

# Croydon Council

For general release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b> <b>7 July 2015</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Jo Negrini, Executive Director Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Ashburton, Bensham Manor, Croham, Sanderstead and Thornton Heath</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b>  This report is in line with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies</li><li>• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6</li><li>• The Croydon Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.</li><li>• Croydon Corporate Plan 2013 – 15</li><li>• <a href="http://www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/">www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/</a></li></ul>	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPACT:</b>  These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
<b>FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:</b> n/a	
<b>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they agree to:  1.1 Consider the objections received to the proposed parking restrictions and the officer's recommendations in response to these in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Craigen Avenue / Selwood Rd, Ashburton – para 3.1 to 3.7</li><li>• Bensham Lane, Bensham Manor – para 3.8 to 3.11</li><li>• Mayfield Road, Croham – para 3.12 to 3.18</li></ul>	

- Beech Avenue, Sanderstead – para 3.19 to 3.22
- St Mary’s Road, Sanderstead – para 3.19 to 3.22
- Theresa’s Walk, Timberling Gardens and White Hill, Sanderstead – para 3.23 to 3.32
- Wharncliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath – para 3.33 to 3.43

1.2 Agree the following:

- Craigen Avenue / Selwood Rd, Ashburton – proceed as proposed
- Bensham Lane, Bensham Manor – proceed as proposed
- Mayfield Road, Croham – not to proceed with proposal
- Beech Avenue, Sanderstead – proceed as proposed
- St Mary’s Road, Sanderstead – proceed as proposed
- Theresa’s Walk, Timberling Gardens and White Hill, Sanderstead – proceed with amended proposal
- Wharncliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath – not to proceed with proposed

1.3 Delegate to the Enforcement and Infrastructure Manager, Highways & Parking Services the authority to make the necessary Traffic Management Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to implement recommendations 1.2 above.

2 1.4 Note the officer to inform the objectors of the above decision.

1.5 Note that the outcome of the monitoring of the bend opposite Nos. 2 and 4 Timberling Gardens shall be reported to the Members for further consideration future review of the proposed restriction as detailed in paragraph 3.32.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Craigen Avenue, Ashburton, Bensham Lane, Bensham Manor, Mayfield Road, Croham, Beech Avenue, St Mary’s Road, Theresa’s Walk, Timberling Gardens and White Hill, Sanderstead and Wharncliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath.

## 3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

### 3.1 Craigen Avenue/Selwood Road junction, Ashburton

3.2 A complaint was received regarding the on-going problem with vehicles parking close to this junction, which results in restricted sight lines and hinders large vehicles accessing the junction. Other junctions in this area have been treated with restrictions and surveys have confirmed that parking close to the junction causes obstruction problems. Therefore, double yellow line ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions returning 7 metres were proposed to reduce this problem.

3.3 Two residents have objected to the proposed restriction for the following reasons:-

- They live opposite the junction and have not observed a parking problem there. They demand to know the number of accidents at the junction as they have not been aware of any.
- Dropped kerbs near the junction ensure that lines of sight are protected as motorists avoid obstructing driveways.
- It is not in a driver's interest to park near a junction and risk damage to their vehicle.
- This junction is used by residents and parking is scarce because of the number of dropped kerbs in the vicinity.
- The restrictions will displace vehicles from the junction and make it more difficult for residents, their visitors and tradesmen to park, as a result.

3.4 **Response** - The purpose of the proposed waiting restriction is to improve visibility and safety on a junction where obstructive parking takes place. Although there have not been any traffic accidents at this location within the last three-year reporting period, a complaint has been received about the obstruction of sightlines and an engineer visiting the site has agreed that parking at this location blocks the view of oncoming traffic.

3.5 Although the properties fronting Craigen Avenue at its junction with Selwood Road have dropped kerbs, there are no dropped kerbs to deter parking in Selwood Road at its junction with Craigen Avenue, where parked vehicles could cause an obstruction. It is the Council's usual practice to continue waiting restrictions at junctions across adjacent dropped kerbs to ensure that any displaced vehicles do not block access to off-street spaces.

3.6 Whilst the proposed restrictions will remove approximately four parking spaces, they are minimal and confined to the junction, where vehicles should not park, in accordance with rule 243 of the Highway Code.

3.7 As the proposed restrictions are the minimum necessary to prevent obstructive parking at this junction, which has been the source of a complaint, it is proposed to proceed with the restrictions originally proposed at shown in plan no. **PD - 270a**.

### 3.8 **Bensham Lane, Bensham Manor**

3.9 Officers met a resident of Bensham Lane by Torridge Road (southern arm) to discuss an ongoing parking problem. Parking on the carriageway between a double yellow line and a footway parking bay is causing congestion along this busy road. There are footway parking bays along this section of the road due to the narrowness and the use of the road as a bus route. Consequently it was proposed to extend the existing restrictions by 5 metres.

- 3.10 A resident has objected to the proposed restriction on the grounds that it will remove parking for the affected frontages and make it more difficult to park within a reasonable walking distance of their homes. The resident also suggests that residents who are elderly or have mobility problems will be particularly affected.
- 3.11 **Response** - It is acknowledged that the proposal would remove one car space and displace one vehicle in Bensham Lane. However, the space is unsuitable for parking, creating a narrowing of the road. Partial footway parking bays have been provided on this (south-west) side of Bensham Lane, to prevent the obstruction that occurs when vehicles park fully on the carriageway on both sides of the road, but could not be provided at this location due to the positioning of a telegraph pole and lamp column. The opposite side of Bensham Lane is unrestricted, as is the majority of the carriageway in Torridge Road, which means that residents should still be able to park in the vicinity.
- 3.10 Residents who are eligible can apply for a disabled parking bay near their homes if they have mobility problems. Their Blue disabled badges also allow them to park for up to three hours on a single or double yellow line, although this would not be advisable at this location. The new restriction will not prohibit vehicles stopping to load/unload or to drop off or pick passengers, providing that the vehicle is moved once the activity is complete.
- 3.11 For the reasons detailed above, it is proposed to go ahead with the proposal as shown in plan no. **PD-270b**.
- 3.12 **Mayfield Road, Croham**
- 3.13 Two local residents requested that action be taken to prevent daytime parking in the above section of Mayfield Road due to increasing parking from the nearby Carlton Road business park. This road has a bus stop and is a busy access road between Croydon and Sanderstead, avoiding the Brighton Road. Existing 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday waiting restrictions are in place on the east side of the road between the Sanderstead Station entrance and Brambledown Road. Surveys have confirmed that double parking along the section leading to Essenden Road is causing congestion, conflict with opposing vehicles and delays to bus services and it was proposed to extend the restrictions as shown on plan no. **PD – 270e** to resolve these issues.
- 3.14 A petition objecting to the proposed restriction has been received, signed by 19 residents representing 11 (37%) of the 30 households in this section of Mayfield Road. One of the signatories to the petition also sent an individual letter of objection, which repeated some of the main objections detailed in the petition.
- 3.15 The petition was in the form of a statement signed by residents of the affected households and accompanied by individual forms on which each household indicated their objections to the scheme. The statement was as follows:-

“We, the undersigned, firmly oppose the Council’s proposal to introduce single yellow line waiting restrictions on the east side, from the common boundary of Nos. 116 and 118 to the common boundary of Nos. 100 and 102, operating from 8am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday.

The individual stated reasons for opposing the proposal are indicated on the relevant sheet submitted by the occupant(s) of each property that will be directly affected by the Council’s decision.”

3.16 The petition was accompanied by a detailed covering letter from the petition’s organiser, the main points of which are summarised below.

- The problem cited by the original complainants does not exist and this is agreed by every resident present on both side of the affected section of Mayfield Road.
- There is abundant off-street parking at the Carlton Road Business Park which is not fully occupied.
- If there were overspill parking from the Business Park the vehicles would park on the unrestricted section of slip road that extends from Carlton Road to the Business Park as this is the nearest location to the Business Park, but cars are not parked there.

3.17 The individual objections made by residents on the sheets provided by the lead petitioner are shown in the table below. They indicate that the main objections that residents cited were displacement parking, potential increased vehicle speed and the lack of any evidence of a parking problem requiring a waiting restriction. Residents’ opinion that there was not a parking problem was the most popular reason for objecting to the proposed restrictions.

<b>Summarised reason for Objection</b>	<b>Number of residents in agreement</b>
I do not have off-road parking available and would be forced to park my car a considerable distance from my home	<b>1</b>
I would not be able to park outside my home during the proposed restricted hours	<b>2</b>
My family & friends would not be able to park near my home when visiting during the proposed restricted hours	<b>3</b>
I have elderly and/or disabled visitors who would struggle because they will be compelled to park a significant distance from my home	<b>1</b>
There will be complications/difficulties for me to receive deliveries/ obtain services at my home because all delivery/tradesmans’ vehicles, and their equipment will not be allowed to park outside or near my home.	<b>2</b>
I believe that the market value of my house will depreciate because of the obvious loss of parking facility directly outside my home	<b>2</b>

The proposed yellow line would displace parking from one side of the road to the other and destroy the existing parking balance	<b>8</b>
The removal of parking would cause an increase in speed of vehicles	<b>9</b>
The restriction would make this section of the street feel less residential and more like a primary traffic route	<b>7</b>
When vehicles park on both sides of the road there are no significant hindrances for passing vehicles	<b>7</b>
There is no evidence to substantiate the claim that there is a overspill parking from the Capital Business Park – it's clear to residents that such a problem does not exist	<b>11</b>

3.18 **Response** – The extension of the single yellow line in Mayfield Road was proposed in response to a complaint from local residents. However, it is clear from the petition that a significant proportion of residents living in that section of the road do not agree that there is a parking problem there, or that a waiting restriction is necessary. Whilst some of the residents' concerns about the proposed restriction can be allayed (e.g. vehicles would still be able to stop on the yellow line to drop-off/ pick up passengers or load/unload) their main objection is that the restriction is not needed. In view of this and the strength of feeling with which it has been expressed, it is not proposed to go ahead with the waiting restriction in Mayfield Road, although the location will be monitored for future review.

3.19 **Beech Avenue and St Mary's Road, Sanderstead**

3.20 Objections to the proposed restrictions in Beech Avenue and St Mary's Road were reported to this committee at its meeting on 29 April 2015 (Agenda item 10 refers). The committee recommended that Officers should consult Ward Councillors for confirmation as to whether the restrictions should proceed.

3.21 Ward Councillors have since been consulted and agree that the restrictions should go ahead as proposed, as recommended in the report of 29 April.

3.22 In view of the above it is proposed that the restrictions in these locations should go ahead as shown in the plans no. **PD-261I** and no. **PD- 261g**.

3.23 **Theresa's Walk, Timberling Gardens and White Hill, Sanderstead**

3.24 A request was received from a local resident concerned that commuter parking (mainly using nearby Sanderstead Station) is now taking place on junctions and bends on this small estate, creating safety and obstruction concerns. Surveys confirmed that this is an issue and therefore, it was proposed to introduce double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions at junctions and on bends.

3.25 Three commuters have objected to the introduction of waiting restrictions in these streets for the following reasons:-

- There are no parking problems on these roads – all houses have off-street parking and the roads are wide. Refuse vehicles and emergency services have no access problems.
- The roads are quiet, filled by commuters in the morning but emptying in the evening.
- The corners of these roads are wide and provide ample manoeuvring space even when cars are parked there.
- Restrictions in these roads will force commuters to move into busier through-routes, causing more disruption.
- The Council has a responsibility to all road users, including commuters, some of whom are also local residents.
- Residents of these roads have affixed unofficial “no parking” signs and installed cones in some parts of the road to prevent their use – the Council should remove these.
- The cost of parking in the station car parks is prohibitive.

3.26 Two residents of the affected roads have written in support of the proposed restrictions. One of these residents has also suggested that a further single yellow line waiting restriction should be considered due to commuters parking on a narrow part of the road, making passing difficult. The resident’s suggestion will be investigated and any resulting proposals reported to a future committee. The other resident states that although they are mainly in support of the proposals, they object to the proposed restrictions on the bend opposite Nos. 2 and 4 Timberling Gardens as they feel that this will displace the vehicles currently parking there to the area outside the houses opposite, thereby narrowing the road and making passing difficult. The resident comments that there is plenty of “central space” on this bend to allow vehicles to turn into Timberling Gardens even when cars are parked there.

3.27 **Response** - Although it may not appear to a commuter that there are parking problems in these roads, a resident complained that there was an issue with commuter parking at bends and junctions and this was confirmed by surveys. The letters of support for these proposals, received from other residents of the affected roads, also confirm that there is a parking problem in the area as far as residents are concerned.

3.28 The fact that the roads are so heavily parked that vehicles are left on junctions and corners indicates that they are not quiet during the day when commuters are present. Surveys have confirmed that vehicles parking in these locations cause an obstruction to sightlines and hinder the manoeuvres of other vehicles.

3.29 The proposed restrictions are confined to junctions and corners and are the minimum required to address residents’ concerns. The majority of the

carriageway in these roads will remain available for parking by both residents and commuters.

- 3.30 Residents are not permitted to reserve parking spaces by blocking the carriageway with cones or other items. This is a highway enforcement issue and the Council's Highways Inspectors have been alerted about the commuters' complaints so that they can investigate and take action as appropriate. The Council has no power to remove signs affixed to private property.
- 3.31 There are three off-street parking options in the area with a comparable range of daily charges, two of which are privately operated. The Council has no control over the parking charges that apply at the station car parks, which are controlled by Southern railways. However, the daily parking charge at the Council run car park at Sanderstead Road (£4.20 for six to 11 hours of parking) compares favourably to the daily charge at Sanderstead Station (£5.50 per day, Monday to Friday) and is only £1.00 more than the daily charge at Purley Oaks Station car park (£3.20 per day). Both the station car parks offer lower rates for weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual parking charges, which should make it cheaper and more convenient for commuters.
- 3.32 The proposal for restrictions on the bend opposite Nos. 2 and 4 Timberling Gardens has been reconsidered in the light of the resident's comments. As the location is not a sharp bend and the displacement of parking could potentially cause a narrowing of the road at this point, it is recommended that the restrictions proposed at this bend should not be progressed and the location monitored for a possible future review. However, in view of the other factors detailed above, and taking into account that the objections were mainly received from commuters whilst residents requested and have since written in support of these restrictions, it is proposed to proceed with the original proposals in all other locations within Timberling Gardens, Theresa's Walk and White Hill, as shown on plan no. **PD – 270jr.**
- 3.33 **Wharncliffe Gardens, Thornton Heath**
- 3.34 A local resident of this cul-de-sac requested help to reduce a conflict problem in the road where parking on two bends restricts sight lines. Surveys have shown that parking at these locations increases conflict problems and therefore it was proposed to introduce double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the bends, matching nearby restrictions at its junction with South Norwood Hill.
- 3.35 Three residents have objected to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines at this location for the following reasons:-
- Many residents do not have driveways and are already competing for spaces. The restrictions will prevent parking outside the objectors' homes and this will be inconvenient as one of the residents has young children.



- Parking further from the house/out of view of the house is an issue for one of the residents who has recently been burgled and is concerned about security.
- Traffic in the road consists only of local residents and their visitors.
- There must be give and take on all roads and there are no accident, congestion or safety problems in the road.
- Refuse vehicles, delivery and skip lorries have regularly accessed the road without a problem.
- A footway scheme and 20mph speed limit would be more effective than the proposed restrictions.
- The bend outside Nos. 1 to 3 Wharncliffe Gardens is very slight and the yellow line would be more appropriate on the opposite side of the road.
- The properties opposite the bend outside Nos. 4 to 6 did not receive notification of the proposals.
- A large number of vehicles access the road without realising it's a cul-de-sac and this could be reduced with additional signs facing towards South Norwood Hill.

- 3.36 **Response** – The purpose of the proposed waiting restrictions as shown on plan no. **PD - 270p** is to improve visibility and safety on bends where parking causes a conflict problem. The proposed restrictions are the minimum necessary to deal with the issue a resident has raised and are consistent with Rule 243 of the Highway Code, which says that vehicles should not park on bends.
- 3.37 Although the residents whose frontages are directly affected will no longer be able to park outside their homes, the majority of the road will remain unrestricted and residents should still be able to park in the vicinity of their houses.
- 3.38 The Council is in the process of rolling out 20mph zones across the borough and this programme should eventually include Wharncliffe Gardens. However, the street does not fit the criteria for a footway parking scheme as the carriageway is of an average width which should allow vehicles to pass each other.
- 3.39 Parking restrictions on bends are generally placed on the apex or inside of the bend as this is the most effective position to protect sightlines. Therefore, moving the restrictions to the opposite side of the road, as the resident suggests, would not be appropriate.
- 3.40 Letters detailing the proposed restrictions were sent to all affected frontages (those that would have restrictions placed outside), as part of the Council's normal Traffic Management Order consultation process. Residents opposite the proposed restrictions were not sent letters, but public notices were displayed at the locations that would be affected by the proposals, which were also advertised on the Council's website, in the local press and the London Gazette.
- 3.41 The suggestion regarding additional signs (road signs in Wharncliffe Gardens already indicate that it is a cul-de-sac) was passed to the Highways section for consideration. They have commented that the Council is committed to the reduction of signage clutter, and to this end, it is usual practice for cul-de-sac

signs to be incorporated into the street name plates, as they are in Wharncliffe Gardens. They also suggest that the number of motorists that inadvertently turn into Wharncliffe Gardens thinking this is a through route is likely to be very small and they are unlikely to repeat the mistake.

3.42 Whilst it appears that there may be a conflict problem in Wharncliffe Gardens, as evidenced by the original complaint from a resident, the comments of the objectors indicate that the problem is low level and one that does not cause regular obstruction difficulties to residents or larger vehicles such as delivery trucks and skip lorries. In addition, as pointed out by one of the objectors and confirmed by comments from the Highways section, Wharncliffe Gardens is a cul-de-sac with traffic confined mainly to residents and their visitors. The comparatively light traffic levels mean the likelihood of conflict between passing vehicles is reduced. In view of these factors and the strength of feeling which has been expressed by 3 residents, it is proposed not to go ahead with the waiting restriction in Wharncliffe Gardens at the current time, but to monitor traffic and parking conditions in the road for future review.

#### 4. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is a revenue budget of £50k for CPZ undertakings and £50k for Footway Parking and Disabled Bays, from which these commitments if approved will be funded from. Attached to the papers of this meeting is a summary of the overall financial impact of this and other applications for approval at this meeting. If all applications were approved there would remain £11k un-allocated to be utilised in 2014/2015. If all applications were approved there would remain £65k un-allocated to be utilised in 2015/2016.

##### 4.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Revenue Budget available</b>				
<b>Expenditure</b>	70	100	100	100
<b>Income</b>	0	0	0	0

<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>	0	0	0	0
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	0	0	0	0

## 4.2 The effect of the decision

4.2.1 The cost of introducing new waiting restrictions at the above locations (in conjunction with the restrictions on the same public notice) including advertising the Traffic Management Orders and associated lining and signing has been estimated at £9,200.

4.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budgets for 2015/16.

## 4.3 Risks

4.3.1 Whilst there is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate, this work is allowed for in the current budgets for 2015/16.

4.3.2 The cost per restriction is reduced by introducing a number of parking restrictions in one schedule and therefore spreading the legal costs.

## 4.4 Options

4.4.1 The alternative option is to not introduce the parking restrictions. This could cause traffic obstruction and have a detrimental effect on road safety.

## 4.5 Savings/future efficiencies

4.5.1 The current method of introducing parking restrictions is very efficient with the design and legal (Traffic Management Order) work being carried out within the department.

4.5.2 The marking of the bays and the supply and installation of signs and posts is carried out using the new Highways Contract and the rates are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.

4.5.3 Approved by: Louise Phillips, Business Partner, Place Department.

## 5. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

5.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Sections 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provide powers to introduce and implement Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement

of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The Council must also have regard to matters such as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.

5.2 The Council must comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations must be considered before a final decision is made.

5.3 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor and Monitoring.

## **6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

6.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

6.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of Human Resources, Chief Executive Department.

## **7. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

7.1 An initial Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and it is considered that a Full EqIA is not required.

## **8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

8.1 Double yellow line waiting restrictions do not require signage therefore these proposals are environmentally friendly. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

## **9. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT**

9.1 Waiting restrictions at junctions are normally placed at a minimum of 10 metres from the junction, which is the distance up to which the Police can place Fixed Penalty Charge Notices to offending vehicles regardless of any restrictions on the ground.

## **10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 The recommendation is to introduce the original proposals in Craigen Avenue, Beech Avenue, Bensham Lane, St Mary's Road (Sanderstead) and Wharncliffe Gardens, to proceed with an amended proposal in respect of Timberling Gardens

and not to proceed with the proposed restriction in Mayfield Road, Croham. These proposals will improve visibility and safety at locations where there are particular concerns over safety and access due to obstructive parking. Surveys have been undertaken which confirm the parking problems and justification to introduce new restrictions.

## **11. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 11.1 The alternative to new double yellow line waiting restrictions would be additional single yellow line daytime restrictions. However, as these locations are ones where obstructive parking causes traffic flow or road safety concerns, 'At any time' waiting restrictions are more appropriate to prevent obstructive parking at all times.

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Order Engineer  
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8604 7363  
(Ext. 47363)

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,  
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8726 6000  
(Ext. 88229)

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**