

Croydon Council

For general release

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 May 2017
AGENDA ITEM:	6
SUBJECT:	THE CRESCENT AREA – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (EAST OUTER PERMIT ZONE)
LEAD OFFICER:	Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
WARDS:	SELHURST
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: The cost of the controlled parking restrictions proposed in this report is estimated to be £61k. The capital expenditure required will be funded from the £100k allocated to controlled parking schemes within Croydon's 2017/18 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding provided by TfL.	
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 to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (East Outer Permit Area) to Beaconsfield Road, Bullrush Close,	

Gloucester Road (from the existing CPZ boundary to Selhurst Road), Guildford Road, Northcote Road, Owen Close, The Crescent, Tugela Road, Selhurst Road, Saracen Close and Sydenham Road (between the boundary of the existing CPZ and Selhurst Road) with a combination of shared-use Permit/Pay & Display bays (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 drawing no. PD - 319.
- 1.3 Officers to 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 (East Outer Permit Area) to Beaconsfield Road, Bullrush Close, Gloucester Road (from the existing CPZ boundary to Selhurst Road), Guildford Road, Northcote Road, Owen Close, The Crescent, Tugela Road, Selhurst Road, Saracen Close and Sydenham Road (between the boundary of the existing CPZ and Selhurst Road) with a combination of shared-use Permit/Pay & Display bays (8 hour maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 In October 2016 residents of the above roads were consulted about the possible extension of the East Outer Permit Zone to include their roads. The consultation was carried out in response to two petitions. One was from residents of the uncontrolled section of Gloucester Road (between the existing East Outer Zone boundary and Selhurst Road) requesting parking controls. The other was a petition received from residents of The Crescent, Beaconsfield Road and Saracen Close, requesting one-way working due to conflicting traffic issues with parking preventing passing places.
- 3.2 Officers reported the requests in separate reports to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee on 26 April 2016 and the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment authorised the informal consultation on a possible extension of the East Outer Permit Zone to determine support for parking controls (minutes A26/16 & A27/16 refer).
- 3.3 The results of the consultation were reported to this committee in December 2016 (minute A67/16 refers) and it was agreed that residents of Beaconsfield Road, Bullrush Close, Gloucester Road (from the existing CPZ boundary to Selhurst Road), Guildford Road, Northcote Road, Owen Close, The Crescent, Tugela Road, Selhurst Road, Saracen Close and Sydenham Road (between the boundary of the existing

CPZ and Selhurst Road) should be formally consulted on the making of Traffic Management Orders to introduce the proposed scheme.

- 3.4 The proposed scheme was advertised in the local press and residents were formally consulted by letter on 1 February 2017, allowing them 21 days to formally object. A total of 13 objections were received.

4. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

4.1 Objections 1, 2 & 3

Three residents (two from the same address) of The Crescent made identical objections on the grounds that:

- The scheme isn't necessary as there are no parking problems.
- They could not find any neighbours who were happy with the scheme.

- 4.2 **Response** – Whilst these residents may not have experienced any parking problems, the majority of consultation respondents from The Crescent (57%) were in favour of a permit parking scheme. This suggests that parking problems exist in the street. In addition, only 4 objections (two from one household and two others) have been received from The Crescent, which also indicates that residents there are generally happy with the introduction of the proposed scheme.

4.3 Objection 4

A resident of The Crescent is objecting on the grounds that:

- There was limited opportunity for residents to participate in the consultation due to inconsistent distribution (the resident alleges that many residents did not receive the consultation document).
- Residents (people) were not invited to give their views only properties were asked to respond.
- Inconsistent inclusion of residents' views which may have altered the decision (the resident included specific objections which they state were not registered in the committee report of December 2016).
- There is no evidence to back up the claim that the problem with parking is due to shoppers and commuters.
- If 50% of those consulted voted against CPZ why did the proposal go ahead?
- How can the term "strong support" be justified when even if there is one resident per property the percentage in favour would be 7.3%?
- The term "strongly in favour" was applied to The Crescent and Saracen Close this cannot be accepted.
- If CPZ goes ahead there is no guarantee that residents, having purchased a permit would be able to park.
- Other identified reasons contributing to parking problems not being addressed for the benefit of residents (resident states that abandoned vehicles and vehicles offered for sale on the highway have not been dealt with).
- The initial consultation it seems was "triggered" by residents of Gloucester

Rd and not by any other residents. Why for the second or is it the third time CPZ is being threatened? On each previous occasion it was abandoned, once supported by a petition against CPZ signed by 57 residents.

- The presumption that introducing CPZ to these roads to resolve traffic issues, is, I believe flawed for the following reasons (the resident states that the problems are mainly due to parents dropping off their children at school, and as they disregard the existing restrictions, a CPZ will not resolve the issue – more enforcement of the existing restrictions is required).
- If CPZ is introduced residents will be paying for something that does not resolve the issue they have petitioned about, and clearly will be irreversible.
- CPZ is an ill-conceived proposal which has not been researched enough to convincingly resolve many of the issues described above.
- Although I acknowledge the council has no legal requirement to post public notices on e.g. lampposts to engage the local residents. But I haven't seen one.

4.4 Response

- Consultation documents were delivered to each address within the consultation area by a company that specialises in such deliveries. There were no complaints that consultation documents had not been received.
- Croydon Council, like most other local authorities, considers responses from households rather than individuals when carrying out a consultation about parking. The purpose of such a consultation is to enable the council to analyse the views from the properties along a road/group of roads rather than from individuals. This provides a better representation of the road/s as a whole. If individuals were consulted, this would enable those properties with more adults to have a greater influence. In addition, as access to the electoral register is limited and it is possible that some residents may not be on the register, addressing consultation documents to individuals would make the consultation process more complicated and is likely to result in some residents being omitted from the consultation.
- The committee report of December 2016 presented the consultation results from The Crescent area to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee. As part of this, the comments made by respondents were examined and categorised. Whilst it is not practical to include full details of every comment made, the most common ones are listed in the committee report. It is unlikely that any comment would alter the decision of the committee to progress a proposed scheme if the consultation results show a majority in favour.

- The original reason for this consultation was a petition from residents in the remaining uncontrolled section of Gloucester Road, who were suffering parking problems due to the displacement of vehicles caused by an extension to the East Outer Permit Zone, which came into operation in February 2016. That extension was introduced in response to a previous petition, from residents of Selhurst New Road, who indicated that they wanted parking restrictions introduced. It is Officers' experience that when areas near stations are afflicted with parking problems, this is usually due to commuter parking, and as Selhurst New Road is near a station, this was the conclusion. Therefore it was also natural to conclude that any vehicles displaced by the CPZ extension into the remaining section of Gloucester Road would also be commuters. Whilst shoppers were not an obvious issue, the proximity of local businesses to Selhurst New Road was also thought to be a factor in the parking problems there.
- Whilst the proportion of responses in favour was 50% in the wider consultation area, the proportion of responses in favour was 53% in the area where parking controls are proposed to be introduced.
- Parking consultations are carried out by household rather than by person, for the reasons explained previously. In our experience, the proportion of those in favour from some of the roads, as detailed in the committee report, would constitute "strong support".
- In our experience, the response rates and levels of support from Saracen Close (a 41% response rate with 57% in favour of the scheme) and The Crescent (a 28% response rate with 57% in favour of the scheme) warrant the term "strongly in favour". This is because there was both a good response rate (of more than 25%) and a clear majority in favour.
- It is not possible to guarantee that parking spaces will be available when a scheme is introduced. However, our previous experience of the many CPZs already in existence in the Borough shows that more spaces become available with the removal of commuter parking and the control of short term visitor parking via pay and display machines.
- Both abandoned vehicles and those offered for sale on the public highway can be dealt with by the Council if they are reported. It is unclear whether the objector has ever reported these issues to request any action. However, if the proposed scheme is introduced, any vehicles parked during the controlled hours will be required to display a permit or pay and display ticket and those that do not will receive Penalty Charge Notices.
- When a consultation area is decided, officers are required to consider both the road where the consultation originated and also the possible impact of the introduction of parking controls on surrounding roads. The consultation area in this case took into account the potential for displacement parking from the adjacent East Outer Zone. The proposed zone extension includes those roads where there was majority support and also those most likely to be affected by displacement parking if they were not included.

- The petition from The Crescent requested one-way working due to traffic congestion and conflict. Parking is an issue in the roads concerned, with few passing places. Previous experience has shown that when parking controls are introduced the need for one-way working reduces. An example of this is when parking controls were introduced in Dennett Road, West Croydon. The need for one-way working was dramatically reduced and infrastructure installed for one-way working following a petition was subsequently removed. With regard to parking enforcement, the introduction of a permit parking scheme will involve regular visits to the area by Civil Enforcement Officers, which should help to deter obstructive parking.
- It is the view of Officers that the proposed scheme will address the issues raised in the residents' petition. It is our experience that residents, even those who are initially against the introduction of parking controls, usually find that they improve the parking and traffic situation. It is rare for residents to want such schemes reversed. However, should residents petition the Council to have the controls removed after their introduction, such a request would be considered.
- Although the objector may not have seen them, public notices were displayed in the area where the scheme is proposed to be introduced on lamp posts and sign posts. The scheme was also advertised in the local press and residents were notified of the proposed scheme and their right to formally object to its introduction by letter.

4.5 **Objection 5**

A resident of Guildford Road is objecting on the grounds that:

- The operational times proposed will not be beneficial to residents as their parking problems mainly occur in the evening

4.6 **Response**

The consultation gave residents two options for the operational hours of the scheme. Either (option 1) 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday, or (option 2) 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday. The results showed that the majority of respondents from the consultation area (57%) were in favour of option 1.

4.7 **Objection 6**

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

- The scheme is only being introduced to make money for the Council and residents are not in favour of it.
- The introduction of "parking meters" is not in the interests of residents.
- The cost of permits will rise year after year.

4.8 **Response**

- The results of the consultation show that the majority of respondents are in favour of this scheme, which was initiated by residents' demand in the form of two petitions from the area.
- Pay and display machines assist residents by limiting visitor parking and ensuring a regular turnover of vehicles, so that spaces become available throughout the day.

- Permit charges are reviewed each year but are not necessarily increased. The cost of the first resident permit per household last increased in 2012/13 from £76 to £80 (the second and third permit charges remained the same). Since then, all resident permit charges have remained static and there is no plan to increase them this year.

4.9 **Objection 7**

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

- They pay their Council Tax and do not want to pay for parking.
- Parking in the street is fine.

4.10 **Response**

Controlled Parking Zones are required to be self-financing, so it is not possible to implement a scheme without introducing parking charges. Although the objector is satisfied with the status quo, the consultation results from the area indicate that the majority of respondents are not happy with the current parking situation.

4.11 **Objection 8**

An objection has been received from two residents of Guildford Road and Beaconsfield Road on the grounds that:

- The scheme will reduce the number of available spaces.
- Not every road in the proposed area had a majority in favour.
- Some of the corner properties included in the zone have a large number of vehicles and will take up spaces in the road.
- Yellow lines will be marked in front of garages but they are not used for vehicles, and are instead being used for storage or laundry.
- Two of the four disabled bays in Beaconsfield Road are not used and are taking up space unnecessarily.

4.12 **Response**

- When a controlled parking scheme is introduced, parking spaces are marked where parking is safe and appropriate and yellow line waiting restrictions are marked where parking would obstruct or block sightlines (e.g. in front of driveways and near junctions). Whilst this can have the effect of reducing the number of available parking spaces during the controlled hours, the introduction of a parking scheme also tends to reduce the number of vehicles parked by removing commuter parking, limiting visitor parking and capping the number of permits which a household can purchase. This generally makes parking easier for residents. Regulating the spaces for parking can have a positive effect by reducing wasted space where some drivers leave more space than necessary between neighbouring vehicles.
- Whilst not every road within the proposed zone extension had a majority in favour of parking controls, the area overall had a majority (53%) of respondents in favour. As explained in the committee report of December 2016, some roads were included because if they were excluded, they would have been sandwiched between controlled roads and suffered displacement parking as a result.

- It is the Council's policy to include corner properties in controlled parking areas. These are properties that are located in roads that are excluded from the zone, but are on the corners of roads that are included. Consequently the residents of corner properties may already park in the controlled roads and may wish to continue to do so. As with all other residents in the zone, these properties will be limited to a maximum of three permits per household.
- It is not possible to block access 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 us that their garage or driveway is no longer used for parking, we can remove waiting restrictions and install additional bays.
- When residents inform us that a disabled bay is no longer needed or report that a disabled bay is not used, we investigate and remove bays as appropriate. As a result of a recent investigation one of the disabled bays in Beaconsfield Road is in the process of being revoked.

4.13 **Objection 9**

A resident of Beaconsfield Road supports the introduction of parking controls but has concerns on the grounds that:

- The management of parking in the area seems to require an unnecessary extension of the yellow lines and double yellow lines which will limit the number of parking spaces. In Beaconsfield Road why does the existing double yellow line outside 59 need to be extended?
- The map residents received has not been updated and shows a disabled parking bay outside No 51 Beaconsfield Road which is no longer in use and needs to be removed; a disabled bay has been marked out outside 42/44 Beaconsfield Road which is not shown on the plan.
- At the top of Beaconsfield Road to the right of No 56 there is currently space for 2 cars, the plan does not make it clear whether there are any parking bays.
- Who will be allowed to apply for parking permits; I have heard that residents in Whitehorse Road, outside of the zone, will be allowed to apply for permits to park in the zone! I am concerned that having paid for a permit we will still encounter difficulties in parking because of the limited number of spaces.
- The number of parking bays will accommodate less cars than park now due to the size of the bays; would it not be better to mark out the areas for permit parking but not as individual bays as they do in other boroughs e.g. Kingston

4.14 **Response**

- Yellow lines have been marked at junctions and in front of driveways where parking would not be appropriate. The 3-metre extension of the existing double yellow line outside No. 59 Beaconsfield Road has been proposed because there is not enough space to fit another parking bay there as it would be too close to the adjacent junction with Guildford Road.
- The disabled bay outside No. 51 is in the process of being revoked following a report that it is no longer in use. The new bay outside No. 42 has been taken into account in the Traffic Management Order for the new scheme.

- According to our records, the space to the right of No. 56 Beaconsfield Road is occupied by a dropped kerb and two disabled bays and the plan supplied to residents shows this.
- All residents and businesses within the zone boundary will be eligible to apply for permits. As explained previously, corner properties on roads not included in the zone are within the zone boundary but will be limited to a maximum of three permits, as will all residents within the zone. Although the number of proposed permit/pay and display spaces in Beaconsfield Road will be lower than the number available whilst the road is uncontrolled, the permit scheme should reduce the level of parking and improve the availability of spaces.
- Parking bays within CPZs are generally marked as individual spaces. The advantage of this is that it prevents selfish parking as each vehicle must be contained within the bay markings and also ensures that sufficient room to manoeuvre is preserved in those spaces that are in the middle of a run of bays.

4.15 **Objection 10**

An objection has been received from a resident of Beaconsfield Road on the grounds that the scheme will decrease the number of parking spaces available and this will be a particular problem in the evening.

4.16 **Response**

As stated above, although the number of proposed permit/pay and display spaces in Beaconsfield Road will be lower than the number available whilst the road is uncontrolled, the permit scheme should reduce the level of parking and improve the availability of spaces.

4.17 **Objection 11**

A resident of Gloucester Road has objected on the grounds that the permit costs too much and this is in addition to Council Tax and car insurance. The resident also feels that the installation of pay and display machines will make the area depressing and objects to her visitors having to pay when they visit her.

4.18 **Response**

As explained previously, parking schemes are required to be self-financing and it is not possible to introduce them free of charge. The current cost of the first resident's permit purchased by a household is £80 per annum. This is a fraction of the overall cost of running a car and the associated expenses and works out at less than £1.60 per week. Pay and display charges will vary from 40p for 30 minutes to £6.40 for an 8 hour maximum stay. Alternatively, visitor permits can be purchased for £4 for a full day, which is significantly cheaper. The installation of pay and display machines is necessary to the scheme. They will be sited so as to cause as little visual intrusion as possible.

4.19 **Objection 12**

An objection has been received from a couple in Saracen Close on the grounds that:

- There have always been spare parking spaces – more than the number proposed.
- A high number of residents are retired and require visits from carers.

- The resident is a member of an organisation for older people that meets regularly at their house and members need to park nearby.
- The resident has friends who are Blue Badge holders and is concerned they would have to walk to find a pay and display machine to park.
- Older residents requiring DIY jobs done would be charged more by tradesmen because parking charges would be factored in.
- The worst parking problem in the area is footway parking in Northcote Road and Whitehorse Road.

4.20 **Response**

- Although these residents have not had a problem finding parking spaces in Saracen Close, the majority of respondents from Saracen Close (57%) supported the introduction of a controlled parking scheme.
- Carers visiting residents have the option of pay and display parking or using a resident visitor permit provided by the resident.
- The scheme should improve the situation for visitors by removing commuter parking and limiting short-term parking via pay and display, to ensure a turnover of vehicles so that spaces are regularly available.
- Blue Badge holders are able to park in permit/pay and display bays within the zone without payment or time limit providing a valid badge is displayed. They can also park on single or double yellow lines (providing that they are not obstructing) for a maximum of 3 hours, as long as a valid badge and time clock are displayed and the clock is set to the time of arrival.
- Pay and display charges will vary from 40p for 30 minutes to £6.40 for 8 hours, with 4 hours costing £3.20. Alternatively, residents can supply tradesmen with a visitor permit at a cost of £4.00 for the day. Trades people operating in London are used to dealing with parking controls and paying parking charges. The charges in Croydon compare favourably with other boroughs and are unlikely to have a major impact on the prices residents are charged.
- Residents of Saracen Close were made aware of the parking charges involved when they were consulted about the scheme and still voted in favour, which indicates that they do not regard the charges as a problem.
- The introduction of a controlled parking scheme in Northcote Road will enable the Council to mark bays to control the extent to which vehicles park on the footway and ensure that footway bays are only placed where they can be accommodated. Whitehorse Road is not included in the proposed controlled parking zone extension but is already subject to a footway parking scheme (between Boulogne Road and The Crescent). Vehicles parking outside the markings of the partial footway bays may receive Penalty Charge Notices.

4.21 **Objection 13**

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

- Many residents in the road do not want the controlled zone.
- The objector has had previous problems with their children running off and delaying the purchase of a pay and display ticket, which has resulted in the objector getting Penalty Charge Notices. The objector is concerned that this will continue to happen in Northcote Road

- There would be no allowance for trailers or carts that have a mobility scooter in them.
- There will be less space than there is now.
- Not everyone can afford a permit, our cars cost enough.

4.30 **Response**

- Whilst there was not a majority in favour of the parking scheme in Northcote Road, the road has been included because if it were omitted from the zone, it would be sandwiched between controlled roads and would be likely to suffer from displacement parking as a result.
- Civil Enforcement Officers will use their discretion to allow a driver time to purchase a pay and display ticket, based on the proximity of the pay and display machine and whether the driver is seen. This should allow most drivers sufficient time to purchase a ticket. Drivers also have the option to use the Ringo mobile phone system to purchase parking time, which can be done from your vehicle.
- Most parking bays, even those specifically for disabled badge holders, are not large enough to accommodate a vehicle with a trailer attached. A car with a trailer attached would require two permit/pay and display spaces in order to park and it would be unlikely to find two vacant bays together, as well as being unfair on the majority of vehicles that do not have trailers attached. However, a vehicle displaying a disabled badge and clock with a trailer attached is unlikely to be ticketed on a yellow line restriction, providing it is not obstructing and the 3 hour maximum stay is adhered to.
- Although the scheme is likely to reduce the number of spaces, residents should find that parking is easier as the number of vehicles will be reduced, due to the introduction of parking controls.
- Residents were aware of the cost of permits at the time of the initial consultation taking place. The cost of the first permit per household is a small proportion of the cost of owning a vehicle.

5 **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 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.
- 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

The required capital expenditure will be funded via an allocation within the TfL LIP grant funding allocated to Croydon for 2017/18. Total funding of £100k is included for controlled parking schemes in 2017/18. 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 not be sufficient funding in 2017/18.

1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast			
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
£'000	£'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	100	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	61	0	0	0
Remaining Budget	<u>39</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 the Gloucester Road / The Crescent area has been estimated at £61,000. 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 funding for controlled parking schemes within the TfL Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding allocation for 2017/18.

3 Risks

- 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

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

- 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.

Approved by: Luke Chiverton, Head of Finance (Place & Resources)

7. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 7.1 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.

- 7.2 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.

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

8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 8.1 Extending East Outer Permit Zone into The Crescent area will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

Approved by: Jason Singh, Head of HR Employee Relations on behalf of the Director of HR.

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 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.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 11.1 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.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into Beaconsfield Road, Bullrush Close, Gloucester Road (from the existing CPZ boundary to Selhurst Road), Guildford Road, Northcote Road, Owen Close, The Crescent, Tugela Road, Selhurst Road, Saracen Close and Sydenham Road (between the boundary of the existing CPZ and Selhurst 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.
- 12.2 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.

13. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 13.1 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.

13.2 Consideration was given to not introducing parking controls in these roads due to the objections received. However, the number of objections is low and the consultation showed that there is support for parking controls in the area proposed.

REPORT AUTHORS:

Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Orders Engineer
Highway Improvements, Parking Design
020 8726 6000 (Ext. 47363)
David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager
Highway Improvements, Parking Design
020 8726 000 (ext. 88229)

CONTACT OFFICER:

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

None

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Proposed extension boundary of
Gloucester Road & The Crescent Area

Appendix 2 – Proposed extension of the
existing East Outer Controlled Parking Zone in
The Crescent area