

# Croydon Council

For general release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  <b>12 July 2018</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>PRINCESS ROAD AREA – OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH PERMIT AREA)</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place Department</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Stuart King, Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport &amp; Regeneration (Job Share)</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Bensham Manor, Selhurst and West Thornton.</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b>  This report is in accordance with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Croydon Plan Feb 2018; Transport Chapter.</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>• 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 Acting Cabinet for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 Consider the responses to the objections received to the proposed controlled parking zone in the Princess Road Area from Hartley Road, Devonshire Road, Pawson's Road and St. Saviours Road,</li><li>1.2 Agree to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone into the above roads as shown on plan PD-345/01 for the reasons as set out in this report.</li><li>1.3 Authorise officers to inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision.</li></ol>	

## **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone in the Princess Road Area with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display machines (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.
- 2.2 The outcome of the informal consultation was reported to the Executive Director of Place as required by the delegation from the Leader dated 6 June 2016 in relation to Traffic Management Orders. Following receipt of the responses to the formal Consultation, these were reported to the Executive Director of Place. On 3 July 2018 the Executive Director of Place referred the matter to this committee on the basis that she considered it appropriate to do so.

## **3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Petitions were received from residents of Boulogne Road and Princess Road requesting that the Council develop a residents' permit scheme to address the parking problems in their roads. Officers reported the petitions to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee (TMAC), on 5 October 2016 after which permission to carry out this consultation was granted.
- 3.2 On 15 November 2017 consultation documents were sent to residents and businesses in the Princess Road Area, as shown on drawing no. PD-345/01. As a result of the consultation, a positive response was received and the majority of those in Amersham Road, Ashby Walk (part of Beulah Grove), Beulah Grove, Broadway Avenue, Eileen Road, Hartley Road, Henderson Road, Lion Road, Mayo Road, Northbrook Road, Pawson's Road, Princess Road, Queens Road, Saddle Mews (alongside Strathmore Road), Smock Walk (part of Beulah Grove), Singleton Close (part of St Saviours Road), St. Saviours Road, Tirrell Road and Windmill Road, voted in favour of parking controls.
- 3.3 The majority of respondents also expressed a preference for 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday rather than 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls. The results of the informal consultation in the proposed extension area are shown in Table 1 overleaf:

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

<b>ROAD</b>	<b>Number of Consultees</b>	<b>Responses Received</b>	<b>% Received</b>	<b>Responses In Favour of CPZ</b>	<b>% in Favour of CPZ</b>	<b>% in Favour of 9am-5pm Mon-Sat</b>	<b>% in Favour of 8am- 8pm Mon-Sun</b>
Amersham Rd	20	5	25%	4	80%	20%	80%
Ashby Walk	13	1	8%	1	100%	0	100%
Berney Road	44	7	16%	3	43%	100%	0
Beulah Grove	111	37	33%	29	78%	43%	41%
Broadway Ave.	46	14	30%	8	57%	36%	43%
Boulogne Road	34	12	35%	11	92%	42%	50%
Cromwell Road	145	1	0.7%	0	0%	0%	100%
Devonshire Rd	47	11	23%	5	45%	55%	27%
Elmwood Road	47	21	45%	4	19%	62%	14%
Englefield Cl.	18	3	17%	0	0%	67%	33%
Grace Road	13	6	46%	2	33%	50%	33%
Greenwood Rd	30	14	47%	5	36%	71%	21%
Hartley Road	64	29	45%	16	55%	45%	28%
Henderson Rd	36	6	17%	3	50%	83%	0%
Hughes Walk	26	2	8%	1	50%	100%	0%
Johnson Rd	66	6	9%	2	33%	67%	17%
Kemp Gardens	14	1	7%	0	0%	100%	0%
Lion Road	5	2	40%	2	100%	50%	50%
Mayo Road	34	10	29%	5	50%	50%	40%
Northbrook Rd	49	14	29%	7	50%	50%	43%
Pawson's Rd	161	34	21%	12	35%	59%	24%
Prestwood Gdns	54	10	19%	3	30%	40%	30%

<b>ROAD</b>	<b>Number of Consultees</b>	<b>Responses Received</b>	<b>% Received</b>	<b>Responses In Favour of CPZ</b>	<b>% in Favour of CPZ</b>	<b>% in Favour of 9am-5pm Mon-Sat</b>	<b>% in Favour of 8am- 8pm Mon-Sun</b>
Princess Road	100	40	40%	33	83%	53%	43%
Queens Road	134	35	26%	21	60%	49%	46%
Saddle Mews	30	6	20%	4	67%	67%	17%
Smock Walk	17	5	29%	4	80%	40%	40%
Strathmore Rd	57	10	18%	9	90%	49%	50%
Singleton Cl.	31	3	10%	0	0%	67%	0%
St Saviours Rd	116	42	36%	24	57%	43%	43%
Tirrell Road	259	13	5%	13	100%	46%	46%
Whitehorse Rd	677	67	10%	21	31%	66%	16%
Windmill Grove	70	16	23%	13	81%	54%	54%
Windmill Road	218	16	7%	9	56%	81%	19%
<b>Total For The Roads In The Proposed Extension Area</b>	<b>2801</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>30%</b>

#### **4. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES**

##### **Objections / comments from residents on similar grounds**

- 4.1 Four residents from St. Saviours Road and one from Devonshire Road have objected that the proposed controlled parking zone on the basis that they consider that the scheme will not make any difference as most of the houses on this road have been split into flats, which means more than one family lives in each house and therefore, there are more cars than parking spaces. Consequently, if you have purchased a parking permit or permits, there is no guarantee a parking space will be available. One objector is a landlord and has properties in St Saviours Road and her concern is that her low income tenants will not be able to afford permits.
- 4.2 One objector has stated that parking issues in St Saviours Road occur in the evenings and not during the day, so introducing parking controls during the day will not resolve parking issues in the evenings. Parking is also an issue during football matches. Introducing controls that end at 5pm will not resolve the issues that occur in the evenings.
- 4.3 Three of the objectors have stated that an overall 18% response from residents is a

low one and the Council should not have proceeded any further. Also, since the petitions came from Boulogne Road and Princess Road, the Council should have consulted these two roads only. Instead, the Council has decided to include the surrounding roads without any requests from the residents who reside in these roads.

### **Response**

- 4.4 A large number of telephone calls and emails have been received from St. Saviours Road. Residents have complained that they cannot park in their own road due to cars dumped by the local garage and commuters who use the local train station. Following a number of site surveys being carried out in and around St. Saviours Road, at the Traffic Management Advisory Committee meeting held on 5 October 2016, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment authorised officers to proceed with the informal consultation in Boulogne Road and Princess Road and that surrounding roads should also be consulted, since the surveys showed there are parking issues throughout the area.
- 4.5 The Council is aware that a number of houses in the Borough have been converted into flats, therefore the Council has made a conscious decision to allow a maximum of 2 permits per property with the cost of the second permit at £126 rather than £80 which has the effect of reducing the demand for second permits.
- 4.6 If the informal consultation was only carried out in Boulogne Road and Princess Road and the residents voted for a controlled parking scheme to be introduced, then this would have the potential to displace vehicles from Boulogne Road and Princess Road into neighbouring streets, like St. Saviours Road. An 18% response rate is considered average for a consultation exercise of this type. Low response rates can be attributed to a higher proportion of rented properties where residents may not be at the address for a long period or may feel that they are not entitled to vote. However, of those that did respond a majority of respondents indicated that they are in favour of parking bays being introduced in their roads.
- 4.7 Two petitions have been received by the Council. The first petition includes the residents' name, address and signature. The total number of signatures received is 82. 8 signatures from Mayo Road, 12 from Northbrook Road, 39 from Pawson's Road, 22 from Whitehorse Road (businesses only) and 1 from Tylecroft Road (which is outside the consultation area).
- 4.8 Although a large number of residents have signed the petition, a number of the objectors responded favourably to the consultation questionnaire, stating that a CPZ should be introduced in their road. This confirms that some residents when confronted on their own doorstep, may feel pressured into signing a petition or they will be targeted as the neighbour who voted for the scheme.
- 4.9 The second petition received was an online petition from a website called Change.Org. The petitioner (who lives in the proposed CPZ area) has encouraged visitors to the site to sign his petition against the proposed parking controls in the Princess Road Area. The petitioner has forwarded a typed petition to the Council.
- 4.10 The petition received from Change.Org website, has the objectors full names and where they reside, with the exception of one resident from St Saviours Road. A total of 86 website visitors signed the petition. 50 objectors, (except one resident who is from St Saviours Road, which is in the proposed CPZ boundary), have stated they are from

Croydon and because they have not given their full address, the Council cannot determine whether they are from the proposed CPZ area or outside it. 38 objectors who do not live in the Borough, have also listed their names on the website, because they are against parking controls in general.

- 4.11 The results of the informal and formal consultations have confirmed that there is support for parking controls from roads some distance from Princess Road and Boulogne Road where the original petitions were received and where surveys have confirmed parking stress.
- 4.12 Residents from Hartley Road, Elmwood Road and Northbrook Road have objected on the grounds that the consultation was misleading and unwanted, since parking spaces will be lost across driveways due to the proposal of new single yellow lines being marked across dropped kerbs.
- 4.13 The residents have requested that the proposed controlled parking zone should not be introduced in Hartley, Elmwood, Greenwood and St. Saviours Roads, as the majority of properties in these roads have driveways and with the proposal of single yellow lines across driveways, this will dramatically reduce the number of bays and at least one third of the available parking spaces will be lost due to the size of the parking bays.
- 4.14 Residents from Elmwood Road have also objected on the grounds that they do not want a single yellow line being marked across their driveways if the proposal is to go ahead. They have stated that they have paid the Council in order to construct their driveways and yet they will not be to park across it and therefore will end up with fewer parking spaces in Elmwood Road due to the proposed single yellow lines across driveways.

### **Response**

- 4.15 It is not possible to mark bays across dropped kerbs which could effectively result in obstruction to off-street parking facilities and the Council is obliged to place yellow lines in front of all dropped kerbs within Controlled Parking Zones. If a resident notifies the Council that their garage or driveway is no longer used for parking, consideration can be given to install additional parking bay.
- 4.16 Following the informal consultation, the percentage of residents who responded to the consultation and who voted in favour of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) being introduced in their road are:

Hartley Road	=	55%
St. Saviours Road	=	57%
Queens Road	=	60%

And the following roads were not in favour of a CPZ being introduced in their road:

Elmwood Road	=	19%
Greenwood Road	=	38%
- 4.17 Despite the above, it is recommended to proceed with introducing a new controlled parking zone in the Princess Road Area and to include Elmwood Road and Greenwood Road, even though they have voted against the scheme. It is prudent to include them because they will be surrounded by parking controls and are likely to suffer from parking stress as some drivers will prefer not to pay for parking.

## **Objection**

4.18 Three residents from Pawson's Road have objected to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:

- The introduction of a controlled parking zone will reduce the value of the objector's property.
- There are a number of small independent businesses in the Princess Road Area and there is great concern about what impact the CPZ will have on them. The objector is also concerned that, because of the current economic climate, introducing a controlled parking scheme in the Princess Road Area will have too negative an impact on small family run businesses to be able to continue to survive.
- The objector has also stated that as it is, there is no parking immediately outside the shops on this part of Whitehorse Road and if people were no longer able to stop in the nearby roads, the objector feels this would be detrimental to their income.
- Likewise, the Pawson's Arms Public House, may also be impacted. This Public House has been a longstanding part of the community and has also helped generate revenue for other local businesses particularly during Crystal Palace home games, when those visiting the pub will also use the local shops and restaurants.
- Pawson's Road is not close to any stations, hospitals or high street shops and the objector does not agree that parking issues are created by commuters. The objector has stated the only time Pawson's Road residents have parking issues is during the football season.
- The objector has also stated she has approached a large number of Pawson's Road residents and has stated they have voted against the scheme. Therefore, the objector would like to see official evidence that the majority of residents from Pawson's Road have voted in favour of the scheme.

## **Response**

4.19 There is no evidence that parking controls affect house prices. Previous experience of views from estate agents show that a residents' permit scheme can have a positive effect on the saleability of a home, as residents are more likely to have priority when parking, especially if the area suffers from commuter parking and other long term parking by non-residents taking advantage of unrestricted roads.

4.20 The Council understands the concerns raised by the second objector with regards to local shops and restaurants that may lose trade due to customers having to pay to park. However, what has been evident in existing controlled areas is that some business customers prefer to Pay & Display because they more likely to find a parking space to allow them to park closer to businesses that they want to visit.

- 4.21 In an area that is not controlled, business customers are less likely to find available space to park due to local residents and commuters, who tend to park all day and sometimes into the evening. Also, restaurants and local pubs are usually not affected by a controlled zone, because the controls finish at 5pm, and evidence has shown that business is usually slow before 5pm.
- 4.22 Our records show 35% of the residents in Pawson's Road voted in favour of an introduction of a controlled parking zone in their road. Although the third objector has stated that Pawson's Road is not close to stations, hospitals or high street shops, surveys have shown that commuters tend to park further away from stations not through choice, but because the roads closer to stations are either controlled or congested. Consequently commuters tend to find spaces further out and hop on a bus to get to their desired station because they already have a travel card that allows them to use other forms of transport if they wish.
- 4.23 The third objector has commented that introducing a CPZ will only benefit the Council financially, through the purchase of permits and the money generated through Pay & Display machines. All parking schemes are required to be self-financed as there is no funding from the Council Tax for these types of schemes. In outer areas revenue from Pay & Display machines is relatively low although there will be income from the purchase of permits and from enforcement through Penalty Charge Notices.
- 4.24 The cost of extending controlled parking into the Princess Road area has been estimated at £30,000. This includes the supply and installation of signs, lines and a contribution towards the legal costs. The supply and installation of Pay & Display machines is funded from existing stock. CPZ schemes have proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

## **5 CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections from the public following the advertisement of the public notice of the proposals. Once the notices were advertised, the public had up to 21 days to respond.
- 5.2 The legal process requires that formal consultation takes place in the form of Public Notices published in the London Gazette and a local paper (Croydon Guardian). Although it is not a legal requirement, this Council also fixes notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed schemes to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.
- 5.3 Organisations such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK and bus operators are consulted separately at the same time as the public notice. Other organisations are also consulted, depending on the relevance of the proposal. No comments were received from any of these organisations.

## **6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There is a revenue budget of £50k for CPZ undertakings and £50k for Footway Parking and Disabled Bays, from which these commitments if approved will be funded.



Attached to the papers of this meeting is a summary of the overall financial impact of this and other applications for approval at this meeting. If all applications were approved there would remain £61 un-allocated to be utilised in 2018/2019 this is taking into account £24k that was committed in 2017/2018 against the 2018/2019 financial years spend.

## 6.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	76	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from Report</u></b>				
Expenditure	6	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>70</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

## 6.2 The effect of the decision

6.2.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into the Princess Road area has been estimated at £30,000. This includes the installation of the signs and lines. Pay & Display machines will be supplied and installed from stock.

6.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available revenue budget for 2018/19. An original amount of £24,000 has been allocated from previous months TMAC reports for this scheme and therefore has already been accounted for therefore and additional £6k is expected to be now spent.

## 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

- 6.5 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.
- 6.6 **Savings/ future efficiencies**
- 6.7 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from Pay & Display takings and permit sales, together with enforcement of these controls through Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.
- 6.8 Approved by: Felicia Wright, Head of Finance – Place

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

- 7.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Section 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provides powers to introduce, implement and revoke Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.
- 7.2 The Council needs to comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations must be considered before a final decision is made.
- 7.3 Approved by Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law, for and on behalf of Jacqueline Harris-Baker, Director of Law and Monitoring officer.

## **8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 8.1 Extending North Permit Zone into the Princess Road area 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: Sue Moorman, Director of Human Resources.

## **9. CUSTOMER IMPACT**

- 9.1 The proposed new Controlled Parking Zone in the Princess Road Area is in response to petitions received from the residents of Boulogne Road and Princess Road. Occupiers of all residential and business premises in the area were invited to take part in the formal consultation to ensure that all those potentially affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views – responses to these comments and objections are the subject of this report.

9.2 The Council only introduces parking controls in the area where the majority of residents are in favour of a CPZ scheme. In this area 55% of the occupiers who responded to the informal consultation voted in favour of parking controls. If controls were not introduced in the roads where the majority of residents voted against controls this would result in a situation where they would be surrounded by parking controls to the detriment of the residents. 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.

## **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.

## **11 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

11.1 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.

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

12.1 There are no such considerations arising from this report.

## **13 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

13.1 The recommendation is to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone in the Princess Road Area where parking stress is high and the majority of occupiers have supported the parking controls which is clear from the recent informal consultation.

## **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**

Huda Wahab, Traffic Engineer  
Infrastructure, Parking Design, 020 8726 6000  
(Ext. 88258)

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

David Wakeling, Traffic Design Manager  
Infrastructure, Parking Design, 020 8726 6000  
(Ext. 88229)

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None