

# Croydon Council

For general release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b> <b>6 OCTOBER 2015</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>QUEENSWOOD AVENUE AREA PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH PERMIT ZONE) RESULTS OF CONSULTATION</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Jo Negrini, Executive Director of Planning and Environment</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>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; 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 2013 – 15</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 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 Transport and Environment that they agree to:-  1.1 Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposal to extend the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into the Queenswood Avenue	

area.

- 1.2 Agree to officers carrying out a formal consultation to extend the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into part of Meadow View Road and part of Frant Road as shown on Plan no PD284
- 1.3 Authorise the Highway Improvement Manager, Streets Directorate to give notice of the proposals and subject to receiving no objections on the giving of the public notice to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).
- 1.4 Note that any material objections received following the giving of public notice will be reported to a future Traffic Management Advisory Committee for Members' consideration and onward recommendation to the Cabinet Member.
- 1.5 Note that the officer shall inform the respondents and consultees of the decision.

## **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 This report considers the results of the informal consultation on the proposal to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Queenswood Avenue area comprising Queenswood Avenue, Kingswood Avenue, Meadow View Road and Frant Road.
- 2.2 It is recommended to proceed to the formal consultation stage with a proposal to extend controlled parking into part of Meadow View Road and the section of Frant Road between the existing CPZ boundary and Meadow View Road.

## **3 DETAIL**

- 3.1 In July 2014, having considered a petition from local residents, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment authorised the extension of the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into Queenswood Avenue and the surrounding area, as shown Drawing No. PD – 241c (minute A12/14 refers). It was agreed to consult on extending the North Permit Zone due to the high parking stress in the area which borders the existing zone and is close to Croydon University Hospital.
- 3.2 The informal consultation commenced on Monday, 29 June 2015 when 287 sets of consultation documents comprising a letter, drawing, factsheet and questionnaire were hand-delivered to addresses within the proposed extension area. Included in each set was a pre-paid envelope for return of the questionnaire. The informal consultation documents are attached as an appendix to this report. The consultation ran for five weeks to Friday, 31 July 2015.

3.3 Consultees were requested to register their “Yes/No” preference votes on the questionnaire and return in the pre-paid envelope provided.

#### 4 CONSULTATION

4.1 Over the 5 week consultation period a total of 101 questionnaires were received, representing a 35% response rate which is considered high for an informal consultation exercise of this type. Table 1 shows the results and returns for the individual roads in the consultation area.

4.2 A small petition was also received against the scheme in Frant Road. This was signed by 21 people. 8 did not give their address. Of the remaining 13, 8 live in the section of Frant Road in which, following the informal consultation is now planned not to proceed with the scheme (3 from the same address). One resident from outside the consultation area signed the petition. Of the four residents in the section of Frant Road where it is recommended to proceed to the giving formal public notice 2 expressed a preference of “no” on their questionnaires and 2 didn’t return their questionnaires.

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

Road Name	Number of Consultees	Number of Responses Received	% Returned	Number of Responses in Favour	% in favour
Brigstock Road	3	0	0%	0	0%
Frant Road	185	62	34%	33	3%
Kingswood Avenue	38	15	39%	5	3%
Meadow View Road	18	5	28%	3	60%
Queenswood Avenue	43	19	44%	9	47%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43%</b>

4.4 The results show that the majority of those in both Frant Road and Meadow View Road who responded to the informal consultation expressed a preference in favour of parking controls.

4.5 Due to the strong support for parking controls in the section of Frant Road between the CPZ boundary and Meadow View Road and the section of Meadow View Road between Buxton Road and Frant Road it is proposed to extend the North Permit Zone into this area. Table 2 below contains the results for the sections of road where the scheme is proposed to proceed

4.6 **TABLE 2 – Results of the consultation Response in the proposed extension area**

Road Name	Number of Consultees	Number of Responses Received	% Returned	Number of Responses in Favour	% in favour
Frant Road (south-eastern end)	150	50	33%	28	56%
Meadow View Road (north-eastern end)	7	3	43%	3	00% <sup>1</sup>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>58%</b>

4.7 Appendix A includes a summary of the comments that were received on the questionnaire sheets.

4.8 The responses are considered to demonstrate the need for the extension of the Controlled Parking Zone into sections of Frant Road and Meadow View Road as shown on drawing no... subject to formal consultation.

4.9 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 street notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed scheme and writes to occupiers who are directly affected to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.

4.10 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, the Cycling Council for Great Britain, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK, The Owner Drivers' Society, The Confederation of Passenger Transport and bus operators are consulted under the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Additional bodies, up to 27 in total, are consulted depending on the relevance of the proposals.

4.11 Once the notices have been published the public has 21 days to comment or object to the proposals. If no relevant objections are received, subject to agreement to the delegated authority sought by the recommendations, the Traffic Management Order is then made. Any relevant objections received will be reported back to this Committee for a recommendation as to whether the scheme should be introduced as originally proposed, amended or abandoned and objectors informed of the decision.

## 5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £70k for the current financial year. Attached to the papers of this meeting is a summary of the overall financial impact of this and other applications for approval at this meeting. If all applications were approved there would be £36k remaining for future spend.

### 1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

#### Effect of Decision

#### from Report

Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

#### Capital Budget available

Expenditure	70	0	0	0
-------------	----	---	---	---

#### Effect of Decision

#### from report

Expenditure	21	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>49</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

### 2 The effect of the decision

2.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into Frant Road (CPZ boundary to Meadow View Road) and Meadow View Road (Buxton Road to Frant Road) has been estimated at £18,000. This includes the provision of Pay & Display machines, signs and lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.

2.2 This cost can be contained within the available capital budget for Controlled Parking Schemes under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2015/16.

### 3 Risks

- 3.1 There is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate. However, this work is allowed for in the current budget.
- 3.2 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from Pay & Display takings and permit sales, together with enforcement of these controls through vehicle removals and Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

#### **4 Options**

- 4.1 The alternative option is not to introduce the parking controls. This could have a detrimental effect on residents in that they would continue to suffer with parking issues in relation to obstruction, road safety and traffic flow problems.

#### **5 Savings/ future efficiencies**

- 5.1 The current method of introducing parking controls is very efficient with the design and legal work being carried out within the department. The marking of the bays and the supply and installation of signs and posts is carried out using the new Highways Contract and the rates are lower than if the schemes were introduced under separate contractual arrangements.
- 5.2 Approved by: Louise Phillips Business Partner, on behalf of Head of Finance, and Deputy Section 151 Officer, Place Department.

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

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 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.
- 6.4 Approved by: Gabriel MacGregor Head of Corporate Law on behalf of the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

### **7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 7.1 Enforcement of new parking schemes will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional

enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

- 7.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of HR, Resources department.

## **8. CUSTOMER IMPACT**

- 8.1 The proposed extension of the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into Meadow View Road and Frant Road is in response to known parking stress and support from local residents for controlled parking. Occupiers of all residential and business premises in the area were consulted to ensure that all those potentially affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views. Parking controls are only introduced in the area where the majority of residents are in favour of a scheme. The proposals are therefore likely to be seen as a positive move by the Council and should improve residents' and businesses' views of the work carried out by the Borough.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

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

## **10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 10.1 Parking schemes are designed so that the signing is kept to a minimum to reduce the environmental impact. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

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

- 11.1 There are no such considerations arising from this report.

## **12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 The recommendations are to give notice of the proposals to extend the Croydon CPZ (North Permit Zone) into Frant Road (CPZ boundary to Meadow View Road section) and Meadow View Road (Buxton Road to Frant Road) and subject to receiving no objections on the giving of the public notice to make the necessary Traffic Management Order. It is considered that parking controls would improve parking conditions for residents and visitors whilst improving safety and access.

## **13. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 13.1 The alternative option would be not to proceed to give public notice but these would not accord with the expressed preference of the majority of those who responded to the informal consultation.

**REPORT AUTHOR** Teresa O'Regan – Traffic Engineer  
Infrastructure – Parking Design, 020 8726 6000  
(Ext 88260)

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

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:** None

## **APPENDIX A – Comments from the questionnaire**

- 1 Included in the questionnaire was a comments box for respondents to respond in writing on the proposals. A summary of these comments is included in the tables below with Table 3 showing comments for residents voting in favour of parking controls and Table 4 those against.

### **2 TABLE 3 – Comments from residents voting in favour of the scheme**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>No. of Comments</b>
1	Difficulty in finding parking spaces	23
2	Hospital staff and visitors to blame for problem	12
3	Bus garage staff to blame for problem	3
4	Scheme should only operate between Monday and Friday	1
5	Scheme should operate between 7am and 7pm	1
6	Concerned that dropped kerb will be blocked by parked cars	1
7	Want bays partially on the footway	1



8	Road needs passing place or to be made one-way	1
9	Cars for sale taking up too many spaces	1
10	Residents from within current CPZ take spaces on unrestricted streets	1

### 3 TABLE 4 – Comments from residents voting against the scheme

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>No. of Comments</b>
1	Council is trying to impose a money making scheme	17
2	Only the street who originally petitioned should be consulted	3
3	All parking permits should be free	3
4	Residents should receive 1 free permit	2
5	No parking problem	2
6	Scheme will not guarantee parking spaces	2
7	Have petitioned against similar schemes twice in the past	1
8	Hospital should build a multi-story car park for their staff	1
9	No benefit due to working during hours of operation	1
10	Happy with current situation	1
11	Not a commercial area	1
12	Concerned that all bays will be fully on carriageway narrowing road too much	1
13	Scheme not appropriate	1
14	Scheme should only operate from Monday to Friday	1
15	Problem will be transferred to other road	1
16	Proposal will increase traffic congestion	1
17	Enough parking controls in area as it is	1

18	Resident has a disabled bay	1
19	Resident will no longer receive visitors	1
20	Scheme will be inconvenient	1