

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9th February 2016
AGENDA ITEM:	7
SUBJECT:	Frant Road / Meadow View Road Area – Objections to the proposed extension of the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone)
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	BENSHAM MANOR AND WEST THORNTON
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: 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">• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6• The Croydon Plan 2nd Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.• 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 objections, survey and letters of support received to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Area) to Meadow View Road and the south-eastern end of Frant Road (between Bensham Lane and Meadow View Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.	

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in paragraph 3.12 not to proceed with the original proposals in Meadow View Road and the south-eastern end of Frant Road1.3 Inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision. |
|--|

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 extend the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Area) to Meadow View Road and the south-eastern end of Frant Road (between Bensham Lane and Meadow View Road) with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display machines (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

Objection 1

- 3.1 A local resident has objected to the scheme on the basis of what they see as a continued harassment from Croydon Council. She feels that the Council has relied on those who never voted in the informal consultation in order to obtain a majority. She also feels that it is a money making scheme, imposing hardship on families who are struggling financially.

Response – This scheme was conceived as a result of a petition from residents of Queenswood Avenue, requesting controlled parking on their street. The initial informal consultation resulting from this petition included roads surrounding Queenswood Avenue as well as Queenswood Avenue itself. This is normal practice as new parking controls tend to shift parking problems to adjacent roads. Therefore it makes sense to consult a wider area. This is the only reason why Frant Road was included in the consultation. A majority of respondents in Meadow View Road and the south-eastern end of Frant Road (between Bensham Lane and Meadow View Road) voted in favour of the scheme at the informal consultation stage, explaining why the scheme progressed on to the formal consultation stage in these streets. The cost of parking permits is the same across the borough. If this scheme were introduced, Frant Road and Meadow View Road residents would have to pay the same fee as those in existing CPZs.

Objection 2

- 3.2 A resident of Frant Road has objected on the basis that the parking charges are unaffordable. She chose to live on the street because of the free parking. With young children she prefers the convenience of being able to park freely on her road.

- 3.3 **Response** – Parking schemes such as this proposal have to be self-financing, residents permits cannot be provided free of charge. The cost of the first permit in particular (£80) is low compared with the overall cost of running a car. It is likely that the residents were aware of the cost of permits when they first petitioned the council.

Objection 3

- 3.4 An objection has been received from a resident of Frant Road who believes that the proposed scheme's hours of operation will not benefit residents. She states that although parking is indeed difficult during the daytime, it is in fact much worse in the evening and during the night. This is most likely due to the proximity to Croydon University Hospital where a large number of staff commute by car and park in the surrounding streets, including Frant Road and Meadow View Road. The objector feels that it is unfair expecting residents to pay for a permit when they will still face a struggle parking in the evening. She feels that longer hours of operation should have been considered in the streets around the hospital, 8am to 7:30pm is suggested.

Response – Currently the outer subzones of the Croydon CPZ operate between 9am and 5pm, Monday to Saturday, with the exception of a pilot scheme on Fairholme Road and Midhurst Avenue where the hours of operation have been changed experimentally to 8am to 8am, Monday to Sunday. The pilot scheme has only been in operation since early December, if it is successful there may be scope to increasing the hours of operation in other streets too.

Objection 4

- 3.5 An objection has been received from a resident of Queenswood Avenue who is concerned that it is not proposed to extend the parking controls into Queenswood Avenue. She believes that parking will be even more difficult on the road if the scheme goes ahead in its current form. Residents from within the zone who do not wish to purchase a permit are likely to park on Queenswood Avenue, along with staff from Croydon University Hospital and residents of Queenswood Avenue, making an already difficult situation worse.

Response – Although this consultation process was started by a petition from Queenswood Avenue, when the informal consultation was conducted, the residents of that street voted 'no' (only 47% of respondents were in favour of the scheme). The scheme was progressed in Meadow View Road and a section of Frant Road because a majority of respondents in those streets voted in favour (60% and 56% respectively). If the scheme were to go ahead in its current form it is likely that the parking situation in Queenswood Avenue (as well as Kingswood Avenue) would become a lot more difficult than at present. When CPZs are extended there is always a knock on effect to a certain degree on neighbouring roads. The effect on Queenswood Avenue and Kingswood Avenue would be especially bad as these two roads would be completely surrounded by controlled streets. Residents unable to find a parking space would most likely have to pay and display in a neighbouring controlled road. The nearest uncontrolled streets are Broughton Road, Whitehall Road, Dunheved Road North, Brigstock Road and Lakehall Road, which are already heavily parked on with limited available spaces.

Objection 5

- 3.6 An objection has been received from a resident of Meadow View Road who believes that there was no parking problem in this area until the neighbouring controlled zone was first implemented. He disagrees that non-residents and commuters are contributing to the parking problem, due to the distance from railway stations. Rather he believes that the majority of people parking in the area are visitors and outpatients attending Croydon University Hospital.

Response – It is known and expected that introducing controlled parking can move parking problems to neighbouring streets. The alternative would be to have no controlled parking zones at all which in an area like that near a major hospital in Greater London would most likely result in a chaotic situation where residents would find it even more difficult to park. It has been reported by many residents in their original questionnaire that hospital staff commuting by car and parking in this area cause much of the problem.

Objection 6

- 3.7 A resident of Frant Road has objected on the grounds that it was Queenswood Avenue who requested the controls originally, not Frant Road and Meadow View Road. He states that while hospital staff and visitors are causing parking problems, this problem lessens when they leave. He is concerned that there will be fewer parking spaces if the controls are introduced and believes that it is a money making scheme.

Response – It was necessary to consult surrounding streets in addition to Queenswood Avenue as new controls in this street would be likely to have an adverse effect on parking demand in neighbouring streets. Unfortunately a hospital functions all day every day meaning that there will always be a demand for spaces from staff who commute by car. The council decided to carry out this consultation as a direct result of the petition from the residents of Queenswood Avenue. Schemes such as this need to be self-financing - permit are never issued for free.

Objection 7

- 3.8 A resident of Frant Road has objected on the grounds that the road is safe since the introduction of speed humps. He believes that there is no problem finding a parking space, even on week days and that parking problems occur because of residents of the existing CPZ parking on Frant Road. He points out that installing restrictions on Frant Road will shift the problem to the next streets. He also objects on the grounds that the controls are unaffordable for local people. He questions why Frant Road is consulted every year and believes the proposed days of operation should be Monday to Friday instead of Monday to Saturday. He states that the charges for 3 cars are exploitative.

Response – Many residents believe that there is a parking problem in the area as illustrated by the responses to the questionnaires in the informal consultation. Council officers are aware that the problem may be shifted on to neighbouring streets but this problem will always exist unless CPZs were scrapped altogether. The first permit for a household is £80 which is relatively little compared with the

overall cost of running a car. It is approximately 7 years since Frant Road was last consulted on the introduction of controlled parking, certainly not every year. That consultation originated from a petition from the residents of Buxton Road. The suggested days of operation (Monday to Saturday) match the existing North Permit Area, which would minimise potential driver confusion. However, in hindsight a broader informal consultation could have been offered with options to choose preferred hours and days of operation. Charges are progressively higher for each car as a way of managing the amount of on-street parking available.

Petition/Survey

- 3.9 A survey of residents of Frant Road (mainly within the proposed controlled area) was carried out by one of the objectors. Residents were asked to provide their name and address as well as ticking whether they were 'for' or 'against' parking meters. 77 households within the relevant section of Frant Road participated in the survey. 20 voted yes, and 56 voted no, a vote of 26% in favour of Croydon Council's proposed scheme. 45 of the signatories had not previously returned their council provided questionnaires during the informal consultation. 4 of the 56 who ticked the 'against' box had voted in favour via the Council's questionnaire.

Response – This survey would appear to show that a majority of residents on Frant Road are against the introduction of parking controls in the street (26% in favour as opposed to 56% who favoured the scheme when consulted by Croydon Council). Care must be taken when analysing these results however as it is possible that residents may be pressured into voting a particular way when approached on their doorstep. The Council's survey provided residents with a questionnaire sheet and prepaid envelope which could be completed in private and without pressure.

Letter of Support 1

- 3.10 A letter of support was received from a resident of Frant Road who does not have off street parking. She frequently has trouble finding a parking space and hopes that the proposal would improve this problem. The lack of space causes much difficulty for the household particularly with visitors, deliveries and workmen. If the scheme were to go ahead, she hopes that cars will still be allowed to park on the pavement due to the narrowness of the road. She thinks that many residents are against the scheme because they want to park alongside their dropped kerbs and that some residents of the street park in their gardens even without a dropped kerb. She is concerned about the environmental impact of rainfall runoff from paving over so many front gardens.

Response – Officers believe that introducing the proposed controls would make it easier for drivers to obtain a space during the controlled hours. Outside of the controlled hours it is likely that it would still be difficult. Drawing no. PD284 supplied with the letter of 9th December 2015 to residents shows that parking bays would be marked partially on the footway in the locations where footway parking currently occurs. If the scheme were implemented single yellow lines would be painted alongside dropped kerbs which would operate alongside the parking bays. Although parking offstreet without a dropped kerb is illegal, the council do not normally enforce this contravention. Applications for driveways and dropped kerbs would not be affected by this proposal.

Letter of Support 2

- 3.11 A letter of support was received from a resident of Frant Road. The resident is objecting to the petition/survey/questionnaire which was submitted against the proposed scheme. She believed that the canvasser's approach was biased and requests that the results not be considered and that only the results from the council's private informal consultation be considered.
- 3.12 **Response** – Careful consideration must be given to the survey/petition in question as it is difficult for officers to know how reliable the answers are, particularly in light of this person's comments about the canvasser. The proposed extension to the zone is likely to improve parking conditions for residents and businesses on Frant Road and Meadow View Road during the hours of operation by reducing the level of commuter parking in the area. If the scheme were introduced problems would still exist after 5pm due to hospital staff working late shifts. The parking problems on Queenswood Avenue and Kingswood Avenue would get significantly worse. It is proposed not to proceed with this scheme at the current time and to continue to monitor the situation. If a future petition is received from roads in this area, an informal consultation offering a choice of hours and days of operation could be offered.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections from the public following the giving of public notice of the proposals. Once the notices were published, the public had up to 21 days to respond.
- 4.2 The legal process 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 notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed schemes to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.
- 4.3 Organisations such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK and bus operators are consulted separately at the same time as the public notice. Other organisations are also consulted, depending on the relevance of the proposal. No comments were received from any of these organisations.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £70k for the current 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.

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
<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>0</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Capital Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	36	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	25	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

2 The effect of the decision

- 2.1 If it was agreed to introduce parking controls into this areas the cost of extending controlled parking into Frant Road and Meadow View Road has been estimated at £25,000. This includes the provision of Pay & Display machines, signs and lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.
- 2.2 This cost could have been contained within the available capital budget for Controlled Parking Schemes under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2015/16.

3 Risks

- 3.1 There is no risk as it is proposed not to introduce parking controls at this time.
- 3.2 If controlled parking was introduced future income would 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 It is recommended not to extend the Controlled Parking Zone into this area at the current time due to the number of objections and petition. The alternative option is

to introduce controls into this area but this is likely to be seen as going against the wishes of the objectors.

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.

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

6. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

6.1 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.

6.2 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 have been considered and responded to in this report.

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

7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

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

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

8. EQUALITIES IMPACT

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

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

9.1 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.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 10.1 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.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into Frant Road (CPZ boundary to Meadow View Road) and Meadow View Road, since the majority of residents in these roads voted in favour of parking controls and a parking scheme should ensure adequate parking facilities for residents, visitors and for local businesses. Also the introduction of marked bays away from driveways, junctions and other locations where parking causes problems with yellow line waiting restrictions in between will ensure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all road users.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 12.1 An 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.
- 12.2 Consideration was given to not introducing parking controls in these roads due to the petition received. However, experience has shown that some residents can feel pressurised when confronted with a petitioner and that the informal questionnaire should be used as a better indication on whether there is support for parking controls.

REPORT AUTHOR: Teresa O'Regan – Traffic Engineer
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8762 6000
(Ext. 88260)

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972