

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 October 2016
AGENDA ITEM:	7
SUBJECT:	SUTHERLAND ROAD AREA – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH PERMIT ZONE)
LEAD OFFICER:	Jo Negrini, Chief Executive and Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	Broad Green and West Thornton
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT: This report is in line with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6• The Croydon Plan 2nd Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.• Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 – 18• www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/	
FINANCIAL IMPACT: These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: Not a Key Decision	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they: 1.1 Consider the objections and letters of support received to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Area) to Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.	

- 1.2 Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone into the above roads as shown on plans PD 312a to j for the reasons as set out in this report.
- 1.3 Inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to consider objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to extend the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Area) to Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay & Display machines (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

3. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

Objection 1

- 3.1 A resident of Greenside Road has objected on the grounds that the costs outweigh the inconvenience of finding a parking space

Response – While some residents may not consider the scheme to be value for money, in the initial informal consultation, 84% of respondents from Greenside Road voted in favour of the scheme. The cost of the first permit (£80) is low in comparison with the overall cost of running a car.

Objection 2

- 3.2 A resident of Sutherland Road is objection on the grounds that:
 - The permit cost is an extra tax on residents
 - They should have the freedom to park on most roads
 - Sutherland Road is not near a shopping centre
 - They think that controls should not apply on Saturday
 - They didn't receive the consultation documents during the informal consultation period

- 3.3 **Response** – Parking schemes such as this proposal have to be self-financing, the fees charged for permits and pay and display tickets funds the enforcement of the zones. Applying a charge for permits is a way of managing supply and demand. The proposed scheme will not stop the objector from parking on a particular road; they will still be free to do so but will have to pay the relevant fee if the scheme proceeds. Sutherland Road is approximately 10 to 15 minutes walk from the Town Centre and closer to Croydon University Hospital and West Croydon station and commuters park in this area on a daily basis. This objector is unhappy with the controls applying on a Saturday, however a large majority (77% of respondents from their street) voted in favour of this scheme. A response was received from this objector to the informal consultation – they did receive the consultation documents.

Objection 3

3.4 An objection has been received from a commuter who works on Canterbury Road on the grounds that:

- It will be financially difficult for them if the scheme goes ahead
- Local businesses are not the problem

Response – If this scheme goes ahead commuters who do not wish to pay and display have the option of parking in neighbouring uncontrolled roads. In addition this area is well serviced by public transport (both trains and busses). Businesses have the option of purchasing parking permits for their vehicles (albeit at a higher cost and limited to 2 permits per business) so they will not be prevented from parking on the road.

Objection 4

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

- They do not want to pay to park their car
- They are not running a business – only businesses should be charged
- People are struggling financially
- They didn't know about the scheme
- Residents should be allowed to park for free regardless of the number of cars in their household

Response – Schemes such as this have to be self-financing as there is no subsidy from the Council tax and as such there needs to be a fee for permits. Charging residents for permits as well as businesses is a way of managing supply and demand. Many households have more than one car while the available on-street parking does not increase. The fee for the first permit is only £80, low when compared to the overall cost of running a car. Consultation documents were delivered to all residents and businesses within this area.

Objection 5

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

- The cost is too much with no guarantee of a parking space
- It will move parking problems to other roads in the area

Response – The cost of one permit is low when compared with the overall cost of running a car, particularly in Greater London. There is an inevitable problem of shifting commuter parking to other uncontrolled streets although this is reduced by allowing Pay & Display users such as commuters to park throughout the day. No parking scheme can guarantee a parking space in a particular road; however, experience has shown that residents have a far improved chance of parking near their homes after a CPZ has been introduced than beforehand.

Objection 6

3.7 A resident of Wortley Road has objected on the grounds that

- They cannot see the advantage of introducing a CPZ

Response – CPZs have been introduced in neighbouring roads in recent years (Fairholme Road and Dennett Road) and residents have expressed satisfaction with the new parking arrangements with increased opportunities in parking close to their homes. Residents who are unsure of the benefits would be advised to visit controlled roads during hours of operation to observe the difference between controlled roads and uncontrolled roads.

Objection 7

3.8 A resident of Wortley Road has objected on the grounds that:

- There will not be enough bays available
- They don't understand why there is a charge applied for permits
- Each house should be given a bay
- Even if they get a permit there is no guarantee that they will get a parking space
- They think house prices will drop as a result of the scheme

Response – Currently it is difficult to park on Wortley Road and the surrounding streets during the day. If the scheme were to go ahead residents would be more likely to find a space as evidence suggests that most commuters will choose not to pay and display. All motorists (except for blue badge holders), both permit holders and those who obtain pay and display vouchers have to pay to park in the road. The scheme must be self-financing as there is no subsidy from the Council tax. No motorist is ever guaranteed a parking space on public highway but experience of existing controlled roads shows that residents are more likely to find a space close to their home. Bays operate on a first come first served basis. There is no evidence to suggest that house prices drop as a result of controlled parking.

Objection 8

3.9 A resident of Priory Road has objected on the grounds that:

- They shouldn't have to pay as they pay their Council Tax
- There are no problems parking during the week, only evenings and weekends
- Carers visiting residents on the street will have to pay
- The road is a 'rat-run' and should be made one-way – this is a bigger problem than parked cars

Response – No funding is available from the Council Tax to introduce parking controls and there is a requirement that these schemes are self-financed. Many residents do experience parking problems here (44% of respondents to informal consultation were in favour of the scheme). A carer would have to pay and display like any other commuter or use a visitors' permit if they wished to park on a controlled road during the hours of operation. Experience of nearby Dennett Road where residents petitioned the council for one-way working due to continuous conflict and subsequent road rage incidences was that once parking controls were introduced last year this resulted in more gaps for passing vehicles and there is no longer a need for one-way working.

Objection 9

3.10 A resident of Priory Road has objected on the grounds that:

- They do not understand why the scheme is proceeding when most residents were against the scheme at the informal consultation stage
- They want a one-way system on the street
- They are not convinced that a CPZ will help the residents of Priory Road
- Residents shouldn't have to pay to park outside their own houses.
- People cannot afford the charges
- Visitors cannot afford the daily charge

Response – Although the results from the informal consultation showed that 44% of residents who responded to the consultation in Priory Road voted in favour, the majority in neighbouring roads were in favour and parking stress would increase considerably if this road remained uncontrolled. A decision was made at the meeting (minute A5/16 refers) to include Priory Road within the formal consultation process. Experience of nearby Dennett Road where residents petitioned the council for one-way working due to continuous conflict and subsequent road rage incidences was that once parking controls were introduced last year this resulted in more gaps for passing vehicles and there is no longer a need for one-way working. Depending on whether this is the case in this road consideration could be given to one-way working at a later date in conjunction with other one-way requests in the Borough. Evidence is available through observation of nearby controlled street of the benefits afforded to residents of CPZs. Permit charges are low when compared to the overall costs of running a car. Visitors who do not wish to pay and display can use visitors' permits or park on an uncontrolled street. The area is also well served by public transport.

Objection 10

3.11 A resident of Wortley Road has objected on the grounds that:

- anyone can pay and leave their vehicle all day
- residents should have priority to park on their roads

Response – It is true anyone may pay and display and park for the entire day. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that this is unlikely in this area and in reality the majority of commuters will not want to pay to park. It is not possible to ensure that residents have a priority over parking spaces. Parking spaces are allocated on a first come first served basis regardless of who is wishing to park there although experience from existing schemes indicates that residents are far more likely to park close to their home within a CPZ than in unrestricted streets.

Objection 11

3.12 A business on Canterbury Road is objecting on the grounds that:

- Businesses are getting the blame for parking problems
- Parking problems are caused by the Council not requiring developers to provide adequate parking at new developments

Response – There has been no suggestion that local businesses are to blame

for the local parking problems. Currently parking is so difficult that many customers may not be able to find available spaces. Introducing controls will most likely free up space to enable customers to park. Many developments now are designed for low car ownership, especially due to the excellent public transport facilities in the area. The Council has no power to prevent residents purchasing more cars than they have space to park.

Objection 12

- 3.13 A business on Boston Road has objected on the grounds that it will adversely affect their business.

Response – If this scheme goes ahead vehicles will still be able to park for free on Boston Road, though there may be some transfer of parking problems from the CPZ. The controlled roads off Boston Road (Donald Road, Lancing, Road and Wortley Road) currently experience parking problems but with controls it is more likely that customers will be able to park.

Objection 13

- 3.14 A resident of Wentworth Road has objected on the grounds that:
- the parking issue is worse in the evenings than during the day
 - the capacity of the road is lower than the residents parking needs
 - new developments need to take parking demand into account
 - the main problem on the road is the inability of vehicles to pass each other
 - a one-way system is needed

Response – A large majority of residents on this street (72% of households that responded) voted in favour of the 9am to 5pm controls. It is proposed to consult residents of the North Permit Zone (including the extension area) on possible 8am to 8pm, throughout the week controls following the current pilot in Fairholme Road and Midhurst Avenue. The road capacity is finite with or without a CPZ. Planners already consider local transport requirements when making decisions on planning applications. With respect to the request for one-way working please see response to Objection 9.

Objection 14

- 3.15 A resident of has objected on the grounds that:
- People who own cars shouldn't be penalised
 - They do not understand why people should have to pay to park
 - There is no guarantee of a parking space
 - Only visitors should have to pay
 - Roads in the surrounding area will experience greater difficulty
 - Parking in their street is tricky but not impossible.

Response – No funding is available from the Council Tax to introduce parking controls and there is a requirement that these schemes are self-financed. Their introduction is not an attempt to penalise drivers but to manage parking where there is parking stress. Motorists are never guaranteed an on-street parking space regardless of whether or not the road is controlled but experience has shown that residents and visitors are far more likely to find a space in controlled

areas. Charging residents for permits and limited the number per household is a way of managing supply and demand. There is an inevitable problem of shifting commuter parking to other uncontrolled streets although this is reduced by allowing Pay & Display users such as commuters to park throughout the day.

Objection 15

3.16 A resident of Wentworth Road has objected on the grounds that:

- They would prefer a one-way street to resolve the current conflict / road rage incidences
- Feel that 9am to 5pm controls will not help the road and are unhappy that there were not given a choice of times at the time of the consultation
- Want long bays instead of individual bays and claim that this is the case in many roads in the Borough

Response – With respect to the request for one-way working please see response to Objection 9. A large majority of residents on this street (72% of households that responded) voted in favour of the 9am to 5pm controls. . In response to the 8am to 8pm, throughout the week request please see response to Objection 13. The Council receives as many requests for individual bays to help regulate parking than it does for unbroken bays allowing residents to park how they wish. Currently individual bays are introduced to indicate paid for parking and unsegregated bays for free parking areas.

Comment 1

3.17 Comments on the proposal were received from a business on London Road, within the existing controlled parking zone. The business is unhappy that they went not consulted and feel that parking is already a problem and that further controls will not help. Their customers find parking such a problem that some are reluctant to visit the Croydon premises. They are not against the principal of parking to park but express concern at the amount of parking available.

Response – Introducing parking controls should free up available spaces during business hours and make it easier for customers of this business, as well as other in the area to park. The maximum possible number of bays will be introduced, single yellow lines will be only be placed over dropped kerbs.

Comment 2

3.18 A resident of Wentworth Road has written requesting a one-way system. They are concerned that a one-way system will not proceed if the CPZ proceeds. They feel that the CPZ will not help the main problems facing the road.

Response – Please see response to Objection 9 in response to the request for one-way working.

Support 1

3.19 A resident of Wentworth Road is supporting parking controls having lived at the address since 1983 and witnessed the dramatic increase in parking in recent years. They feel that 8am to 8pm controls are needed and that one-way working is urgently required. They are aware that prospective home purchasers have

been put off due to the parking problems.

Response – In response to the 8am to 8pm, throughout the week request please see response to Objection 13. With respect to the request for one-way working please see response to Objection 9.

Support 2

- 3.20 Eight households of Priory Road have sent pro-forma type letters fully supporting the proposals but for 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls rather than the 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday proposals. In order to prevent bad parking they have requested individually marked bays.

Response – In response to the 8am to 8pm, throughout the week request please see response to Objection 13. Bays are proposed to be individually marked.

Support 3

- 3.21 A resident of Priory Road supports the scheme but wants 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls and wants confirmation that residents in the newly built developments that are mainly in London Road will not be eligible for permits.

Response – In response to the 8am to 8pm, throughout the week request please see response to Objection 13. Most new Town Centre residential developments now have a clause within the Section 106 Planning Agreement that prevents residents from obtaining permits. In addition the Articles for Traffic Management Orders for all on-street Permit / Shared-use bays have a statement that the Council 'may' issue permits to residents within a Permit Zone to give some flexibility even for those earlier developments that have no section 106 permit restriction.

Support 4

- 3.22 A resident of Lancing Road supports the proposals and emphasises that two nearby garages cause most of the parking problems with vehicles being left long-term in the area. Their preference would be for 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls.

Response – Although businesses can purchase permits these are limited to a maximum of 2 per business within the Croydon CPZ so vehicles that are left on the highway during the controlled period would be required to Pay & Display. In response to the 8am to 8pm, throughout the week request please see response to Objection 13.

- 3.23 It is recognised that parking in this area is at a premium due to the close proximity of the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone, Croydon University Hospital, the number of large residential developments in the area and the Town Centre including West Croydon Station. The majority of residents in the area voted in favour of parking controls when consulted early in the year and although 15 objections have been received this can be considered a low number bearing in mind the number of households in this area which is close to 1200 over 9 roads. In view of the above it is proposed to extend the existing zone into this area.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections from the public following the giving of public notice of the proposals. Once the notices were published, the public had up to 21 days to respond.
- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 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.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 The capital spend is to come out of the LIP (local Implementation Plan) budget allocation of £30k 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.

5.2 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Revenue Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from Report</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Capital Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	30	70	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	30	40	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

5.3 The effect of the decision

5.3.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into the Sutherland Road / Canterbury Road area is estimated at £70,000. This includes the provision of 22 Pay & Display machines, signs and lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.

5.3.2 This cost can be contained within the available capital budget for Controlled Parking Schemes under the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) projects for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

5.4 Risks

5.4.1 There is a risk that the final cost will exceed the estimate. However, this work is allowed for in the current budget.

- 5.4.2 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from Pay & Display takings and permit sales, together with enforcement of these controls through vehicle removals and Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

6 Options

- 6.1 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.

7 Savings/ future efficiencies

- 7.1 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.

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

8 COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 8.1 The Solicitor to the Council comments that Sections 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provide powers to introduce and implement Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council (so far as is practicable) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The Council must also have regard to matters such as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.

- 8.2 The Council must comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations have been considered and responded to in this report.

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

9. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 9.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

- 9.2 Approved by: Adrian Prescod, HR Business Partner, for and on behalf of Director of Human Resources, Chief Executive Department.

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 Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas. This area is not a conservation area.

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 ground.

13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into Greenside Road, Pemdevon Road, Sutherland Road, Wentworth Road, Priory Road, Canterbury Road, Wortley Road, Donald Road and Lancing Road, since the majority of residents in this area voted in favour of parking controls and a parking scheme should ensure adequate parking facilities for residents, visitors and for local businesses.
- 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.
- 14.2 Consideration was given to not introducing parking controls in these roads due to the petition received. However, experience has shown that some residents can feel pressurised when confronted with a petitioner and that the informal questionnaire should be used as a better indication on whether there is support for parking controls.

REPORT AUTHOR: Teresa O'Regan – Traffic Engineer
Infrastructure Parking Design, 020 8762 6000
(Ext. 88260)

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None.

APPENDICES: Appendix 1 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312a
Appendix 2 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312b
Appendix 3 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312c
Appendix 4 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312d
Appendix 5 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312e
Appendix 6 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312f
Appendix 7 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312g
Appendix 8 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312h
Appendix 9 – Map of the Sutherland Road Area
PD 312i
Appendix 10 – Map of the Sutherland Road
Area
PD 312j