

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 FEBRUARY 2016
AGENDA ITEM:	6
SUBJECT:	SUTHERLAND ROAD AREA – RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION TO THE POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH PERMIT ZONE)
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Planning and Environment
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Broad Green and West Thornton
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: This report is in accordance with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Croydon Plan; Transport Chapter.• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6• Croydon Corporate Plan 2013 – 15• www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/	
FINANCIAL IMPACT: These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: n/a	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they:- 1.1 Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposal to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Sutherland Road area. 1.2 Agree the extension of the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone)	

into Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road and Wentworth Road as shown on Plan no.PD 295

- 1.3 Delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Streets Directorate the authority to give notice and subject to receiving no objections on the giving of the public notice to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) in order to implement Recommendation 1.2 above.
- 1.4 Note that any material objections received following the giving of public notice will be reported to a future Traffic Management Advisory Committee for Members' consideration and onward recommendation to the Cabinet Member.
- 1.5 Note that the officer shall inform the respondents and consultees of the decision.
- 1.6 Note that officers will monitor parking conditions and complaints in the remaining consultation area for future review.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report considers the results of the informal consultation on the proposal to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Sutherland Road area which includes unrestricted roads between London Road, Mitcham Road, Thornton Road, Boston Road and Stanley Road.
- 2.2 It is recommended to proceed to the formal consultation stage with a proposal to extend controlled parking into Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road and Wentworth Road.

3 DETAIL

- 3.1 Petitions have been received from residents in Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road and the Wortley Road area. Currently lack of available parking including parking close to junctions and vehicular accesses is causing a number of problems in many of the roads mentioned in the petitions including safety concerns for road users, access issues for larger vehicles including delivery trucks, refuse vehicles and potentially fire appliances, stress for residents accessing their homes and customers for local businesses.
- 3.2 At the 6 October Traffic Management Advisory Committee meeting, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment authorised the extension of the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Sutherland Road area, as shown Drawing No. PD – 290 (minute A**/** refers). It was agreed to consult on extending the North Permit Zone due to the parking problems in the area which borders the existing zone and is close to Croydon University Hospital.
- 3.2 The informal consultation commenced on Monday, 14 December 2015 when 1742 sets of consultation documents comprising a letter, drawing, factsheet and questionnaire were hand-delivered to addresses within the proposed extension area. Included in each set was a pre-paid envelope for return of the questionnaire. The informal consultation documents are attached as appendix B to this report. The consultation ran for five weeks to Friday, 15 January 2016.

3.3 Consultees were requested to register their “Yes/No” preference votes on the questionnaire and return in the pre-paid envelope provided.

4 CONSULTATION

4.1 Over the 5 week consultation period a total of 498 questionnaires were received, representing a 29% response rate which is considered average for an informal consultation exercise of this type. Table 1 shows the results and returns for the individual roads in the consultation area.

4.2 **TABLE 1 – Results of the Questionnaire**

Road Name	Number of Consultees	Number of Responses Received	% Returned	Number of Responses in Favour	% in favour
Pemdevon Rd	144	54	38	43	80
Greenside Rd	119	38	32	32	84
Sutherland Rd	130	52	40	40	77
Wentworth Rd	133	53	40	38	72
Priory Rd	108	32	30	14	44
Mitcham Rd	131	30	23	5	17
Canterbury Rd	290	34	12	16	47
York Rd	19	6	32	2	33
Stanley Rd	156	46	29	18	39
Wortley Rd	59	18	31	9	50
Donald Rd	94	29	31	18	62
Lancing Rd	99	35	35	21	60
Boston Rd	140	43	31	9	21
Furtherfield Cl	35	7	20	4	57
Marden Cres	48	15	31	5	33
Marden Rd	37	12	32	2	17
Totals	1742	504	29	276	55

- 4.3 The results show that the majority of those in Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road, Wentworth Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road, Lancing Road and Furtherfield Close who responded to the informal consultation expressed a preference in favour of parking controls.
- 4.4 However, Wortley Road, Donald Road, Lancing Road and Furtherfield Close are relatively isolated to the other roads where residents have indicated that they are in favour of parking controls and a distance from the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone. For these reasons and the fact parking problems are generally lower than the other roads where residents have indicated a preference for controls it is suggested that parking conditions and complaints and requests from residents are monitored for future review.
- 4.5 Table 2 below contains the results for the sections of road where the scheme is proposed to proceed
- 4.6 **TABLE 2 – Results of the Questionnaire in roads the proposed extension area**

Road Name	Number of Consultees	Number of Responses Received	% Returned	Number of Responses in Favour	% in favour
Pemdevon Rd	144	54	38	43	80
Greenside Rd	119	38	32	32	84
Sutherland Rd	130	52	40	40	77
Wentworth Rd	133	53	40	38	72
Totals	526	197	37	153	78

- 4.7 Appendix A includes a summary of the comments that were received on the questionnaire sheets.
- 4.8 The questionnaire responses are considered to demonstrate the need for the extension of the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone into Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road and Wentworth Road as shown on drawing no PD 295 subject to formal consultation.
- 4.9 The extension of a Controlled Parking Zone requires the making of a Traffic Management Order. The legal process for making a Traffic Management Order requires that formal consultation takes place in the form of Public Notices published in the London Gazette and a local paper (Croydon Guardian). Although it is not a legal requirement this Council also fixes street notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed scheme and writes to occupiers who are directly affected to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.

- 4.10 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK, The Owner Drivers' Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport and bus operators are consulted under the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Additional bodies, up to 27 in total, are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposals.
- 4.11 Once the notices have been published the public has 21 days to comment or object to the proposals. If no relevant objections are received, subject to agreement to the delegated authority sought by the recommendations, the Traffic Management Order is then made. Any relevant objections received will be reported back to this Committee for a recommendation as to whether the scheme should be introduced as originally proposed, amended or abandoned and objectors informed of the decision.

5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £70k for the 2016/17 financial year. 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 this would leave £9k for the rest of the 2015/2016 financial year and utilise the full budget for 2016/17

1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2015/16 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000
<u>Revenue Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	4	93	100	100
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from Report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>4</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

**Capital Budget
available**

Expenditure	70	70	0	0
-------------	----	----	---	---

**Effect of Decision
from report**

Expenditure	2	70	0	0
-------------	---	----	---	---

Remaining Budget	<u>68</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
-------------------------	-----------	----------	----------	----------

2 The effect of the decision

2.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road and Wentworth Road has been estimated at £72,000. This includes the provision of Pay & Display machines, signs and lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.

2.2 This cost can be contained within the available capital budget for Controlled Parking Schemes under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2015/16 and 2016/17.

3 Risks

3.1 There is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate. However, this work is allowed for in the current budget.

3.2 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from Pay & Display takings and permit sales, together with enforcement of these controls through vehicle removals and Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

4 Options

4.1 The alternative option is not to introduce the parking controls. This could have a detrimental effect on residents in that they would continue to suffer with parking issues in relation to obstruction, road safety and traffic flow problems.

5 Savings/ future efficiencies

5.1 The current method of introducing parking controls is very efficient with the design and legal work being carried out within the department. 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.

5.2 Approved by: Louise Lynch, Finance Business Partner, Place Department.

6. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

6.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Section 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provides powers to introduce, implement and revoke 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 such matters as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.

6.2 The Council needs to comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Order 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.

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

7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

7.1 Enforcement of new parking schemes will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

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

8. CUSTOMER IMPACT

8.1 The proposed extension of the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into Meadow View Road and Frant Road is in response to known parking stress and support from local residents for controlled parking. Occupiers of all residential and business premises in the area were consulted to ensure that all those potentially affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views. Parking controls are only introduced in the area where the majority of residents are in favour of a scheme. The proposals are therefore likely to be seen as a positive move by the Council and should improve residents' and businesses' views of the work carried out by the Borough.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT

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

10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

10.1 Parking schemes are designed so that the signing is kept to a minimum to reduce the environmental impact. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

11.1 There are no such considerations arising from this report.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 The recommendations are to give notice of the proposals to extend the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into Sutherland Road, Pemdevon Road, Greenside Road and Wentworth Road and subject to receiving no objections on the giving of the public notice to make the necessary Traffic Management Order. It is considered that parking controls would improve parking conditions for residents and visitors whilst improving safety and access.

13. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 13.1 The alternative option would be not to proceed to give public notice but these would not accord with the expressed preference of the majority of those who responded to the informal consultation.

REPORT AUTHOR / CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager
Infrastructure – Parking Design, 020 8726 6000
(Ext 88260)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDIX A – Comments from the questionnaire

1 Included in the questionnaire was a comments box for respondents to respond in writing on the proposals. A summary of these comments is included in the table below.

2 **TABLE 3 – Comments from residents**

	Comment	No. of Comments
1	Difficulty in finding parking spaces	80
2	Wrong hours of operation proposed	41
3	Costs too much	37
4	Roads should be one-way	34
5	Money making scheme for Croydon Council	23
6	No parking problems in area	17
7	Parking problems caused by local garages	16
8	Visitors shouldn't have to pay	14
9	Local businesses would suffer if controls were introduced	12
10	CPZ doesn't guarantee a parking space	10
11	Residents only scheme preferred	9
12	Residents from other roads take spaces on road	8
13	Parking problems caused by hospital staff and visitors	7
14	CPZ will reduce the number of parking spaces	6
15	Residents should get free parking permits	6
16	New developments not providing enough parking spaces for residents	5
17	Want to continue to park across driveway	5
18	Controls should not operate on Saturdays	4
19	Permit prices will increase after introduction	3

20	Commuters park on road	3
21	Parking bays should be allocated to each household	3
22	Vehicles for sale on highway contribute to problem	3
23	Driveways are frequently blocked at present	3
24	Existing yellow lines are not maintained	2
25	Commercial vehicles left for extended periods of time	2
26	Parking problems caused by local pubs	2
27	Commuters will still park on street with controls	1
28	Permits should be limited to one per household	1
29	Will increase parking problems in adjacent roads	1
30	Consultation period too short	1
31	Want annual visitors permit	1
32	Residents currently block road with wheelie bins to save parking spaces	1
33	Controls not suitable for residents who drive a vehicle registered elsewhere	1
34	P&D machines are an eyesore	1
35	20mph zone or speed humps needed	1
36	Disabled parking bays are too large	1
37	Scheme will stop congestion	1
38	Will be difficult to sell property if controls introduced	1
39	Scheme will cause increased traffic	1
40	Scheme will bring criminals to road	1
41	Houses in multiple occupancy contribute to parking problem	1
42	All controlled parking zones should be removed	1
43	Council is harassing people	1