

## **Traffic Management Advisory Committee**

Meeting held on Wednesday, 24 July 2019 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,  
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

### **MINUTES**

- Present:** Councillor Stuart King (Chair);  
Councillors Muhammad Ali, Felicity Flynn and Simon Hoar and Ian Parker
- Also Present:** Councillor Andrew Pelling
- Apologies:** Councillors Jeet Bains and Karen Jewitt

### **PART A**

#### **1/19 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 May 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

#### **2/19 Disclosure of Interests**

Councillor Pelling informed the Committee that he was the Vice-Chair of the London Road Safety Council.

#### **3/19 Urgent Business (if any)**

There were no items of urgent business.

#### **4/19 Objections to Emission-Based Parking Permit Charges and Diesel Surcharges for Permits**

Officers introduced the report stating that the policy to introduce emission-based parking charges was linked to the Air Quality Action Plan, the Clean Air Strategy and the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

A consultation on the scheme was undertaken, and officers stated that all 14,000 permit holders in the borough were contacted by email, or by post if

email was not possible. From the consultation around 1,000 responses were received and had been responded to.

Ms Batt addressed the Committee in objection to the proposals as it was stated that residents had not been informed of the proposed increase in parking permit charges. Furthermore, it was stated that the proposal was disproportionate and unfair as only impacted those who lived in Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), as such it remained free to park outside the CPZs. Whilst Ms Batt noted that the aim was to encourage people to replace their cars to lower emitting vehicles; it was stated that it was not possible for many as they were on low incomes or pensions and their current cars had no resale value. Ms Batt suggested that rather than charge for parking the council should consider charging on the miles travelled; and thus the emissions produced by the vehicles.

Ms Thomas also spoke in objection to the proposals stating that residents felt that it was an additional tax and that they had had no warning. It was stated that the charging was an unfair increase as it only impacted those who had parking permits and who wanted to park by their homes. Concerns were raised about those who drove in Croydon, but parked on roads which were not in a CPZ; that whilst they emitted emissions they were not being charged.

Ms McSherry addressed the Committee in objection, also, stating that she only became aware of the proposal when she was renewing her parking permit; and as such it was felt that the council had failed in its statutory requirement to consult residents on the proposals. The Equality Analysis was referenced as stating there was a risk that the proposal would disproportionately affect those with disabilities or long term health concerns and, it was suggested, the mitigations would not be sufficient. Ms McSherry noted that different authorities had different bandings for similar policies and it was felt that this was not creating a level playing field for London residents. Furthermore, it was stated that there was insufficient infrastructure to encourage residents to buy electric cars and that many residents could not afford to replace their current cars. The council was requested to look at alternative solutions which were more reasonable and proportionate.

Dr Nicodemi noted that emissions were an issue across the whole borough and that it was the responsibility of all to contribute to supporting the environment; however it was felt that the proposal was grossly unfair as it only impacted those in CPZs. Concerns were further raised that a number of permit holders had not received communication regarding the proposals and had only heard of the consultation via Inside Croydon.

Mr Hameed stated that the proposed charging bands would lead to all residents paying more than currently charged, and queried how the banding had been calculated. It was noted that hybrid and fully electric vehicles are very expensive; and that there was not sufficient infrastructure in the borough to support all residents having plug-in hybrid or electric cars. Mr Hameed further expressed concerns in relation to the consultation undertaken by the

council as it was stated that many affected residents were unaware of the proposals.

A statement from Mr Samuel was read to the Committee which stated that he objected to the scheme on four points; that a parked car does not emit any emissions, that outside the operating times of a CPZ it is currently free to park in a CPZ, the proposal would cause displacement to areas outside CPZs, and that residents had not been consulted on the proposals.

Cllr Pelling addressed the Committee as the ward councillor for Waddon ward and sharing the views of Waddon residents. It was noted that a 10% response rate to the consultation showed a high level of concern by residents, and that it was important to fully consider those concerns. Councillor Pelling stated that serious consideration should be given to the bandings as over 700 residents would be impacted by an increase in the permit fee from £80 to £300. It was suggested that a reasonable amount of time should be given to enable residents to save up to change their vehicle, as the proposed increase would have a significant impact on residents. Additionally, it was stated that it was important that the infrastructure for electric cars needed to be in place before the increase took place to support residents. Councillor Pelling concluded by stating that residents felt it was important that the scheme was cost neutral and was not a means to increase revenue.

In response to the concerns and objections raised the officer stated that emails were sent to all permit holders using the email addresses provided when residents had applied for permits. The council had tested to ensure the email would not go into people's spam or junk folder. For those residents without email addresses, the council had written to them separately. Officers were confident that the email had been correctly sent as a large number of responses had been received within 48 hours of the email being sent. Furthermore, officers stated that receiving 1,000 responses from 14,000 notifications was a relatively high response rate to a parking consultation.

In relation to the concerns raised regarding the bandings the council was proposing; officers noted that the DVLA had 16 bands. Whilst it was agreed that Croydon was proposing a different system to other London authorities; those schemes were looked at and the proposal in the report was to ensure there was a simplified system of five bands.

Officers stated that they had sought to have the scheme neutral; however this was not entirely possible. However, any surplus was required to be spent on areas outlined within Traffic Management legislation and, at present, it was spent on supporting the Freedom Pass scheme. It was noted by officers that the cost of permits had not increased in the past seven years, and the proposal to increase the lowest permit charge to £104 was in line with inflation over that period.

In response to concerns relating to the scheme is adversely affecting those with disabilities, the officer confirmed that blue badge holders did not require a

permit and so there was no disadvantage. Additionally, it was stated that companion permits were also available to support those with disabilities.

Officers confirmed that the council was working to improve the infrastructure for electric and plug-in hybrids, and as such it was planned that new charging points would be implemented in the next six to 12 months, with 400 to be installed by the council in total. This figure, it was stated, was in addition to those being installed by Transport for London (TfL) and fuel garages.

In response to concerns raised that parked cars do not pollute, officers stated that they are taking parking spaces which makes it difficult for residents who regularly use their cars to park. There was a need to manage supply and demand as there was finite space for parking in the borough.

Councillors stated that they all agreed that it was important that everyone worked to tackle emissions as there was a climate emergency.

Some councillors, however, raised concerns that while it was positive that 400 charging points were being installed it was fairly impractical for thousands of residents to use them. It was suggested that all new developments with parking spaces be required to have charging point installed. In response, officers confirmed that policy was in place to require charging points be installed in new developments. Additionally it was noted that each charging point could charge up to four vehicles at one time.

Concerns were raised by some Members that those vehicles which were rarely used would incur a high charge, and that cars which did not qualify for a ULEZ (Ultra Low Emission Zone) charge would be charged by Croydon. It was felt that the policy should be an emission based policy which was based on emissions, and not on where people lived.

Further concerns were also raised in relation to the proposed charge for band 5 vehicles which was felt to be too high, particularly for those on low incomes or pensioners who would find it difficult to change to a lower emitting vehicle.

The Cabinet Member stated the council had looked at the schemes set by other local authorities and TfL, and while the proposed Croydon scheme did not exactly match these they had influenced the design of the Croydon scheme.

Some councillors noted that the roads were highly polluted which was having a serious, and negative, impact on the health of residents and was contributing to early deaths. With other 10,000 more cars in Croydon between 2013 and 2016, and likely more in coming years it was felt that it was important that something was done to tackle the air quality issue. Councillors stated that the public health emergency was clear and that it was the duty of the council to respond.

Councillors welcomed the decision that blue badge holders and companion permit holders would not be affected. Additionally, the phased introduction of

charging and implementation of charging points was welcomed, however it was suggested that the majority were needed in the CPZs to support residents to move to cleaner vehicles.

In response to the suggestion that councillors should lead by example, and that they should be charged in relation to proposed charging schedule for the councillor parking permit, the Cabinet Member confirmed he supported the idea and that he would raise the suggestion with the Group Whips.

Officers confirmed that Croydon had the highest rate of admissions to hospital for childhood asthma in London, and as such it was felt that it was important that there was a policy which sought to tackle emissions. It was further noted that, 76% of people were in favour of the council tackling emissions when the council consulted on the Air Quality Action Plan.

The Chair stated that it had been difficult to create a scheme which sought to tackle the emissions problem without the potential to adversely affect those on lower incomes. While it might be desirable to means test parking permits it was not permissible under Traffic Management regulations. It was recognised that there was a public health emergency, and that improving air quality was the focus of the policy and not parking charges and raising income.

The council, it was stated, had sought to get the right balance between proposals which would encourage people to move to cleaner vehicles or public transport and avoiding prohibitively high charges.

In relation to the concerns raised regarding the consultation, the Chair stated that the consultation emails had been sent and so it was considered that the council had consulted permit holders.

The Chair concluded by noting that the Government was requiring councils to act on emissions, and that a number of other authorities were also introducing emission based parking policies. It was considered to be a tool for tackling air quality and was part a wider over-arching aim to improve the environment including; School Streets, fining of idling vehicles, and the introduction of diesel surcharges and pay & display charging.

Some councillors stated that while it was Government policy to tackle emissions, it was felt that the proposal did not address emissions and only penalised parking.

Following a vote the Committee voted four in support of the recommendations, and two against.

**RESOLVED: To**

1. Consider the responses received to the formal consultation on the proposed introduction of emission-based parking permit charges and the contents of the report and make such comments to the Cabinet

Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) as they consider necessary; and

2. Note that in accordance with the delegation from Cabinet dated 25 March 2019, the Executive Director Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) is authorised to consider the outcome of the consultation regarding Emission-Based Parking Charges; and subject to there being no significant changes which would necessitate further consultation, finalise, agree and implement the Emission-Based Parking Charges proposals (see Appendix 1 of the report). Note that any proposals requiring significant changes or further consultation will be brought back to Cabinet for consideration.

## 5/19 **South Croydon Area - Results of Informal Consultation on the Proposed Introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)**

The Chair proposed that the order of the agenda be amended to take the South Croydon Area report as the second substantive item. The Committee agreed to vary the order of business.

The officer informed the Committee that the report outlined the results of an informal consultation in the South Croydon area for a proposed introduction of a CPZ. Around 22 roads were consulted around the South Croydon Bus Garage which was noted to be an area of very dense parking.

It was noted that across the whole area which was consulted there was a fairly negative response; however a positive response was received from Sunny Nook Gardens, Sussex Road and Bynes Road; and the recommendation was to proceed to formal consultation on those particular roads.

Mr Shorey spoke in opposition to the proposals stating that as a proprietor of a local business he had a vested interest in whether the area became a CPZ, and that he had spoken to many of his customers regarding the proposals. As such, he felt that the proposal would have a negative impact and would only move the issue to other roads which had not voted in support; rather than fix it. Mr Shorey stated that many local people felt that they were being ignored. Furthermore, it was suggested that the questionnaire had been confusing and some residents had voted in support when they objected to the proposal. Mr Shorey concluded by stating that he felt the proposal to extend the CPZ to three roads would have a negative impact on local businesses.

Mr Humphrey spoke to the Committee in support of the recommendations; stating that as a resident of Sussex Road he had noted that parking had got worse in the local area and was now a major issue. It was suggested that the proposal would stop commuter parking, as Sussex Road was the closest road to South Croydon station which was not in a CPZ. In addition to commuter

parking, Mr Humphrey suggested that parking from a local car garage also exasperated the issue as customers and staff often parked cars on the surrounding road before and after MOTs. In response to some resident concerns, Mr Humphrey stated that he had spoken to the council and had had it confirmed that the proposal was for a continuous parking bay; so no parking bays would be lost.

In response, the officer stated that the council was responding to petitions which had been submitted. It was recognised that parking was an issue in the area, however in response to the informal consultation it was recommended to proceed to formal consultation only where there had been support. It was anticipated that the scheme would help residents; however it was recognised that there would likely be a knock-on effect to the surrounding roads.

Members noted that a response rate of 30% was relatively high for parking consultations, and that the council had listened to those responses by designing a scheme which proposed extending the CPZ to those roads which were in support.

In response to Member questions the officer confirmed that the ward councillors had been contacted for their views on the proposals; and that the councillors felt that there was a parking problem in the roads which supported the introduction of a CPZ, but that there was a concern of possible displacement.

Members raised concerns in relation to splitting Bynes Road; however noted that the recommendations were to undertake a formal consultation of the proposed roads. It was further noted that if there was insufficient support in Bynes Road then the scheme could be reduced before the final decision was made by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (Job Share) or the Executive Director Place.

The officer confirmed that the proposal to have continuous bays, and so there would not be a loss of parking, and that there was no intention to remove the current CPZ bays in Bynes Road. Furthermore, it was confirmed that all residents in Bynes Road would be informed of the formal consultation.

**RESOLVED:** That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they

1. Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone) into the South Croydon Area;
2. Agree to proceed to the formal consultation stage for a proposal to extend the Croydon CPZ (West Permit Zone) into Sunny Nook Gardens and Sussex Road, as illustrated on drawing number PD 398a;

3. Agree to proceed to the formal consultation stage for a proposal to extend the Bynes Road CPZ into the remainder of Bynes Road as illustrated on drawing no. PD 398b; and
4. If formal consultation is agreed, delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Public Realm Directorate the authority to give the notice.

6/19

**Cecil Road and Aurelia Road - Results of Informal Consultation on the Proposed Change of Hours of an Existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)**

The officer informed Members that a petition had been received which requested the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Aurelia Road and Cecil Road be extended to 8am – 8pm Monday – Sunday. An informal consultation had taken place which had resulted in 69% of respondents supporting the proposal.

The report recommended that the council undertake formal consultation on the proposal, which was planned to take place as soon as possible.

In response to Member questions the officer confirmed that it was not desirable for different roads to have different hours of operation as it could cause confusion. It was anticipated that Aurelia Road would experience a benefit from a consistent approach to the CPZ.

The Chair noted that many the CPZ was implemented many residents had asked for the extended operating hours, and that this consultation would support the request.

**RESOLVED:** That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they

1. Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposed change of hours in the existing West Thornton CPZ in Cecil Rd and Aurelia Rd;
2. Agree for the reasons detailed in the report, to proceed with formal consultation regarding the proposed change the operational hours in the West Thornton CPZ (drawing no.PD-396) to 8am – 8pm, Monday – Sunday;
3. If formal consultation is agreed, delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Public Realm Directorate the authority to give the notice; and
4. Agree that the results of the formal consultation are reported to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee in order for it to make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share).

7/19

### **Lower Road Area - Results of Informal Consultation on the Proposed Introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)**

The officer informed Members that a petition requesting a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Lower Road Area had been received; however a low response rate, which was largely negative, had been the outcome of an informal consultation. As such, it was recommended that the council did not proceed to formal consultation.

The Chair noted that the council requested petitions had a large proportion of local residents support so as to ensure council resources were effectively used.

**RESOLVED:** That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they

1. Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into the Lower Road Area;
2. Agree not to proceed to the formal consultation stage regarding the proposal to introduce the Kenley Controlled Parking Zone into Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue as illustrated on Drawing No. PD 395 due to the reasons set out in paragraph 3.8 of the report; and
3. Inform the organisers of the petitions of these decisions.

8/19

### **Outcome of Formal Consultation on School Streets**

Officers introduced the report stating that a pilot at three schools had been made permanent the previous year, and the report in the agenda recommended creating School Streets surrounding a further eight schools. The aim of the scheme was to improve the health of young people and to reduce congestion near schools at school pick-up and drop-off times.

Members noted that Fairchildes School had not been included in the report, and officers confirmed that following consultation with residents an Experimental Traffic Management Order was proposed which was supported by the ward councillors and the Head Teacher. The report on the Fairchildes scheme was due to be considered and agreed by the Executive Director Place, and would be shared with the Chair and Lead Opposition Member.

Officers informed Members that residents could, and had, responded on the proposals for more than one school. It was noted that all the responses received were outlined within the report, and that across the seven locations

there was an even level of support and objection; although it was noted that some roads were supportive whereas others were in objection.

In response to Member questions, officers stated there was no specific data in relation to the number of accidents or types of accidents; however the creation of safer roads around schools would support a reduction in accidents.

Members raised concerns relating to the displacement of traffic in the roads surrounding Woodcote Primary School following the decision to make it a School Street in 2018. It was stated that within the local area there were a number of cul-de-sacs and closes which were being affected by the displacement of traffic, and while there were mobile patrols of the local roads residents were raising concerns. Officers confirmed that they had visited the cul-de-sacs and it was noted that the roads were saturated with parking; as such there was no opportunity for displacement. Furthermore, it was stated that the further people had to travel to park their car to drop off their children the more likely it was to encourage behavioural change to walk, cycle or scoot to school.

Officers informed Members that in response to the displacement experienced by residents in Coulsdon, residents were being encouraged to petition for parking controls as it was recognised that there were some difficulties in the local area in relation to parking.

In response to Member questions, officers stated that Royal Mail vehicles were able to access any road during the restrictions; however it was not the intention of the council to provide access to delivery vehicles as it was important to ensure the roads were safe and it was noted that uncongested roads can lead to people to drive faster. In terms of children who require to be dropped off by the school; the council required the school to inform them to allow the vehicle access to the road.

The Chair informed Members that the council had received a number of requests from schools to be a part of the School Streets, and that part of the process of deciding which schools to proceed with was looking at whether they had travel plans.

It was felt that the scheme had encouraged a behavioural change as the three original schools in the scheme had seen a reduction in the number of students arriving by car. Additionally, it had been seen that while some displacement of traffic had been experienced; that the parking had been better with fewer cars being parking on dangerous corners or across peoples driveways.

Officers informed Members that Harris Academy Purley had approached the school to be part of the scheme; and as Regina Coeli Primary School was located on the same road it was contacted. The school was in support of the scheme, and so had been included.

Members were informed that in addition to more courteous parking, and a decrease in the number of pupils arriving by car, the three original schools

had also seen an improvement in punctuality. By working with the schools to improve cycle proficiency and encouraging walking it was an aim to not only improve safety, but to also tackle childhood obesity.

Officers confirmed that the impact of the scheme was being reviewed and changes were being made where possible. The council had, and would continue to, review the impact with surveys. In addition to surveys; air quality, health benefits and punctuality would also be considered to understand the effect of the scheme. It was further noted by Members that the enforcement resource was limited, and that this scheme enabled the council to focus on fewer problem schools and provided an improved response rate.

Some Members stated their support for the scheme which sought to address the issue of dangerous streets surrounding schools around drop-off and pick-up time, and to improve the health of young people in the borough. It was noted that the results from the original three schools showed a number of benefits, and as such it was beneficial to support other schools to realise the benefits also.

Following a vote the Committee voted four in support of the recommendations, and two abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they

1. Consider the objections and responses from the consultation on the Public Notice of 23 May 2019 (attached at Appendix 1 of the report);
2. For the reasons detailed within the report to introduce School Street schemes under the permanent Traffic Management Order procedure in the following 7 locations as detailed in the Public Notice of 23 May 2019:
  - Abingdon Road (between Turle Road & Upwood Road), at Norbury Manor Primary School;
  - Biggin Way (between Biggin Hill & Downsview Road), at Downsview Primary and Nursery Schools;
  - Brading Road (between Cecil Road & Lavender Road) and Rosecourt Road, at West Thornton Primary Academy;
  - Cypress Road, at Cypress Primary School;
  - Goston Gardens (between Winterbourne Road & Oaklands Avenue) and Winterbourne Road (between London Road & Wiltshire Road), at Winterbourne Girls and Boys Schools;
  - Kendra Hall Road, at Harris Academy Purley and Regina Coeli Primary School; and
  - Little Roke Road (between Lower Road & the north-western flank wall of No. 47 Little Roke Road), at Harris Primary Academy Kenley.

9/19

**Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The item was not required.

The meeting ended at 8.44 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:**

.....

.....