

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  <b>2 MAY 2019</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>BENSHAM MANOR AREA – RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF A CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Paul Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share)</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Bensham Manor and West Thornton</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b>	
<p>This report is in accordance with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough’s roads as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Croydon Local Plan Feb 2018</li> <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 2015 – 18</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 the 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 Environment, Transport and Regeneration that he:	
1.1	Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into the Bensham Manor Area.
1.2	Agree to proceed to the formal consultation stage for a proposal to introduce a new CPZ operational 9am – 5pm Monday to Saturday into Attlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road ( south eastwards of Swain Road junction, Nos. 1 – 53 & 2 – 64), Palmerston Road, Pitt Road and Sandringham Road as shown on Drawing No. HWY/PD/0219/391.
1.3	If formal consultation is agreed, delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Public Realm Directorate the authority to give the notice.

## **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 This report considers the results of the informal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into the Bensham Manor Area which includes roads bounded by the existing Thornton Heath CPZ, Princess Road area CPZ, proposed Lakehall Road area CPZ and Brigstock Road.
- 2.2 It is recommended that the Council proceeds to the formal consultation stage with a proposal to introduce controlled parking into Attlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road (south-eastwards of Swain Road junction Nos. 1 – 53 & 2 – 64), Palmerston Road, Pitt Road and Sandringham Road as shown on Drawing No. HWY/PD/0219/391.
- 2.3 On 23 April 2019 and pursuant to the delegation from the Leader dated 6 June 2016, the Executive Director Place, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) determined that it was appropriate to refer consideration of the matters detailed paragraph 2.2 above to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for onward recommendation and determination to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share).

## **3 DETAIL**

- 3.1 A petition has been received from residents of Sandringham Road and Palmerston Road (during February 2019), requesting that a residents' permit scheme be introduced to help improve parking conditions. The Residents of Sandringham Road & Palmerston Road stated "We the undersigned residents would be in favour of a CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone)".
- 3.2 In response the Council commenced an informal consultation for possible parking controls in a large area in roads bounded by the existing Thornton Heath CPZ, Princess Road area CPZ, proposed Lakehall Road area CPZ and Brigstock Road on 1 March 2019 until 29 March 2019 although returns were accepted until Wednesday 3 April 2019.
- 3.3 A total of 1753 sets of consultation documents (one per property) which comprised of a letter, explaining the reasons for the consultation, a plan of the consultation area, a Frequently Asked Questions factsheet and a questionnaire (appended to this report) were sent to addresses within this area. Included in each pack was a pre-paid envelope for the return of the questionnaire.
- 3.4 Consultees were requested to register their "Yes/No" preference votes, with the operational hours of 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday matching the controls in the existing zone bordering the consultation area.

## 4 INFORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 Over the course of the informal consultation a total of 375 questionnaires were returned, representing a 22% response rate which is similar to that normally expected for an informal consultation exercise of this type. Table 1 shows the number of properties and returns for all of the individual roads within the consultation area.

Table 1 – Response rates by road

Street name	No. of Properties	No. of responses	Response rate
Attlee Close	52	7	14%
Bensham Close	13	6	46%
Bensham Lane	88	11	13%
Bensham Manor Road	254	39	16%
Berne Road	61	11	18%
Boswell Road	59	17	29%
Ecclesbourne Road	168	27	16%
Geneva Road	28	8	29%
Haslemere Road	95	30	32%
Kemsing Close	12	1	8%
Kynaston Avenue	125	36	29%
Kynaston Crescent	41	11	27%
Kynaston Road	80	16	20%
Lucerne Road	81	15	19%
Marion Road	67	19	29%
Norman Road	36	4	11%
Palmerston Road	25	10	40%
Penshurst Road	133	33	25%
Pitt Road	36	13	36%
Sandringham Road	33	12	36%
Swain Road	36	8	22%
Torrige Road	99	24	24%
Zermatt Road	62	16	26%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1684</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>22%</b>

- 4.2 Response rates varied from a high of 46% from Bensham Close, 40% from Palmerston Road and 36% from Pitt Road & Sandringham Road. With Kemsing Close to lows of 8%, Bensham Lane (13%), Norman Road (11%) Attlee Close (14%).
- 4.3 Low response rates are often received from residents in roads where there are dedicated off-street parking areas and where there are a high proportion of short-term rented properties where residents feel that they will either not be affected or where they are likely to move in the near future.
- 4.4 The table 2 below shows in detail the road by road responses.
- 4.5 Overall, table 2 shows 375 respondents (41%) indicated that they were in favour of the introduction of a CPZ in their road. 220 respondents (59%) did not support the introduction of parking controls.

**Table 2**

Are you in favour of a CPZ?					
	No. of responses	Yes		No	
Attlee Close	7	3	42%	4	57%
Bensham Close	6	3	50%	3	50%
Bensham Lane	11	3	27%	8	72%
Bensham Manor Road	39	12	30%	27	69%
Berne Road	11	1	9%	10	91%
Boswell Road	17	5	29%	12	70%
Ecclesbourne Road	27	5	18%	22	81%
Geneva Road	8	1	13%	7	88%
Haslemere Road	30	10	33%	20	66%
Kemsing Close	1	0	0%	1	100%
Kynaston Avenue	36	23	64%	13	36%
Kynaston Crescent	11	7	63%	4	36%
Kynaston Road	16	4	25%	12	75%
Lucerne Road	15	5	33%	10	66%
Marion Road	19	8	42%	11	58%
Norman Road	4	0	0%	4	100%
Palmerston Road	10	10	100%	0	0%
Penhurst Road	33	17	51%	16	48%
Pitt Road	13	11	84%	2	15%

4.6 On a road by road basis of respondents, of the 23 roads consulted:-

Sandringham Road	12	10	83%	2	16%
Swain Road	8	2	25%	6	75%
Torrige Road	24	11	45%	13	54%
Zermatt Road	16	4	25%	12	75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>59%</b>

- Six roads had a high percentage (over 60%) in favour of the introduction of parking controls; Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road, Palmerston Road, Pitt Road and Sandringham Road.
- Fourteen roads did not support the introduction of parking controls or had a poor response rate; Attlee Close, Bensham Lane, Bensham Manor Road, Berne Road, Boswell Road, Ecclesbourne Road, Geneva Road, Haslemere Road, Kemsing Close, Lucerne Road, Marion Road, Norman Road, Swain Road and Zermatt Road.
- Three roads Bensham Close, Penhurst Road and Torrige Road, was split to about 50:50.

4.7 With the figures now presented from this informal consultation it is recommended to proceed with a formal consultation in roads shown in Drawing No. HWY/PD/0219 /391 and listed in table 3 which show the majority of roads in favour of parking controls. Attlee Close is included in the proposed extension area due to its proximity to the existing and proposed controlled areas. It is worth noting that in Attlee Close most residents are able to park in private areas off the highway.

Table 3 – roads including part of Kynaston Road to be formally consulted

Street Name	No. of responses	Are you in favour of a CPZ?			
		Yes		No	
Attlee Close	7	3	42%	4	57%
Kynaston Avenue	36	23	64%	13	36%
Kynaston Crescent	11	7	63%	4	36%
Kynaston Road (SE of Swain Road)	13	8	61%	5	38%
Palmerston Road	10	10	100%	0	0%
Pitt Road	13	11	84%	2	15%
Sandringham Road	12	10	83%	2	16%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29%</b>

- 4.8 With regards to operational hours, there were few requests in the comments box on the questionnaire for different operational hours than the 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday proposal although there was some demand to have Event Day controls when there are games being played at the nearby Selhurst Park Stadium.
- 4.9 The final section of the questionnaire also offered respondents the opportunity, should they wish, to make any other comments they might have relating to parking. Although the majority of respondents chose not to do so.
- 4.10 The informal consultation is titled 'Bensham Manor area' to reflect streets from where most of the residents are suffering from the parking pressure / displacement effects from the nearby N1 (Princess Road area) and Thornton Heath CPZs. It has been noted that commuter parking takes place as this area is close to the Thornton Heath rail station, with some parking taking place by staff working in the nearby shops and businesses, including Croydon University Hospital.
- 4.11 The introduction of a new CPZ requires the making of a Traffic Management Order. The legal process for making a Traffic Management Order requires formal consultation to take place in the form of Public Notices published in the London Gazette and a local newspaper (Croydon Guardian). Although 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.
- 4.12 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.
- 4.13 Once the notices have been published, the public has 21 days to comment or object to the proposals. If no relevant objections are received, the Traffic Management Order may then be made. Any relevant objections received following the giving of public notice will be considered by the Executive Director of Place and may be referred to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for consideration and onward recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration.

## **5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The required capital expenditure will be funded via an allocation within the TfL LIP grant funding allocated to Croydon for 2019/20. Total funding of £75k is included for controlled parking schemes in 2019/20.

## 5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from Report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	75	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	18	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>57</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

## 5.2 The effect of the decision

- 5.2.1 The cost of introducing controlled parking into the Bensham Manor area has been estimated at £18,000. This includes the supply and installation of signs, lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.
- 5.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available capital budgets for 2019/20.

## 5.3 Risks

- 5.3.1 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

## 5.4 Options

- 5.4.1 An alternative option is to introduce a Residents Only parking scheme. Virtually all permit schemes in the Borough are shared-use with Pay & Display users and this offers the greatest flexibility for drivers who may be visitors to residents and businesses in the area or the minority of commuters who are willing to pay for all day parking.

## **5.5 Savings/ future efficiencies**

5.5.1 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from paid for parking (Pay by Phone), together with enforcement of these controls through the issue of Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have typically been proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

5.6 Approved by: Flora Osiyemi, Head of Finance, Place, Residents and Gateway

## **6. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

6.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provides the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.

6.2 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.

6.3 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as 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. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-

- The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
- The national air quality strategy.
- The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
- Any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

6.4 The Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision. 6.5 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.

6.5 Approved by: Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance and Deputy 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: Jennifer Sankar, Head of Human Resources.

## **8. CUSTOMER IMPACT**

8.1 The introduction of a new CPZ into Attlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Road (Kynaston Avenue to Sandringham Road), Sandringham Road & Palmerston Road is proposed in response to support from local residents for controlled parking.

8.2 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 The fact that uniformed Civil Enforcement Officers will be regularly patrolling the area should have a deterrent effect on crime.

## **12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 The recommendations are to give notice of the proposal to introduce a new CPZ into the roads listed in paragraph 1.2 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 with publication of the public notice and formal consultation but this would not accord with the expressed preference of the majority of those who responded to this informal consultation.

---

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Harji Hirani, Traffic Engineer,  
Parking Design, Highway Improvements, Streets,  
020 8726 6000

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager  
Parking Design, Highway Improvements, Streets,  
020 8667 8229

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:** Consultation Documents