

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  <b>2 MAY 2019</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>BOSTON ROAD / KESTON ROAD / BROUGHTON ROAD AREA – RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF A CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Planning and Environment</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Paul Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share)</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>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 formal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into Boston Road, Broughton Road Colvin Road, Curzon Road, Dunheved Close, Dunheved Road North, Dunheved Road South, Dunheved Road West, Furtherfield Close, Harcourt Road, Kenmare Road, Keston Road, Lynton Road, Marden Crescent, Marden Road, Oakwood Place, Oakwood Road, Ramsey Road, Sharland Close, Southwell Road, Stanley Grove, Stanley Road, Whitehall Road and York Road
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 nos. PD 369a 00, 01, 02, 03 & 04.

- 1.3 Agree to the extension of permit eligibility for this new CPZ to include property Nos. 39 - 353 Thornton Road odd numbers only (the east and south-eastern side).
- 1.4 Inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision.

## **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 This report considers the results of the statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into the Boston Road / Keston Road / Broughton Road Area which includes unrestricted roads bounded by London Road, Thornton Road and the existing Northern CPZ in the Wards of Bensham Manor, Selhurst and West Thornton.
- 2.2 It is recommended that the Council proceeds with the implementation of a controlled parking in Boston Road, Broughton Road Colvin Road, Curzon Road, Dunheved Close, Dunheved Road North, Dunheved Road South, Dunheved Road West, Furtherfield Close, Harcourt Road, Kenmare Road, Keston Road, Lynton Road, Marden Crescent, Marden Road, Oakwood Place, Oakwood Road, Ramsey Road, Sharland Close, Southwell Road, Stanley Grove, Stanley Road, Whitehall Road and York Road as shown on Drawing nos. PD 369a 00, 01, 02, 03 & 04 and also extend permit eligibility to include property Nos. 39 – 353 Thornton Road.
- 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 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Petitions have been received from residents of Boston Road, Broughton Road, Colvin Road, Keston Road and Southwell Road requesting that a residents' permit scheme be introduced to help improve parking conditions in the area.
- 3.2 There is currently a lack of available parking due to parking associated with staff of and visitors to the nearby Croydon University Hospital (formerly known as Mayday Hospital), Town Centre office and shop workers and residents of the adjacent North CPZ who are not prepared to purchase a permit to park in their own roads. This is causing problems in the area and residents are finding that they frequently are unable to park close to their home due to space being occupied by non-resident vehicles.
- 3.3 In July and August 2018 1,576 sets of consultation documents 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 the proposed CPZ area. A total of 410 questionnaires were returned, representing a 26% response rate which is similar to that normally expected for an informal consultation exercise of this type.

- 3.4 The table below shows in detail the road by road responses to both Questions 1 and 2 as part of the informal consultation. Please note that the 5 responses which stated 'don't know' and 2 responses with no preference to their preferred hours have been removed from the table – hence totals do not quite add to 100%.

Street Name	No. of responses	Are you in favour of a CPZ?				What are your preferred hours?			
		Yes		No		Mon-Sat 9am - 5pm		Mon-Sun 8am-8pm	
Boston Rd	58	48	83%	10	17%	10	21%	37	77%
Broughton Rd	31	12	39%	19	61%	6	50%	6	50%
Colvin Rd	12	7	58%	5	42%	2	29%	5	71%
Curzon Rd	6	1	16.5%	4	67%			1	100%
Dunheved Close	8	3	38%	5	63%	1	33%	2	67%
Dunheved Rd Nth	6	5	83%	1	17%	3	60%	2	40%
Dunheved Rd Sth	5	2	40%	3	60%			2	100%
Dunheved Rd West	6	3	50%	3	50%	2	67%	1	33%
Furtherfield Close	3	3	100%	0				3	100%
Harcourt Rd	31	9	29%	21	68%	1	11%	8	89%
Kenmare Rd	10	8	80%	2	20%	2	25%	6	75%
Keston Rd	42	20	48%	21	50%	7	35%	13	65%
Lynton Rd	20	17	85%	3	15%	4	24%	13	76%
Marden Crescent	11	9	82%	2	18%	2	22%	6	67%
Marden Rd	10	6	60%	4	40%	2	33%	4	67%
Oakwood Place	3	2	67%	1	33%	1	50%	1	50%
Oakwood Rd	5	0		5	100%				
Ramsey Rd	7	2	29%	5	71%	1	50%	1	50%
Sharland Close	3	1	33%	2	67%	1	100%		
Southwell Rd	23	15	65%	8	35%	1	7%	14	93%
Stanley Grove	25	14	56%	9	36%	4	29%	10	71%
Stanley Rd	33	24	73%	9	27%	5	21%	19	79%
Thornton Rd	21	3	14%	18	86%	1	33%	2	67%
Whitehall Rd	24	14	58%	10	42%	5	36%	9	64%
York Rd	7	6	86%	1	14%	0		6	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>73%</b>

- 3.5 Overall, the majority of respondents 234 (57%) indicated that they were in favour of the introduction of a CPZ in their road. 171 (42%) did not support the introduction of parking controls and 5 (1%) did not know.

- 3.6 Due to the positive response to the informal consultation it was agreed at the Traffic Management Advisory Committee on 17 October 2018 to undertake formal consultation on the detailed design with a view to considering the introduction of

parking controls in the whole area subject to outcome of the formal consultation on the detailed design.

#### **4 STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The statutory consultation period was between 6 March and 5 April 2019. Adverts were placed in the Croydon Guardian and the London Gazette. Notices were also placed on lamp columns in the proposed area, this is in line with Councils statutory duty.
- 4.2 Further to the Council's statutory duty a total of 1,576 sets of consultation documents (representing the number of addresses in the whole area) which comprised of a letter, explaining the reasons for the consultation, a plan of the consultation area and a Frequently Asked Questions factsheet were sent by post to all occupiers in the affected area.

#### **5 OBJECTIONS**

- 5.1 A number of objections to the proposed parking controls have been received including 18 individual objections, one generic response sent by 25 residents and 4 separate petitions. Two of the petitions have been received from residents both in the Broughton Road, Whitehall Road and Colvin Road area and the remaining 2 petitions from the Elim Pentecostal Church in Stanley Road and the Croydon Mosque which is on the corner of London Road and Dunheved Road South. The objections are listed below with the officer responses following.
- 5.2 **Objection 1 – Resident of Stanley Road.**

"To Whom It May Concern; I am writing to you on behalf of the residence of Stanley Road, Croydon, in order to OBJECT the parking proposal.

On Monday 14th March a public notice was put up stating that parking permits were soon to be required by residence and that visitors would be required to pay. The request is completely unreasonable for the following reasons:

Residence should not have to pay to park their car(s) outside their own homes. The street has been peaceful without any interruptions from the council for years so why impose such a charge on residence. If it is for the sake of the residence then they should be given FREE permits and not have to pay!

Residence with 2 cars or more will be penalised. This is unethical as you are stating that those with 2 or more vehicles should pay £126 which is £46 more than the first car. How can you justify this? This is also in addition to the £30 administration fee.

Visitors will have to pay for parking. Stanley road is a residential road of which there are many families who reside there. You will be charging visitors who will be coming to see their family. Again unethical.

A parking ticket will be required 7 days a week, which is a big change for the street since this restriction is new. It is not right you want to impose this even on a weekend, more so a Sunday.

The timings of when visitors will require a parking ticket is ridiculous as you are basing it on 12 hours 8am to 8pm. I have never known the timings to cover such a long period of time. Think about working parents who drop their children off to grandparents which takes 10 minutes max. This would cost an extra £20pm at least.

There is a local doctors at the top of Stanley Road, you are charging people who need medical assistance, and not even considering giving them a couple hours free parking.

Some residence have a dropped curb and are able to park on their drive. Their second vehicle or visitor(s) have the ability to park outside their home without obstructing anyone else drive. Therefore there is no reason as to why you should impose this parking requirement.

Residence of Stanley Road have lived amicably for over 30 years, so parking restrictions are not required.

Residence have also NOT been given enough notice for this. It is not sufficient putting one or two public notices up in the 'hope' that residence will see it. You have not communicated this well in the slightest. As a council I would have thought that you should be demonstrating a duty of care to the public by being clear and transparent.

Having parking meters will encourage non-residential individuals (not visitors of the street) to park on Stanley Road, because they will have the attitude of 'well I've paid for parking so it's OK'. It is NOT OK, because those with a second vehicle will have to park elsewhere and further away from their property.

Should residence have to park far away from their property, it will be out of sight and at risk of theft/broken in.

Properties with a dropped curve I assume will have a yellow line which is a waste of space, since the residence second vehicle could be parked here with no issues.

The value of the price of properties on Stanley Road. Seems as though this proposal is not of much/any benefit to local residence and is just a way for the council to make more money. The parking restrictions you are suggesting to impose on Stanley Road, are far and beyond unfair and we would like to OBJECT the councils proposal. A petition is currently underway in order for you to take this seriously.

I would like a response on this as soon as possible, of which our contact details are below:"

### 5.3 **Officer Response**

The proposal is based on the results of the informal consultation. With the introduction of the CPZ residents will not be competing for road space with non-residents, therefore it is suggested that residents will benefit from the parking restrictions proposed. The informal and formal consultation information and details of circulation of information to residents is detailed at paragraphs 3.3 and 4.1 above. Due to non-permit holder visitors to the area having to pay for parking using the RingGo facility at a current charge of £1 per hour it is highly likely that the vast majority of all-day visitor/commuters will be deterred from using streets within the proposed CPZ. Bay designation is something that can be looked at the time of any review of the zone if this issue is raised. The proposed parking charges are in line with the current parking policy in Croydon which was approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration and implemented via a notice of variation from 17 September 2018.

#### **5.4 Objection 2 – Resident of Dunheved Road North**

“I have reviewed the proposal for the extension of CPZ for the above mentioned area.

I am totally in favour of the proposal but would like there to be consideration that some bays are set aside as "Resident Only" bays. I live on Dunheved Road North.

There are two national hotels whose customers I know do not all use the hotels facilities for parking as the difference can be seen on the roads on a Saturday morning plus occasionally coaches are parking on Dunheved Road West.

Being so close to Croydon University Hospital there are a constant stream of cars looking for spaces throughout the day so it would be extremely helpful to residents if some bays were specifically set aside for resident use only.

Resident only parking bays operate in other parts of the borough and other boroughs so I do not see why it is something that has been completely ruled out in your F.A.Q. for this area. I realise some income will be lost from not being completely RingGo but hopefully residents wishes will be considered too.

I also think parking near to local businesses should be limited to maximum 2 hours or short term that allows a higher turnover of vehicles/Customers being able to park. Again this operates in other boroughs where parking restrictions are enforced but at the same time helping local tradespeople”.

#### **5.5 Officer Comments**

Evidence from existing parking controls in roads close to Croydon University Hospital show that few commuters pay for parking and the majority look for free parking. At a rate of £1 per hour it is very unlikely that more than a few commuters will park in this area and residents will benefit from the controls. Visitors to the area will have the option to use the Pay by Phone facility. Where relevant to the area under consideration, short term bays are considered around shops and businesses, however this area is predominantly residential and therefore such matters have not been specifically considered here.

#### **5.6 Objection 3 – Resident of Curzon Road**

“We strongly object to this proposal and believe it will only serve to worsen the parking and traffic flow in the area. I strongly suggest this is reconsidered so a repeat of the recycling debacle is avoided.

You have also failed to detail the implication(s) for disabled bay residents”.

#### 5.7 **Officer comments**

With implementation of these proposals residents of the area will be prioritised therefore improving the parking situation. Traffic flow is not usually an issue when parking controls are introduced as there will be passing places where there is a gap in the parking. Disabled badge holders are able to park in the shared-use Permit / Pay by Phone bays whilst displaying their badge for an unlimited period. For disabled blue badge holders who do not wish to display their badge constantly due to the risk of theft, there is a Companion badge available from the Council which allows the resident the same privileges as when the blue badge is shown.

#### 5.8 **Objection 4 – Resident no address**

“I oppose the introduction of the proposed extension of a controlled parking Zone in Boston Road/ Keston Road/ Broughton road Area I am strongly oppose.”

#### 5.9 **Officer Comments**

Your opposition is noted, however no points have been made to comment on.

#### 5.10 **Objection 5 – Resident no address**

“Dear Sir, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed parking restrictions for my road. The initial proposal was for restrictions Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm. I was shocked to see that it will now be 8am to 8pm Monday to Sunday!

This is a residential road which means it’s going to be difficult and very expensive whenever family and friends visit, especially for someone like me that’s disabled and relies on lots of outside support. Even next door to Thornton Heath Station it’s only 9 to 5. I know that all my neighbours are furious at this proposal.

There is also a further concern that our local church goes, many of whom are elderly will not be able to visit and worship without having to pay! I happen to know that even right into London these kind of restrictions do not apply on a Sunday. I’m sorry but I think this is a disgraceful money making exercise and not a benefit to the residents.”

#### 5.11 **Officer comments**

The proposed hours of operation are in line with the informal consultation results which is documented in point 4.1 of this report. Of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday rather than 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls matching the controls in the Sutherland Road area bordering this area. On Sundays there is proposed to be a flat fee of £3.30 for all day parking and £1.30 for one hour parking. Residents are able to purchase up to 60 half day Visitor Permits at a cost of £2 using the Pay by Phone method of payment.

#### 5.12 **Objection 6 – Resident of Southwell Road**

“I understand parking permits will go ahead. However for the working families who have childcare support from friends and family. This will become a very costly affair.

I would like to oppose the recent proposed times and ask you reduce them to 9pm to 5pm Monday to Friday, like the surrounding area.

The council is supposed to work with its residents, not course expenses to people who are working to tight budgets. With the cost of living increasing and an uncertain Brexit. Life will become more expensive. Please could you look into this.”

#### 5.13 **Officer Comments**

The proposed hours of operation are in line with the informal consultation results which is documented in point 4.1 of this report. Of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday rather than 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls matching the controls in the Sutherland Road area bordering this area. It is accepted that some residents will be adversely affected by the longer hours of operation although it is worth noting that residents are able to purchase up to 60 half day Visitor Permits at a cost of £2 using the Pay by Phone method of payment which may help with child care commitments.

#### 5.14 **Objection 7 – Resident of Ramsey Road**

“Please find attached a letter contesting the parking permissions in my area and asking for further information. I bring your attention to the fact that there are many elderly people living in this vicinity who struggle to get out. Bringing parking restriction on their visitors and themselves will only alienate them more from society adding to the social care funding issues that Croydon Council already has.”

#### 5.15 **Officer Comments**

Currently there is a high percentage of non-residential and commuter parking in the area. This limits available space for legitimate visitors to the area such as visitors to elderly residents. Neighbourhood Care permits are available to care workers enabling them to park freely within the Borough’s CPZs. The introduction of the parking controls will allow for visitors to use permits or use the Pay by Phone system which is at a cost of 50p for each 30 minutes.

#### 5.16 **Objection 8 – Resident of Stanley Grove**

“To whom it may concern:

We are objecting to the proposed Orders because we are concerned that despite paying for a permit, we, residents, will still struggle to find a parking space at all times, which we should, as we live there and will be paying!

We worry that the people who do not pay and park anyway will not automatically get big fines, which they should if this scheme is enforced. There should be a guarantee that there will be Civil Enforcement Officers patrolling the roads at all times.

In addition, only £1.30 an hour and £3.30 All Day on Sundays are not sufficient amounts, as this means non-residents may take spaces, and either not pay, not being fined anyway, or may think it is cheap, so it is fine, and again this will prevent residents to park themselves.

Also, there seems to be more and more 'disabled spaces'. Whilst we understand some of those are genuine, there needs to be a regular check to see if the people who get their own saved spaces, are indeed genuine, as otherwise it is not fair. AND they must also pay a parking permit, like everyone else - will they?

What about the space in front of the garages at the end of Stanley Grove - people regularly have to park there because there is simply no other space available. Will there be parking spaces there too? If not, again despite paying for a permit it is very likely that it will happen that there is no space available and in that case - where are we supposed to park? On that note, just so we know, will the permit be for a specific road only, solely the one we live in?

Also, if someone has a gate, does this mean the space in front of it will always be theirs only, which is not fair, and will they be paying for a permit too?

Also, there are people who have two cars and a van (and for a van the council should check that they are legally running a business with that van), taking a lot of space, this is not fair because for people like us who only have one car and who will be paying, there may not be space because one household takes 3 spaces!"

#### 5.17 **Officer comments**

Non-residents will have to pay to park within the CPZ within the hours of operation. Evidence of existing zones within the Borough including neighbouring zones is that once controls are introduced there is not a capacity issue for residents. The Sunday tariff is currently cheaper, however, this will be looked at if it becomes an issue once the zone is live. There are no specifically allocated spaces within the CPZ. However, it is expected that there will be capacity for all residents within the zone, this may not be directly outside their property. Disabled bays are implemented on request from residents and businesses. If a disabled bay is no longer in use this can be reported to the Council for eventual revocation. There are criteria that must be met to be able to obtain a residents permit, these checks are made during the permit application process. Currently there is a two permit policy per household in Croydon with annual charges of £80 for the first and £126 for the second permit issued at a household. The reasons for this approach were detailed in paragraph 3.3, 12th July 2018 PARKING CHARGES 2018 / 2019 report minute reference 9/18 which was considered by Traffic Management Advisory Committee and recommended to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration for approval.

#### 5.18 **Objection 9 – Resident of Boston Road**

“Dear Sirs, I wish to state my objections to the proposed controlled parking introduction. The problem faced by residents is one of insufficient parking availability, not merely the influx of out of area visitors caused by the established encroachment of CPZ'S to bordering streets.

The introduction of this new zone will make the situation worse not better for residents in this area. Reasons for this are an overall reduction in the number of parking spaces due to the prohibition of the current practice of houses with driveways

being allowed to park across their own driveway. As an example Stanley Road has over 40 such properties, an extremely significant number of lost spaces.

Also to create an autonomous Sub-Zone is impractical as it prohibits residents parking in adjacent roads which may be yards from their own property. My submission requests further review of these proposals which do not meet the needs of local people, just give them unnecessary, additional expense.”

#### 5.19 **Officer comments**

The introduction of the CPZ prioritises residents over visitors and commuters. Whilst the on street parking capacity will be reduced, the charge for parking in the zone will deter the all-day commuter from parking in the area, whilst allowing visitors and users of local amenities access to parking. The purpose of a dropped kerb is not to reserve a parking space but to legally cross the footway to access a private parking area. Parking alongside a dropped kerb can be enforced even without a yellow line, providing that the affected resident contacts Parking Services giving full details of the offending vehicle. Residents and their visitors can therefore park alongside dropped kerbs outside the hours of the parking controls.

#### 5.20 **Objection 10 – Ramsey Rd**

“I am writing to object the proposal of the above reference which will affect parking around Ramsey Road. I object on the grounds that my parents are elderly, my father is retired and would find it difficult to with these new changes. I feel it is unfair for my father to pay for a parking permit as he is now retired. Furthermore, we have regularly visitors coming over during the week and mostly on weekends. Why should they have to pay to park to visit us as we live on a residential street? I can't imagine why you are considering a permit parking scheme, other than to gain revenue for the council. The price of the permits are also very steep and a maximum of 2 per household? £80 plus £30 admin fee for a year is disgraceful. I know some residents who have 3 vehicles, what are they supposed to do with the extra car? You will only push people to park in other places, and then made to walk home. With all the recent crime rates going on, can you imagine walking home if you've parked away from your house? This is very dangerous for the residents around area.

There is no problem with parking. It is just a money making scheme. It will generate in excess of £12,500 in revenue in the area between Boston Road and Broughton Road. We pay our road tax, where safe and within the law we should be able to park where we want when away and at home.

When are these changes being considered to be applied? I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed extension of a controlled parking zone. I look forward to hearing from you.”

#### 5.21 **Officer comments**

The proposals regarding pricing of permits are in line with the current parking policy. There is no contribution made to the Council for parking schemes from Central Government through the payment of road tax or from the Council Tax. All parking schemes must be self-financed and any revenue received from parking charges and enforcement is ring fenced to fund future traffic and parking schemes and other transport related initiatives such as the concessionary fares scheme for some of the

Borough's residents i.e. Freedom pass. The Council do not currently have any concessions for the elderly or pensioners, however, parking charges are 50p for 30 minutes and Visitor Permits are available to all residents within the proposed zone – 60 half day permits at a cost of £2 each using the Pay by Phone method of payment.

#### 5.22 **Objection 11 – Ramsey Rd**

"I am a resident of Ramsey Road, and I would like to strongly object to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) being considered on Ramsey road.

I am an elderly and retired man and have been living on Ramsey road since 1984. I would find it very difficult with these changes you are proposing. This will be an additional financial burden on me as I don't work and I will have to use my pension to pay for a permit which I think is unfair.

Furthermore, I also have my family members coming to check on me twice or 3 times a week in the evenings and weekends, and I believe it would be unfair for them having to pay for parking each time they come and check if I am ok. I believe by doing this, you are making it difficult for people to care for their elderly relatives for the purposes of financial gains.

There has not been a permit zone for all these years, and I fail to understand why you are proposing to implement one at this time.

If you are going to ignore the thoughts of your residents and implement the controlled parking zone anyway, I believe having it from 8am-8pm is too long and would significantly impact on my family coming to see me in the evenings during the week.

I strongly urge you should reconsider the proposal for a controlled parking zone in my area. I look forward to hearing from you."

#### 5.23 **Officer comment**

Whilst it is recognised that there is a cost for residents for purchasing permits and this is a potential burden for those that are retired and on limited incomes this cost does need to be considered relative with running a car including the initial cost, depreciation, servicing, maintenance, tax and insurance. Retired residents are likely to benefit more from the scheme as they are more likely to use their vehicles during the daytime and require more frequent parking than those residents that either do not use their vehicles during the daytime, if they commute using other methods or use their vehicles for the commute. The Council do not currently have any concessions for the elderly or pensioners, however, parking charges are 50p for 30 minutes and Visitor Permits are available to all residents within the proposed zone – 60 half day permits at a cost of £2 each using the Pay by Phone method of payment.

#### 5.24 **Objection 12 – Colvin Road**

"I am a resident Colvin Road and I strongly disapprove of the proposed controlled parking zone because the money is too high and is unaffordable to pay on top of the countless bills I already pay. As it is the Arriva drivers always park their cars here making a big problem for residents of Colvin Road as it makes it so hard to find a parking space. The unaffordable fee makes it almost impossible for residents to pay it is as if the council doesn't care and doesn't think of the citizens so I would want and

appreciate if the council lowers the fee or thinks of an alternative option suitable to residents.

Further to your letter of the 6 March 2019, I am writing to object to the proposed CPZ extension to the Broughton Road Area, namely Colvin Road and Whitehall Road on the grounds that whilst you indicated that the majority of residents voted in favour of introducing the CPZ there is no evidence to suggest that the majority of residents in Colvin Road or Whitehall Road supported the proposed implementation.

I understand that a CPZ is formally introduced within the Croydon Borough to manage parking where demand exceeds supply or where unsafe conditions exist. However, there is no evidence of this being a concern for residents many of whom have lived in the area for a number of years, and despite living in close proximity or adjacent to the Arriva bus garage.

I therefore, formally object to the said proposal to extend the CPZ to Colvin Road & Whitehall Road as the majority of residents have not voted in favour of the proposed extension.”

#### 5.25 **Officer comments**

The outcome of the informal consultation indicate that a majority of residents in the area consulted were in favour of the proposed parking controls, however, there are some streets that were not in favour of parking controls these are indicated in point 4.1 of this report. If the streets that were against parking controls were to be left out of the zone, there may be an unacceptable level of displacement for residents from streets within the CPZ, therefore it is recommended that the whole area consulted is included in the zone. The current parking charges are in line with Borough wide parking policy. The implementation of a CPZ will prioritise parking for residents in the area. The informal consultation was triggered by four petitions from several roads in the area including from Broughton Road residents by Colvin Road and Whitehall Road, as outlined in the TMAC report of 17 October 2018.

#### 5.26 **Objection 13 – Canterbury Road**

“I am one of who is in favour of CPZ but your decision to introducing controlled zone from 8am to 8pm Monday to Sunday is really disgusting looks like the Council once again don't want to miss making easy money. Sorry to say the residents living on Canterbury Rd and Sutherland Rd are more in minority than majority as you claiming. Hoping according to the meeting of CTMT on 17th Oct.2018 the attendance from the above two roads was 100%.and all agreed with you. Even the Croydon Mosque is not in favour of your decision. Sunday is one day when most of the families get together. Don't be joy killer and put family values before cash.”

#### 5.27 **Officer comments**

The proposed hours of operation are in line with the informal consultation results as detailed in paragraph 4.1 of this report. Of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday rather than 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls matching the controls in the Sutherland Road area bordering this area. It is accepted that some residents will be adversely affected by the longer hours of operation although it is worth noting that residents are able to purchase up to 60 half day Visitor Permits at a cost of £2 using the Pay by Phone method of payment

which may help with child care commitments.

#### 5.28 **Objection 14 – Broughton Road**

“Hello Sir/Madam, I strongly object to the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone to include Broughton Road.

I have a disabled mother and have care workers attending to her about 2/3 times a day. At present they park outside my driveway at 8 Broughton Road. This will make it extremely difficult to provide services to my mother. Apart from the care workers, my family also visit on a daily basis and use the parking outside my driveway.

We did the driveway to allow us to park in the driveway and the space outside. This policy is will make life difficult for us and drive us out of the area. This place will then become a place for bedsits only. As it is there are too many houses converted to bedsits.”

#### 5.29 **Officer comment**

Provisions for carers are made through Parking Services. There is a Neighbourhood Care permit available if they are registered as community health staff. Visitors to the area will have the option to pay via the Pay by Phone facility (charges 50p per 30 minutes) or using Visitor Permits available to residents at a cost of £2 per half-day and up to 60 permits per annum.

#### 5.30 **Objection 15 – Thornton Road**

“Dear Sir/Madame,

I'm writing in regards to the letter I recently received about the introduction of CPZ in my area, specifically Boston Road.

I live along Thornton Road which is a red route, not only is it difficult as it is to find parking space what with every second house along Marden Road getting a driveway but having bays added along Boston road means less vehicles can be parked. It is bad enough that some days members of my household/neighbours/Myself have to park behind the warehouses on Peall Road or Shamrock Road because there is nowhere to park nearby, but now we are having to pay at least £80 per year for the chance to park near our homes.

Leading on from paying for the ability to park near my house, I come from a household where my father, my brother and myself all work. That's 3 working adults in the house that require a vehicle to go about their lives and do their jobs. Why are we being limited to having only 2 vehicles per household when this isn't practical at all. Are you expecting my 62 year old dad who requires multiple tools to get on the bus with rowdy school kids just to work? Or maybe expecting my brother to get on 6+ different busses with the possibility of being late for work because he has to go to different locations, which I have had to do myself when my car was being repaired. Relying on public transport to get to different meetings all around London isn't viable and therefore isn't an option, especially when meetings overrun or the public transport system in general is unreliable.

I'm not sure why residents along the red route are being forced to pay these prices

just for the chance to park close to their home (as you said in the letter it's not possible to guarantee a parking spot). Again, why are we being limited to only 2 vehicles per household when it's not an option to rely on public transport for commuting to and between work locations.”

**5.31 Officer comments**

Residents of Thornton Road will be eligible for permits within the N2 CPZ. The introduction of a CPZ prioritises the parking for residents whilst still allowing visitors to pay for parking. The two permits per household is in line with the current parking policy. This was approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration following the report dated 12th July 2018 titled PARKING CHARGES 2018 / 2019 which was received by the Traffic Management Advisory Committee on that date. It is also worth noting that there are no current proposals to introduce parking controls on the west side of Thornton Road in roads such as Peall Road mentioned in this objection. These roads are closer to many of the addresses in Thornton Road where officers are recommending residents be eligible for permits for parking in the area on the east side.

**5.32 Objection 16 – Dunheved Close**

“Objection to proposed extension of a controlled parking zone – Dunheved Close, Dunheved Road North, Dunheved Road South, and Dunheved Road West.”

**5.33 Officer comments**

The objection is noted.

**5.34 Objection 17 – Dunheved Close**

“There are no congestion or obstruction issues as: double yellow lines on corners and points of potential obstruction are already in place. Traffic flow is already controlled by ‘one – way – traffic direction’ for Dunheved Roads North, West, and South – from and on to London Road.

Unjustifiably long paid parking restriction time – 8am – 8pm as most commuter parkers leave by 5.30pm.

Unjustifiable restriction of daytime parking outside ones own drive – it does not create an obstruction because if the drives did not exist, there would be on road parking anyway. This restriction would significantly reduce the number of available spaces for all residents – particularly Dunheved Close by 40%.

There are no suitable locations on Dunheved Close to charge for parking!! The Close is part-privately owned and left side of the road is not paved – currently dirt, rubble and huge tree trunks.

The proposed parking restrictions would significantly reduce the current number of parking spaces available for all residents and would not address congestion or obstruction as these do not exist!!

**5.35 Officer comments**

The hours of operation is in line with the informal consultation results as detailed in

paragraph 4.1 of this report. Of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday rather than 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls matching the controls in the Sutherland Road area bordering this area. It is accepted that some residents will be adversely affected by the longer hours of operation although it is worth noting that residents are able to purchase up to 60 half day Visitor Permits, per annum, at a cost of £2 using the Pay by Phone method of payment which may help with child care commitments. In Dunheved Close the majority of residents have off-street parking and are therefore less affected by the proposals than other streets where driveways are limited. The end section of the road is designated as unadopted highway (highway rights exist but frontagers are responsible for maintenance rather than the Council) and due to the fact that it is unmade means that it will be left out of the parking scheme. If parking becomes an issue and residents request action, consideration may be given to potential solutions.

#### 5.36 **Objection 18 – Dunheved Close**

“I refer to your notification dated 6th of March Ref:PD/CS/369 advising the residents of the introduction CPZ on the above streets. However, from the data supplied, it is very clear that a majority did NOT vote in favour of this revenue generating scheme. Data supplied for the above streets as stated below is totally contradictory to show a majority and it is baffling as to how the figures can be manipulated to show a majority.

Total number of properties on the above 4 roads total 228. Responses received from the 4 roads total 25. This gives a 10.96% response hardly worthy of representation of the whole neighbourhood! Having spoken to many residents on these streets a vast majority have no recollection of ever seeing this survey hence the poor response rate. Apathy it seems is due to the fact that the vast Majority are not owner occupiers but short term renters in the area. Hence they do not represent the views of owner occupiers whose views should matter.

Further break down from data taken as supplied:

Dunheved Close has 22 properties (your data shows 21??). Only 8 responded with only 3 in favour giving you a 37.5% rate which is NOT a majority.

Dunheved North has 83 properties and only 6 responded! (7.22% Response!!!) Such low figures DO NOT represent the views of the whole street.

Dunheved South has 76 properties with just 5 responses! (6.57% Response!!). Again not representative of the whole street. 2 out of the 5 in favour (40%)

Dunheved West has 48 properties with just 6 responses! (12.5% Response) Not representative of the whole street with 50% of the poor 6 responses in favour.

It seems that the scheme is not representative of a majority but a MINORITY.

Our Ward Councillors need to take note of this as they work for a majority not a minority. This Scheme will be detrimental to the owner occupiers and to the area and only serve to devalue the properties on these streets, cause misery and stress and isolate elders/disabled who depend on families visiting.

In short we DO NOT want a CPZ on the above streets and totally oppose this scheme, and based on the data we will be compelled to lodge a legal challenge should this scheme be forced through.”

#### 5.37 **Officer comments**

The Council encourage all residents to respond to consultation to get a true

representation of local views. A 20-30% response rate is typical for a consultation of this type. The Council will only take into account the responses received, therefore, the percentages that are quoted are from the total residents who responded to the consultation, not the percentage of the whole street as has been suggested. Whilst it is disappointing that the response rate in the Dunheved area is low there was an overall positive response. The low response rate can be explained by the higher proportion of rented properties in this area and the fact that the majority of residents in the multiple dwelling homes have off-street parking and are therefore not affected. However, this area is directly opposite the Croydon University Hospital site and as a consequence suffers from high parking stress. Reducing the demand on parking spaces by introducing parking controls will help to improve access into the area, provide more parking opportunities for residents and their visitors and including for Croydon Mosque worshippers.

### 5.38 **Objection 19 – Generic Response**

There was a generic response that was sent in by 25 residents of the area and one from outside the area. The response is detailed below.

“Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Your Ref: PD/CH/K4 & K5

I write to oppose the introduction of the proposed extension of a Controlled Parking Zone in the Boston Road / Keston Road / Broughton Road Area.

You state in your letter dated 6th March, 2019 that the majority of residents voted in favour of a controlled parking zone. Please tell me how many residents live in the area and in each street and, of those how many responded and how they voted in each street so I can assess the responses transparently.

I am against the scheme because:

I do not believe the residents in this area should be charged a penny to allow a parking company and the council to profit from the rights and privileges we have already paid for.

We pay national taxes, MOT and Council Tax for the upkeep of the roads and the area but Croydon Council have not been keeping up with its responsibilities to maintain the roadways, pavements and to clean the streets consistently to any reasonable standard. Some residents with vehicles have been paying for this failure through increased repairs and now the council is asking us to pay to park in-front of our own homes that will result in fines, bailiffs and removal of goods for those who are unable to pay.

The additional pressure from having to manage a more complex parking system and the additional stress will ultimately impact on the health of those who have to manage that increased stress. The wellbeing of the residents will suffer in ways you cannot mitigate.

This type of scheme is also known as weaponised parking where the council turns residents free parking into a money-making exercise, and I object to it in the strongest terms as it will mean:

- increased Civil Enforcement Officer activity

- increased parking of non-residents
- Hefty fines for residents at a time when we do not know what our income will even look like in two years. A Bailiff's fee may be the difference between losing your car for good if you do not have the money to pay and for some people getting to work by car is cheaper than on public transport.
- It will impact negatively on our relatives and friends visiting and create a simple choice between visiting where they have to pay for parking or visiting a friend/relative where parking is free. This may not seem significant but may affect the number of visits a person/family member may receive particularly in their senior years.
- Residents who have paid for the use of their own driveways will suddenly be forced to give up the benefits they have experienced having already paid the council for the privilege and may be forced to pay parking fines to park outside their own homes.

I cannot accept your proposals under any circumstances and must decline your offer to open myself and my neighbours up to being fined, stressed, pressed for money we may not have and subjected to a costly, stressful scheme designed to extract what is left of our hard earned cash after all the council and national taxes we already pay.

Instead please use the money you are ploughing into trying to persuade us to vote for more fines, Civil Enforcement Officers, bailiffs, court action into fixing the pot-holes in the roads, cleaning the streets and tackling crime.”

### 5.39 **Officer Comments**

All parking schemes are required to be self-financed as no funding is available from the Council Tax or through Central Government from taxes. Any surplus income from parking schemes is used to fund transport related schemes such as subsidising the concessionary fare system. This funding helps to ensure that other funds can be used for repairing and cleaning the Borough's streets.

Whilst it is recognised that there is a cost for residents for purchasing permits and this is a potential burden for those that have limited incomes this cost does need to be considered relative to running a car including the initial cost, depreciation, servicing, maintenance, tax and insurance. The current charge of £80 per annum for the first residents' permit issued to a household equates to approximately £1.54 per week.

There is no evidence that parking controls cause additional stress to residents. In fact, it is hoped that being able to park more freely should reduce the stress levels of residents compared to the current situation where it is very difficult to park close to an address within this area. An increase in the number of Civil Enforcement Officers patrolling the area should help to deter crime and reassure residents that parked vehicles are being monitored. The number of non-residents vehicles parking should be reduced as there would be a charge on parking. The current attractiveness for parking is the fact that it is free.

Visitors to the area will have the option to pay via the Pay by Phone facility (charges 50p per 30 minutes) or using Visitor Permits available to residents at a cost of £2 per half-day and up to 60 permits per annum.

There is some evidence that a few residents in the area have had dropped kerbs constructed to reserve parking spaces and that they will be adversely affected with the introduction of a yellow line. However, dropped kerbs or vehicular crossovers are introduced to allow legal access to and from a driveway or garage. If a resident, cannot or does not want to use their private parking area then they do have the option of requesting for a parking bay although this would be available to any permit holder / Pay by Phone user / disabled badge holder.

#### 5.40 **Petition 1**

“REFERENCE: PD/CH/K4 & K5

I live on Broughton Road and this letter is sent on behalf of all residents of Broughton Road. We have all signed this petition to appeal the decision taken by Croydon Council to make Broughton Road a Controlled Parking Zone. All residents are against this proposal, we object to this in any shape or form.

Also Broughton Road residents that signed this petition are extremely angry and upset, that you are introducing a yellow lines outside their driveways, where all residents who have paid you their hard earned money to Croydon council, in good faith to drop their Kerb.

Are now told that they can't park their own car outside, their own driveway in controlled hours. This is extremely upsetting to Residents.

I have spoken to all of the residents, while they signed this petition and they have expressed these concerns below. Now for those residents who have 3 cars this is going to cause problems and stress for them. As they currently park 2 cars on their driveway and the 3rd car directly outside their house. These Residents will struggle to find parking for a 3rd vehicle, as they will be driving around looking for parking bay spaces, as can't park outside their own house driveway.

Also relatives or friends visiting will struggle to find space as they will not be able to park outside, the driveway of the friends or relative they are visiting, which fall in your proposed controlled hours of operation of 8 am to 8pm. This will mean families, will less frequently come and visit their families or friends. As they will be worrying all the time they need, to pay for more time in parking.

One common thing I got from this petition, is all Broughton Road residents with driveways are more upset about losing the right to park outside their home in the controlled parking hours. They all feel there should be no yellow line outside their driveway.

Furthermore Residents of Broughton who do not have a driveway are equally outraged and upset by this planned controlled parking zone.

Broughton Road resident pay so much on Council tax, car road tax, Car insurance and other bills and now with the cost of living going up, Croydon Council have added more expenses to our bills. This controlled parking will make the situation worse as residents will be in competition for parking bays, this will turn Neighbour against Neighbour, causing arguments.

The residents of Broughton Road feel betrayed and let down, so please take this as our Appeal and true opinion of our residents of Broughton road, who are against this. I have provided evidence of this in a form of a petition, which is enclosed with this

letter and email. So please kindly stop and cancel this, as we are all against this at Broughton Road. You are more than welcome, to come to our road and talk to our residents.”

#### 5.41 **Officer Comments**

This petition included 96 signatures from Broughton Road CR7.

There is some evidence that a proportion of residents of Broughton Road have had dropped kerbs constructed to reserve parking spaces and that they will be adversely affected with the introduction of a yellow line. However, dropped kerbs or vehicular crossovers are introduced to allow legal access to and from a driveway or garage rather than reserving a space on the highway. If a resident, cannot or does not want to use their private parking area then they do have the option of requesting for a parking bay although this would be available to any permit holder / Pay by Phone users / disabled badge holder.

Currently there is a two permit policy per household in Croydon with annual charges of £80 for the first and £126 for the second permit issued at a household. The reasons for this approach were detailed in paragraph 3.3, 12th July 2018 PARKING CHARGES 2018 / 2019 report minute reference 9/18 which was considered by Traffic Management Advisory Committee and recommended to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration for approval. The reduction in the number of permits available to residents was introduced due to increasing complaints by residents in some areas where there is simply insufficient space for the number of residents' vehicles especially in roads where the properties are predominantly terraced houses with narrow frontages such as most of the roads in this area.

Whilst it is recognised that there is a cost for residents for purchasing permits and this is a potential burden for those that are limited incomes this cost does need to be considered relative to running a car including the initial cost, depreciation, servicing, maintenance, tax and insurance. The current charge of £80 per annum for the first residents' permit issued to a household equates to approximately £1.54 per week.

This parking scheme should reduce the situation where residents are competing for spaces as non-residents will be deterred from parking due to the charges. Evidence from nearby roads where controls have been introduced show that the number of vacant spaces are significantly increased and many residents are able to park close to or actually outside their homes.

## 5.42 Petition 2

This petition is of the form of a letter which is included overleaf

### **Elim Pentecostal Church**

Stanley Road, Croydon, Surrey CR0 3QA

Tel: Office: 0208-665-5370; Mob. : 07724 882 707

Email: [office@elimpentecostal.org.uk](mailto:office@elimpentecostal.org.uk) Website: [www.elimpentecostal.org.uk](http://www.elimpentecostal.org.uk)

Registered Charity No: 251549



Order Making Section  
Parking Design Team,  
Place Department, Croydon Council  
Floor 6 Zone C,  
Bernard Weatherill House,  
8 Mint Walk,  
Croydon,  
CR0 1EA

15<sup>th</sup> March 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

#### **OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE CROYDON NORTH CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE – NEW N2 SUB-ZONE**

We strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions to be introduced on Stanley Road and yellow lines in front of our church building and church offices at 439B & C. The church has been on Stanley Road for 91 years and very involved in the life of the community through the programs and support it offers to the local people. The church supports the local community in a number of ways i.e. food bank, free youth events, summer holiday schemes, lunch for the elderly, health & wellbeing seminars and talks in conjunction with Eversley Medical Centre etc. We have over 600 people who receive support from the church and would require parking in the close proximity of the church.

We strongly feel that Residents, Parishioners, and Users of the church should have the right to park their vehicles without additional costs of obtaining parking permits. Our reasons for objecting the controlled parking zones are as follows:

- Parking restrictions from Monday to Sunday is severe and unreasonable for a residential area.
- The proposed operational time of 8am – 8pm is also unreasonable and seems like just a money making venture.
- The proposal will impose additional financial burden on residents and parishioners.
- It will prevent friends and relatives from visiting us during the permit restrictions.
- The proposal will disadvantage residents who are homebound and isolated as friends and relatives are likely to visit them during the permit restrictions and may chose not to do so due to parking cost.
- The restrictions will substantially affect the quality of life within the community.
- Most houses on the top part of Stanley road already have dropped kerbs so further restrictions is unreasonable.
- We only have limited parking spaces in front of the church and the church offices therefore controlled parking will introduce yellow lines which will further reduce our limited parking space.
- Introducing controlled parking zone will encourage people to park in 'non controlled parking zone' areas, thus making parking more difficult further up the street.
- Currently restrictions are in place on Canterbury Road and therefore it is unnecessary to impose further restrictions.
- Over enthusiastic parking attendants will bring unnecessary anxiety and nuisance to the residents and visitors.

Please see attached petition signed by our parishioners who oppose the proposal of parking restrictions on Stanley Road and surroundings.

Petition statement: We, the undersign, object to Croydon Council's plan to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone along Stanley Road. Reasons are listed in the attached letter.

#### 5.43 **Officer Comments**

A 319 signature petition has been received from the Elim Pentecostal Church, Stanley Road. Nineteen of the signatures are from residents within the proposed CPZ. Whilst it is recognised that there will be a cost for parishioners most will have a choice to use public transport (bearing in mind that the church is by London Road with excellent bus services) or perhaps car share to reduce the cost of parking. Responding to the main points in the petition:

- Existing roads bordering the proposed extension area operate between 8am and 8pm, Monday to Sunday which followed petitions and requests from these residents experiencing parking problems outside the standard 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls currently in operation in most of Borough's CPZs. At the informal consultation stage occupiers in the area were given these 2 options for operational hours and of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred the longer hours of operation hence the current proposal for this area. One of the main issues that residents currently experience is evening and Sunday parking stress due to a combination of the nearby Croydon University Hospital, where parking is very limited for both employees and visitors and the number of residential developments along London Road where residents are currently prevented through the planning agreement from obtaining residents' parking permits. On Sundays there is a flat fee of £3.30 for all day parking and £1.30 for one hour parking.
- Although it is recognised that there will be additional costs for parking for residents and parishioners the informal consultation was as a result of 4 petitions from this area for parking controls and a positive response to the informal consultation. Flat fees of £1.30 for one hour and £3.30 for the whole day will be available for Sunday parking. Free parking on Sundays will still be available in nearby roads to the east of London Road where controls operate 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.
- Residents are able to purchase up to 60 half day Visitor Permits, per annum, at a cost of £2 using the Pay by Phone method of payment. Although it is accepted that this will be a financial burden it is worth noting that currently parking stress is such with very few parking spaces available, that many potential visitors may be deterred from parking in this area and a parking scheme may actually assist visitors. Registered carers can obtain Neighbourhood Care permits allowing unlimited parking.
- Parking bays will be maximised allowing for dropped kerbs and junctions where yellow lines will be required. The high proportion of dropped kerbs currently restricts available space in Stanley Road close to the Church and it may be easier for most parishioners to park in the nearby free on a Sunday streets to the east of London Road.
- If parking controls are introduced into this area the nearest uncontrolled parking will be some of the roads to the west and north of Thornton Road and sections of Mitcham Road and roads to the southwest of this road. These areas are a distance from the Church.
- There is no evidence that parking controls cause additional stress and anxiety to residents and visitors. In fact, it is hoped that being able to park more freely should reduce the stress levels of residents and visitors compared to the current

situation where it is very difficult to park close to an address within this area. An increase in the number of Civil Enforcement Officers patrolling the area should help to deter crime and reassure residents that parked vehicles are being monitored.

#### 5.44 **Petition 3**

“To: Mr. David Wakeling (Parking Design Manager) Croydon Council  
CC: Leader of Council, Ward Councillors, Croydon MPs, Faith Groups.

Petition Against 12-hours Proposed Parking Restriction  
Croydon North Zone – New N2 sub-zone

As residents, workers, visitors, business owners, drivers, motor cyclists, taxpayers and supporters of Croydon North – N2 sub-zone;

(Dunheved Road North, Dunheved Close, Dunheved Road West, Dunheved Road South, Sharland Close, Broughton Road, Whitehall Road, Colvin Road, Curzon Road, Furtherfield Close, Harcourt Road, Kenmare Road, Lynton Road, Marden Road, Marden Crescent, Oakwood Road, Oakwood Place, Ramsey Road, Boston Road, Southwell Road, Stanley Road, Stanley Grove, Keston Road, York Road and ‘odd numbers’ 39 to 393 Thornton Road)

We are supporting this petition to ask Croydon Council to reconsider the 12-hour parking zones, and implement sensible parking hours zone, 9 am to 5pm Monday to Saturday) for above-mentioned roads in N2 sub-zone. This would satisfy our needs, as residents and those attending Croydon University Hospital, Croydon Mosque & Islamic Centre and other activities. We are supporting this petition on behalf of the community with names, post code, and counter-signature.

We are also responding to the Council letter, dated 6th March 2019, about ‘most of the residents’ request for the 12-hour parking. Your letter mentioned the parking charges as 50 pence for 30 minutes and Sundays £1.30 pence per hour. Yet, your letter failed to specify how many responded, how many requested the 12-hour slot, and those who did not.

However, the Council report about the consultation was poor. This means the report contradicts the letter dated 6th March. This is misleading and disregarding the needs and interests of all the local people’ needs.

Your decision to impose the 12-hour parking suits the needs of a few, not the views of the overwhelming many affected. This is in complete contradiction to the Labour Party Policies to which most of the councillors follow. This means double standards in your service-delivery.

However, this petition is supporting sensible parking hours from 9 am to 5pm with a reduced charge of 30p per 30 minutes and 60p per 1 hour. This would be the rate for Lakehall Road Area. It would be reasonable and fair. It would benefit everyone, not the few. It would show respects to carers, needing parking after 5pm, for hospital and Mosque visits.

This petition also supports;

Free 60-minutes parking for Friday's prayer between 12:00 pm to 3.00 pm  
At any other times free 30-minutes parking.  
Free parking in front of driveway in the Zone N2.  
No restriction on the 2-hour parking meter areas.

These requests are for everyone's facilities. It would help others needing parking to go to local shops. It would assist older people or young families who may need parking after 5pm. It would also show that Council is considerate and compassionate to the needs of everyone, not the few.

Please note that we are contacting the Croydon MPs, the Croydon Councillors, other faith Groups, Local Employers, local charities, local businesses and everyone accessing the above-mentioned roads to support this petition. Having listed our concerns, we look forward to your decision because we represent the many not the few who responded to your initial consultation.

Please note that this also overrides and impairs the legitimate attendance at Croydon Mosque & Islamic Centre which is an important community hub within Croydon."

#### 5.45 **Officer Comments**

An 877 signature petition has been received from the Croydon Mosque & Islamic Centre. Thirty seven signatures are from residents who live within the proposed CPZ. The informal consultation results are available on the Croydon website – TMAC meeting of 17 October 2018. Answering the main points of the petition:

- Existing roads bordering the proposed extension area operate between 8am and 8pm, Monday to Sunday which followed petitions and requests from these residents experiencing parking problems outside the standard 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls currently in operation in most of Borough's CPZs. At the informal consultation stage occupiers in the area were given these 2 options for operational hours and of those that responded 73% indicated that they preferred the longer hours of operation hence the current proposal for this area. One of the main issues that residents currently experience is evening and Sunday parking stress due to a combination of the nearby Croydon University Hospital, where parking is very limited for both employees and visitors and the number of residential developments along London Road where residents are currently prevented through the planning agreement from obtaining residents' permits.
- Although it is understandable that the Croydon Mosque are requesting both lower charges and free Friday afternoon parking this will adversely affect local residents and if such a policy were adopted then similar parking arrangements should be offered for other places of worship. There is also a need to have a consistent parking policy for parking charges throughout the Borough to avoid driver confusion and possible accusations that some members of the community are treated differently to others.
- Dropped kerbs or vehicular crossovers are introduced to allow legal access to and from a driveway or garage rather than reserving a space on the highway. If a resident, cannot or does not want to use their private parking area then they do have the option of requesting for a parking bay although this would be available to any permit holder / Pay by Phone users / disabled badge holder. It is a

requirement that a Controlled Parking Zone should be continuous with either yellow lines or parking bays. It is therefore not possible to allow free parking alongside of dropped kerb.

In summary it is worth pointing out that if parking controls are introduced in the Dunheved area parking should become easier with more spaces available for visitors including worshipers to the Croydon Mosque. Currently, with the domination of the area by with commuters' vehicles, mainly from Croydon University Hospital which is virtually opposite this site, there are very few spaces available. Most worshipers are only in the Mosque for a short period and a charge of 50p for each 30 minutes is not considered unreasonable for those that wish to drive.

#### 5.46 **Petition 4**

"I am writing in response to your letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019 with regards to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone (CPZ) in Colvin Road / Whitehall Road and Sub-Zone Areas.

Your proposal to extend the CPZ has raised a lot of concerns with residents, some of whom have lived in the street for over three decades. Particularly ageing parents, widows and single mothers who are managing without any financial support from the government to make ends meet.

As residents, we have a duty of care securing convenient parking spaces in our street without another levy. As the law demands, we also pay our road taxes which gives us legitimate right to park in unrestricted areas.

Over the past years we have managed to find suitable parking without your help. Why now? In your letter, you outlined the because the majority of residents on Boston Rd / Keston Rd / Broughton Rd have sought your help in this matter, you are proposing to extend the controlled parking into other sub-zones. At the inception phase, we responded to your enquiry opposing to the controlled parking zone in Colvin Road and Whitehall Road. Our feedback to you was as clear as daylight and our decision still stands.

As a result, residents of Colvin Rd and Whitehall Rd DO NOT NEED YOUR HELP TO CONTROL the influx of traffic or parking our streets. No matter the challenges we are faced with during major gas repair works or installation of utility meters, residents have dealt with unforeseen circumstances without your help. Rather, you've been unrealistic in issuing residents with Traffic Enforcement Charges during major roadworks in the Easter holidays. Sorry. We don't need your help!

#### PROPOSED NOTICE-

The proposal notice sent to residents is packed with misspellings and inconsistency of response dates.

- Page 1 request for responses by 4/4/19; while
- Page 4 request for responses by 5/4/19.

If your office does not have the resources to manage the efficiency of official/formal letters, how then could you control the parking zones in all the intended Sub-Zones?

We object to your proposal of introducing a controlled parking zone in our streets. We are already overburdened with huge utility bills, including the incremental Council Tax- over £1200 per year to worry about. We don't not need a further drain on

MAKING SCHEME? In a few years' time we are likely to see a rise in parking charges due to inflation. No matter your decision to introduce control zones in our area, we stand in solidarity as residents to oppose you 'Revenue GENERATING PROJECT'.

We have noticed that the car parking areas in Croydon, Even though there's been a slash in parking fees, the spaces are almost empty during the weekdays. Is this not the reason why you are looking for an alternative measure to raise revenue.

Researchers have shown that children who walk to school tend to act smarter than those who travel by car. As a result, the governments encouraging parents to walk with their children to school to encourage a healthy lifestyle in order to reduce obesity. Now, you are rather imposing a charge to house owners who intend to leave their cars in the street. Don't we have the legitimate right to park in our streets without the council's interference? We've had a duty of care to manage on our own over the past decades without your help. This is not the time to call on you-especially with all the uncertainty surrounding our economy.

With the ongoing uncertainty, we are unsure whether we will have a job in coming months. On behalf of the widows living in Colvin Rd - it is very difficult as it is. We can't recall the last time we had a decent holiday. The only option and consolation we have is regular visits from our family members. It seems your intended proposal is seeking to deprive us of this privilege by imposing a parking fine to visitors during weekdays as well as weekends. We no longer have the right to park in our street without paying a tariff? Have you thought of the financial constraints and challenges some of us have had to endure each month to cater for our children, and in some cases our elderly parents? Most significantly the emotional trauma.

We seriously object to your intended proposal and would like a face to face consultation with you to discuss this issue as a matter of priority. If you have any questions or would like to schedule a meeting with residents, please contact us by phone or email. We have enclosed our petition which outlines our contact details, as well as appendices for your information and action."

#### 5.47 **Officer Comments**

A 21 signature petition has been received from residents of Colvin Road and Whitehall Road.

Answering the point about inconsistencies in the formal consultation document it is unfortunate that the letter included 4 April whereas the FAQ sheet mentioned 5 April as the deadline date for objections to be received. However, in reality objections received up to the 10 April to allow for the postal service were considered so this should not have influenced the number of objections received.

The law does not provide a right to park on the highway as all parking is regarded as an obstruction of the basic right of anyone to pass and repass without hindrance. Parking on any part of the highway – including a verge or a footway is technically an obstruction of that highway under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980. Revenue raised from parking schemes is ring fenced for transport issues. Parking schemes are consulted on as a response to petitions and lobbying from local Ward Councillors. The Council will arrange a meeting with the petitioners to answer questions.

## 6 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.

### 6.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2019/20 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
		£'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	32	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>43</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

### 6.2 The effect of the decision

6.2.1 The cost of introducing controlled parking into the Keston Road area has been estimated at £32,000. This includes the supply and installation of signs, lines and a contribution towards the legal costs. It is proposed that there will be no Pay & Display machines in this area.

6.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available capital budgets for 2019/20.

### 6.3 Risks

6.3.1 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

#### **6.4 Options**

6.4.1 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.

#### **6.5 Savings/ future efficiencies**

If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from paid for parking, be it from Pay & Display machines or Ringo, 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.

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

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

7.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance that 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.

7.2 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.

7.3 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.

7.4 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.

7.5 Approved by Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law, on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer.

## **8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

8.1 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.

8.2 Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of Human Resources.

## **9. CUSTOMER IMPACT**

9.1 The introduction of a new CPZ into Boston Road, Broughton Road, Colvin Road, Curzon Road, Dunheved Close, Dunheved Road North, Dunheved Road South, Dunheved Road West, Furtherfield Close, Harcourt Road, Kenmare Road, Keston Road, Lynton Road, Marden Crescent, Marden Road, Oakland Road, Oakland Place, Ramsey Road, Sharland Close, Stanley Grove, Southwell Road, Stanley Road, Whitehall Road and York Road is proposed in response to support from local residents for controlled parking.

9.2 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 sought to be introduced in the area where there is an overall majority of occupiers in favour of a scheme. This is true of this scheme with the exception of a few roads where there was not support. It is however considered that not including the scheme in their roads when a scheme is proposed for the surrounding roads is likely to be detrimental to residents in these areas as they are likely to experience greater parking stress. The proposals are made with a view to improving residents' ability to park nearer to their homes.

## **10. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

10.1 An initial Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and it is considered that a Full EqIA is not required. Specific equalities issues raised as part of the formal consultation are referenced within the officers' response to those objections within the body of the report.

## **11. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

11.1 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.

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

- 12.1 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 on the ground.

## **13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 13.1 The recommendations are to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into the Keston Road area since a majority of respondents 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.
- 13.2 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.

## **14. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 14.1 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.

---

### **REPORT AUTHOR**

Omar Tingling, Traffic Engineer,  
Parking Design, High Improvements, Streets, 020  
8726 6000 (Ext. 63750)

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

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

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None