the provision of drop crossings. In this report it recommended that the use of white lines to highlight a crossover is discontinued. The reason for discontinuing their use was to limit the number of road markings on the borough roads, this would then lessen the visual impact on the street scene and also dilute the impact of essential lines.

- 4.4 Later in September 2003 Cabinet adopted the principles considered by Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee as a 'Policy on Crossover'.
- 4.5 The provision of white lines is only advisory and can not be enforced. However a change in legislation, through the Traffic Management Act, allowed enforcement action to taken (the issuing of a Penalty Charge Notice) to vehicles parked across a formal crossover. It should be noted that the issuing of the PCN is not dependent on the presence of any line or sign but the owner of the property needs to request enforcement action is undertaken.
- 4.6 While the action outlined in the preceding paragraph is applicable in many situations it does not currently apply where a CPZ bay is marked across a driveway. In this situation during the hours of operation of the zone the designation of the parking bay would (in the view of the Council) override the issue of parking across an entrance.
- 4.7 Therefore a balance needs to be made between having long lengths of parking bays marked out and having separate bays between each and every crossover. The advantage of longer bays is that it maximises parking space and minimizes street clutter as there is less signage required (if individual bays are marked out then a separate sign would be required at each bay). The advantage of having separate bays is that you can ensure parking does not take place in front of a crossover, but at the expense of reducing the number of parking spaces.
- 4.8 In practice the longer bay lengths has worked reasonably well with only specific locations being addressed where a continuous and specific problem is highlighted.
- 4.9 The Council in 2005 consulted with the public on its Public Space Design Guide. However, before the document was consulted on it was considered (by way of a 'Call In') by this Committee. The committee confined its comments to ones relating to speed humps and bus lanes.
- 4.10 While the actual 'Public Space Design Guide' does not make specific reference to white lines at crossovers it does refer to the 'Crossover Policy' and the need to keep carriageway markings to a minimum.
- 4.11 The Public Space Design Guide was first approved by the then Cabinet Member for Environment & Planning in January 2006 and later updated by the Cabinet Member for Environment in December 2006.
- 4.12 In October 2006 the Cabinet Member for Environment made a Cabinet Member Decision to adopt (following public consultation) a supplementary planning document "Front Garden and other Street Parking Standards". In this document reference is made to not using white lines at drop crossings. Although the Cabinet Member Decision was not called-in, the Head of Planning Policy presented this committee with reports in January 2007 and March 2007 dealing with issues surrounding front garden parking.

5. Financial Implications

The cost of providing a white line is approximately £5.00 - £10.00 depending on length of line required and assumes that the contractor is able to undertake the work when in the vicinity.

6. Policy and Equality Implications

The report outlines the position of a current policy/planning guidance.

7. Environmental Impact Assessment

The Supplementary Planning Document '*Front Gardens and Other off Street Parking Standards*' has taken account of the impact on the environment of 'off street parking' and the provision of crossovers..

8. Background Papers

Cabinet Report on vehicle crossovers Sept. 2003
Supplementary Planning Document "Front Garden and other Off street Parking Standards" September 2006.
Public Space Design Guide (Updated December 2006)

9. Contacts

Andrew Darvill
Assistant Director for Environment
Tel 020 8891 7070
Email a.darvill@richmond.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank