

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 8 February 2017
AGENDA ITEM:	7
SUBJECT:	SUTHERLAND ROAD AREA – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH PERMIT ZONE)
LEAD OFFICER:	Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Broad Green 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 2015 – 18• www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/	
FINANCIAL IMPACT: These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: Not a Key Decision	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they: 1.1 Consider the objections to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Area) to Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display (12 hours maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday.	

- | |
|---|
| <p>1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone into the above roads as shown on drawing no. PD - 329 for the reasons as set out in this report.</p> <p>1.3 Inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision.</p> |
|---|

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 Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display machines (12 hours maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 In December 2015 an experimental scheme with increased hours of operation from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday to 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls was introduced in Fairholme Road and Midhurst Avenue following a petition from residents concerned with the level of evening and Sunday parking creating problems for residents. Following a consultation in October 2016 in which the majority of residents voted in favour of the new hours of operation this scheme was made permanent.
- 3.2 Following petitions from Pemdevon Road, Wentworth Road and Wortley Road in 2015 residents were consulted on a possible extension of the North Permit Zone in a large area bounded by the existing Controlled Parking Zone, Mitcham Road, Thornton Road, Marden Crescent, Boston Road and Stanley Road in December 2015 and January 2016.
- 3.3 On 9 February 2016 the committee agreed a report (minute A5/16 refers) to extend the zone into the Sutherland Road / Canterbury Road area following a positive response from most households and businesses that responded to the questionnaire.
- 3.4 Following detailed design occupiers in this area were formally consulted (public notice stage) on a proposal with 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday proposal and objections included in a report to the 5 October 2016 committee meeting (minute A55/16 refers) recommending that the zone should be extended into this area.
- 3.5 At a public meeting in July 2016 residents in the Sutherland Road area indicated that 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls would be more 'fit for purpose'. A decision was made to consult all households and businesses in the North Permit Zone to determine support for these increased operational hours. The results were included in a report to the meeting of 19 December 2016 (minute A66/16 refers) and a

decision was made to only introduced 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls within the proposed extension area.

- 3.6 All occupiers were written to in early January 2017 regarding the proposed increased hours with a copy of the public notice and given the opportunity to object to the proposal.

4. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

4.1 Objection Petition

A petition has been received, signed by 735 residents and businesses both within the proposed extension area, in nearby roads and other areas in and out of the Borough.

- 4.2 The petition is titled '*Parking Petition*' and states;

'Response to the statutory notice issued by Croydon Council (PD/CH/A55-A57) in respect of its proposal to increase the operational hours of the North Permit Zone to 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday into Pemdevon Road, Fairholme Road, Greenside Road, Midhurst Avenue, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priors Road, Canterbury road, Lancing Road, Donald Road and Wortley Road. We, the undersigned, reject the proposal and SAY NO to the proposed increased operational hours of 8am – 8pm.'

4.3 Response

An analysis of the petition gives the following facts for roads within the proposed extension area:

4.3.1 Canterbury Road

- 69 signatories
- Five of these responded to the informal consultation questionnaire.
- Two voted yes.
- Three voted no.

4.3.2 Priors Road

- 3 signatories
- None of the three responded to the informal consultation questionnaire.

4.3.3 Wentworth Road

- 6 signatories
- None of the six responded to the informal consultation questionnaire.

4.3.4 Sutherland Road

- 9 signatories
- Two of these signatories responded to the informal consultation questionnaire.
- Both voted no.

4.3.5 Greenside Road

- 4 signatories
- None of the four responded to the informal consultation questionnaire

4.3.6 Pemdevon Road

- 17 signatories
- Two of these signatories responded to the informal consultation questionnaire
- One voted yes.
- One voted no.

4.3.7 Lancing Road

- 8 signatories
- Five of these responded to the informal consultation questionnaire
- All five voted no.

4.3.8 Donald Road

- 7 signatories
- Two of these signatories responded to the informal consultation questionnaire
- One voted yes.
- One voted no.

4.3.9 Wortley Road

- 4 signatories
- One of these signatories responded to the informal consultation questionnaire.
- They voted yes.

4.4 Petitions are a useful tool to show the strength of feeling either for a proposal (such as in this case) or for a request for action and in the case where residents request parking controls the Council encourages residents to send in petitions to instigate an informal consultation process. More weight is given to completed questionnaires where the responded can make their own informed decision on whether they want a scheme to be introduced into their road. Very little time is normally given to petitioners to make a decision on the subject. Residents were consulted on the 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls in November 2016 and within the proposed extension area the results indicated the following:

4.5 TABLE 1 – Results of the consultation Response in the Sutherland Road / Canterbury Road area

Road Name	Number of addresses consulted	Number of Responses Received	% Returned	Number of Responses in Favour	% in favour
Lancing Road	99	28	28	13	46
Donald Road	94	20	21	17	85
Wortley Road	59	14	24	12	86
Canterbury Road	292	26	9	10	38
Priory Road	108	22	20	20	91
Wentworth Road	133	34	26	28	82
Sutherland Road	132	44	33	30	68
Greenside Road	119	29	24	20	69
Pemdevon Road	144	39	27	28	72
<i>Midhurst Avenue*</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>Fairholme Road*</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>67</i>
Totals	1377	307	22	215	70

* *Midhurst Avenue and Fairholme Road currently have 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls and residents also voted separately on retaining these controls*

4.6 The petition has confirmed the fact that the majority of residents and businesses in Canterbury Road who responded are not in favour of parking controls whereas there is little change in the remaining area where (apart from Lancing Road) the majority of respondents continue to be in favour of parking controls.

4.7 It would not be possible to introduce parking controls in Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road without including Canterbury Road which links the existing Controlled Parking Zone and the proposed Sutherland Road extension area with these 3 roads. Currently there are double yellow line 'At any time' waiting restrictions on the south side of Canterbury Road along its entire length reducing the availability of parking for residents and businesses.

4.8 **Objection 1**

A resident of Canterbury Road has objected on the grounds that:

- The Council hasn't disclosed why this scheme is being proposed and how the decision to proceed was made.
- There is concern that the child care provider will struggle to find parking near the address and worries that friends and family may not visit due to the charges.

- Whilst not currently a car owner, there is concern that should a car be purchased in the future, this scheme will result in an additional financial burden.

4.9 **Response** – The consultation documents, delivered to all addresses within the consultation area contains information on the origins of this proposal. It is expected that should the scheme proceed, it should be easier for motorists to find parking spaces during the hours of operation. Visitors will have the option of using visitor permits, which for a full day's parking, are better value than paying at a meter.

4.10 **Objection 2**

A resident of Canterbury Road is objecting on the grounds that:

- This proposal is extending the hours beyond those of the original proposal of 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday.
- This will adversely affect local residents instead of outsiders who park in the area.
- Most of the parking problems are caused by local garages which are mainly closed by 6pm.
- This area is a mile from West Croydon Station and Croydon town centre and residents shouldn't be charged just to live in the area.
- Residents should be able to use one permit for two cars.

4.11 **Response** – The Council was preparing to introduce the scheme with the original 9am to 5pm restrictions but was prompted to alter the proposal and extend the hours at the insistence of local residents. It was these residents who requested that Sunday be included. The permit charge will only apply to those in the area who choose to purchase a permit. Costs will not directly affect those who choose not to have cars. Permits are only allocated to individual cars. Households with more than one car are welcome to purchase additional permits.

4.12 **Objection 3**

A resident of Greenside Road is objecting on the grounds that:

- The minutes of the TMAC meeting of December 2016 misrepresent what was said at a meeting in July which the local M.P. arranged with residents to discuss parking and other traffic issues.
- There was no consensus at the July meeting to introduce further parking controls in the area.

4.13 **Response** – The information on the July meeting with residents, organised by local M.P. was relayed back by a senior council officer. A majority of residents on Greenside Road, as well as other roads in the area have voted to proceed with the updated proposal.

4.14 **Objection 4**

An objection has been received from a resident of an undisclosed road on the grounds that:

- The original proposal of 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday was suitable.

- The reason that residents wanted controlled parking was to deal with the no. of car repair garages in the area. Their business hours are 9am to 5pm.
- 4.15 **Response** – Council officers were prepared to introduce the original scheme which would only have operation between 9am and 5pm Monday to Saturday. It was due to the demands of local residents that the proposed hours were changed.
- 4.16 **Objection 5**
An objection has been received from a resident of Pemdevon Road on the grounds that:
- They think it will cost £100 for a visitor staying for one week to park on their road.
 - They think that visitors will be unhappy to pay and may visit less often as a result.
- 4.17 **Response** – The figure of £100 is incorrect. If this scheme were to go ahead, it would cost £28 for a visitor to park in the zone for 7 days. If visitors choose not to purchase visitors' permits they have the option of parking outside the controlled parking zone for free or of using public transport.
- 4.18 **Objection 6**
An objection has been received from a resident of Priory Road on the grounds that:
- They cannot expect visitors to pay for parking when visiting.
 - They do not believe that the proposed scheme will help the parking situation in the area
- 4.19 **Response**
Visitors' permits currently cost £4 for a full day. This is significantly cheaper than the pay and display cost of £9.60 for 12 hours. Visitors may also park outside the controlled parking zone for free or use public transport. Priory Road is close to both London Road and Mitcham Road, both of which are well served by public transport. Controlled parking with similar hours of operation has recently been introduced on Midhurst Avenue and Fairholme Road. Evidence from these streets suggests that the scheme has been effective in improving the parking situation and a similar result would be expected in Priory Road, should this scheme proceed.
- 4.20 **Objection 7**
An objection has been received on the grounds that:
- The proposals would cause some residents to be priced out of the area
- 4.21 **Response**
Currently the first resident's permit purchased by a household costs £80 per annum. This is merely a fraction of the overall cost of running a car and the associated expenses. It works out at less than £1.60 per week.
- 4.22 **Objection 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13**
Six objections have been received to the scheme with no details as to the nature of the objections.

4.23 **Objection 14**

An objection has been received on the grounds that:

- The objector's parent lives within the consultation area and requires regular visits from family.
- The proposal is unworkable for residents.
- Residents already pay motor and council tax.
- The proposal is a money making scheme.
- Family members need to be able to park without fear of getting a ticket.
- The scheme will put a strain on resources.
- They have a right to park on the street without being forced into another area.
- The proposal will 'lead to contention and a disregard for the Council'.
- They particularly object to the scheme operating on Sundays from 8am to 8pm.

4.24 **Response**

Visitors will not be prevented from parking on the street in the event that this scheme is implemented. They will have the option of purchasing either visitors permits or pay and display vouchers. Visitors permits being the cheaper option. They also may park for free outside the hours of operation. This proposal is a direct result of requests from residents for controlled parking in the area. Schemes such as this are expected to be self-financing. The original proposal was to introduce the controls only on Monday to Saturday, and only from 9am to 5pm. This was approved. However, at the request of residents the proposal was altered to include Sundays and the longer daily hours of operation.

4.25 **Objection 15**

An objection has been received from someone with a parent within the consultation area on the grounds that:

- They believe that the proposed scheme will not help the parking situation.
- They believe that local businesses will continue to park many cars on the streets.
- The majority of houses have at least two cars and spaces are limited.
- They visit their parent for at least two days every week and they would have to pay to park.
- They believe that the scheme would cause more problems than it would solve.
- Although parking is difficult they can usually find a space within five or ten minutes.
- The roads should be made one-way to deal with road rage.

4.26 **Response**

In the event that this scheme goes ahead and residents feel that it is not effective in solving the parking problems on the street, residents are entitled to petition the council to remove or alter the scheme. Businesses are allowed to purchase up to two business permits and may purchase pay and display vouchers for other vehicles. Spaces are indeed limited, both currently and under the proposed scheme. Residents may use their residential permit to park in neighbouring roads within the North Zone in the appropriate bays. If residents want one-way systems introduced they need to request that their ward councillor's contact the relevant team within the Council.

4.27 **Objection 16**

An objection has been received from a resident of Canterbury Road on the grounds that:

- When they purchased their home in 2014 they were advised that the Council was not intending to introduce any additional parking controls in this area of Croydon.
- They believe that the scheme is not convenient for residents.
- If a resident returns after 8pm when the controls are not in force there will be no parking spaces and it may take some time to find somewhere to park. It could be a safety issue for women.
- Introduction of the scheme does not guarantee residents a parking space on their street or any adjacent street.

4.28 **Response**

This scheme was not planned until residents petitioned the Council in 2015. Council officers could not have predicted that a petition was imminent. The proposal was prompted by petitions by residents of the area. Those who signed the petition and voted in favour of the scheme at the informal consultation scheme appear to believe that the scheme will be convenient for them. The parking situation outside of the hours of operation would be similar to how things stand at the moment. It is not possible for the Council to guarantee a parking space for any resident. They are allocated on a first come first served basis.

4.29 **Objection 17**

An objection has been received on the grounds that:

- The cost of the residential parking permits are too high.
- The cost of the first and second permits (£80 and £126 respectively) are roughly in line with other London boroughs.
- The cost of the third permit (£305) is too high at almost twice the cost of the second highest charging borough.
- The permit costs should be lowered and should be in line with the surrounding London boroughs.

4.30 **Response**

Residents were aware of the cost of permits at the time of petitioning the council and the initial consultation taking place. There is only a finite amount of on street parking space. Higher charges for second and third permits help deal with the issue of supply and demand by encouraging motorists to explore other modes of transport. The area is well served by public transport.

4.31 **Objection 18**

An objection has been received from a resident of the consultation area on the ground that:

- It is insulting that visitors will need to pay to park.
- They have a regular visitor for three days each week who cannot afford the charges.

- Their visitor never has trouble finding a parking space.

4.32 **Response**

Visitors' permits will be available in the area, costing less than pay and display vouchers. Visitors who do not want to or cannot afford to pay can park in uncontrolled neighbouring roads. While the visitor may not have experienced problems parking in the area, there are many residents who have requested and are supporting this scheme who have experienced problems.

4.33 **Objection 19**

An objection has been received from a resident of Canterbury Road on the grounds that:

- The scheme will serve no purpose but to increase the financial burden on local residents.
- Many residents of the street are in low income jobs.
- They would be forced to get rid of their car or would have to work two jobs.
- The scheme would increase parking issues.
- The scheme will not increase road safety.
- A 20 mph speed limit should be introduced.

4.34 **Response**

The cost of the first permit per household is £80, this is insignificant compared to the overall cost of running a car. There is currently a public consultation to introduce 20mph speed limits at various streets around the borough, including Canterbury Road.

4.35 **Objection 20**

An objection has been received on the grounds that:

- Residents pay enough for council and road tax.
- The scheme should be introduced on the main roads but not on back streets.

4.36 **Response**

Residents are charged for permits as the scheme needs to be self-financing. Requests were received from residents on minor roads, this consultation is taking those views into account.

4.37 **Objection 21**

An objection has been received from a resident of Priory Road on the grounds that:

- The controls should end at 4pm on Saturdays and Sundays and bank holidays should be uncontrolled.
- A one way street should be introduced.
- The cost of the second permit is too high.

4.38 **Response**

The longer days and hours of operation have been chosen at the request of local residents. If there is demand for a one way street, the appropriate Council team should be contacted. Information about the cost of the resident's permits has always been available. The scheme has support on Priory Road despite the associated costs.

4.39 **Objection 22**

An objection has been received on the grounds that:

- Their mother lives within the consultation area and is registered disabled.
- The scheme would severely restrict visitors. Their mother is regularly visited by care assistants, relatives and friends.
- As a result of the scheme many of these people may no longer visit due to the charges levied.
- They would prefer 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday restrictions.

4.40 **Response**

Visitors may purchase visitors permits or park outside the controlled zone. Longer restrictions have been proposed at the request of residents.

4.41 **Support 1**

A letter of support has been received from a resident of Lancing Road. They support the scheme due to the continuous parking problems which they face on their street. There are two garages on Lancing Road are approximately 20-25 parking spaces are always occupied by the vehicles under repair. Some vehicles do not move for up to six months and vehicles are regularly repaired on the street. He regularly has to park three or four streets away and carry his children back to the house.

4.42 **Response**

If the proposed scheme were to proceed, garages would be required to place pay and display tickets on all cars on the highway. It is likely that most would be moved off street to avoid paying the charge, freeing up spaces for residents.

4.43 **Support 2**

A letter of support has been received. It did not contain any additional details.

5 **CONSULTATION**

5.1 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 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.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Revenue Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
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>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Capital Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	110	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	110	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

6.2 The effect of the decision

6.2.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into the Sutherland Road / Canterbury Road area is estimated at £110,000. This includes the provision of 22 Pay & Display machines, signs and lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.

6.2.2 £30k of the funding required for this scheme is from the £30k budget for Controlled Parking Scheme under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2016/17. The remaining £80k will be funded through re-allocation of underspends identified in other LIP schemes to this scheme. This is allowable through the LIP guidance and policies and will be approved at the LIP Steering Group to be held in February. This will ensure that we maximise funding of projects through non council borrowing and fully utilise the LIP funding available to the council.

6.3 Risks

6.3.1 There is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate. However, this work is allowed for within the described provision in section 2.2. Should the LIP Steering group not approve the reallocation the implementation will be delayed until the 2017/2018 financial year to utilise next year's LIP funding.

6.3.2 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.

6.4 Options

6.4.1 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.

6.5 Savings/ future efficiencies

6.5.1 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.

6.5.2 Approved by: Zulf Darr, Interim Head of Finance, Place and Resources.

7. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

7.1 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 (so far as is 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.

7.2 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.

7.3 Approved for and on behalf of Jacqueline Harris-Baker, Acting Council Solicitor and Acting Monitoring Officer.

8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

8.1 Extending North Permit Zone into the Sutherland Road / Canterbury Road area and with increased hours of operation will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

8.2 Approved by: Jason Singh, Head of HR Employee Relations on behalf of the Director of HR.

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 Evidence from nearby roads where controls have recently been introduced has shown that reducing the density of parking, especially during the daytime, has resulted in far easier street cleaning and therefore a general improvement in the environment.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 11.1 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.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road, since the majority of residents in this area voted in favour of parking controls and a parking scheme should ensure adequate parking facilities for residents, visitors and for local businesses.
- 12.2 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.

13. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 13.1 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.
- 13.2 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 AUTHORS:

Teresa O'Regan – Traffic Engineer
Highway Improvements, Parking Design
020 8762 6000 (Ext. 88260)

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager
Highway Improvements, Parking Design
020 8762600 (ext. 88229)

CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,
Highway Improvements, Parking Design
020 8726 6000 (Ext. 88229)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

– LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972:

None.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – North Permit Zone map

Appendix 2 – Sutherland Road area map
PD312a

Appendix 3 – Sutherland Road area map
PD312b

Appendix 4 – Sutherland Road area map
PD312c

Appendix 5 – Sutherland Road area map
PD312d

Appendix 6 – Sutherland Road area map
PD312e