

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>  <b>2 May 2019</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>LAKEHALL ROAD AREA – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (NORTH N &amp; N1 PERMIT AREAS)</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Paul Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Bensham Manor and West Thornton</b>
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:</b>	
<p>This report is in line with objectives to improve the safety and reduce obstructive parking on the Borough's roads as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Croydon Local Plan Feb 2018</li> <li>• The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies</li> <li>• Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6</li> <li>• The Croydon Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43.</li> <li>• Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 – 18</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/">www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/</a></li> </ul>	
<b>FINANCIAL IMPACT:</b>	
These proposals can be contained within available budget.	
<b>FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:</b> Not a Key Decision	
<b>1. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration that the Cabinet Member:	
1.1	Consider the objections to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North N & N1 Permit Areas) to Bensham Lane, Bert Road, Fairgreen Road, Frant Road, Kingswood Avenue, Kimberley Road, Lakehall Road, Lakehall Gardens, Meadow View Road and Queenswood Avenue with a combination of Shared-Use (Permit/Pay-by-phone) bays 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 in drawing no. PD 382.
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 N & N1 Permit Areas) to Bensham Lane, Bert Road, Fairgreen Road, Frant Road, Kingswood Avenue, Kimberley Road, Lakehall Road, Lakehall Gardens, Meadow View Road and Queenswood Avenue with a combination of shared-use (permit/pay-by-phone) bays and single yellow lines operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.
- 2.2 The outcome of the informal consultation was reported to this Committee at its meeting on 12 December 2018, where it was agreed to proceed to a formal consultation on the making of Traffic Management Orders to introduce the proposed scheme.
- 2.3 On 23 April 2019 and pursuant to the delegation from the Leader dated 6 June 2016, the Executive Director Place, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) determined that it was appropriate to refer consideration of the matters detailed paragraph 2.1 above to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for onward recommendation and determination to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share).

## **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Following a petition from Lakehall Road in May 2017 residents were consulted on a possible extension of the Croydon (North Permit Area) Controlled Parking Zone into the Lakehall Road Area which includes Attlee Close, Bensham Lane, Bert Road, Fairgreen Road, Frant Road, Haslemere Road, Kingswood Avenue, Kimberley Road, Lakehall Road, Lakehall Gardens, Meadow View Road, Norman Road, Peshurst Road, Torridge Road and Queenswood Avenue.
- 3.2 On 12 December 2018, following informal consultation, it was agreed to undertake formal consultation (minute 4/17 refers) regarding proposals to extend the zone into Bensham Lane, Bert Road, Fairgreen Road, Frant Road, Kingswood Avenue, Kimberley Road, Lakehall Road, Lakehall Gardens, Meadow View Road, and Queenswood Avenue following a positive response from an overall majority of respondents in these streets (see results table overleaf).

Street Name	No. of responses	Are you in favour of a CPZ?				What are your preferred hours?			
		Yes		No		Mon-Sat 9am - 5pm		Mon-Sun 8am-8pm	
Bensham Lane	46	26	57%	20	43%	13	50%	13	50%
Bert Road	3	2	67%	1	33%	0	0	2	100%
Fairgreen Road	5	2	40%	3	60%	1	50%	1	50%
Frant Road	51	28	55%	23	45%	20	71%	8	29%
Kimberley Road	33	16	48%	17	52%	10	62.5%	6	37.5%
Kingswood Avenue	12	3	25%	9	75%	1	33%	2	67%
Lakehall Road	47	33	70%	14	30%	14	42%	19	58%
Lakehall Gardens	3	2	67%	1	33%	2	100%	0	0%
Meadow View Road	6	3	50%	3	50%	3	100%	0	0%
Queenswood Avenue	13	8	62%	5	38%	4	50%	4	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>45%</b>

3.3 Following detailed design, occupiers in this area were formally consulted (public notice stage) on a proposal to introduce 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday parking controls. Residents/businesses within this area were written to in March 2019 with a copy of the relevant drawings and the public notice, and invited to submit objections to/comments on the scheme by Friday 5 April 2019.

#### 4. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

4.1 A total of ten objections and three emails of support for the proposal have been received.

##### Objection 1

4.2 An objection from a resident of Bert Road was raised on the grounds that:

- There is nowhere to park when I get home from work at about 8pm on weekdays.
- I agree with the proposal in principle but I would like it to be amended so that residents can park on the roads after working hours by restricting parking after 5/6pm to residents only.

### **Objection 2**

4.3 An objection from a resident of Frant Road was raised on the grounds that:

- There was no option to choose controlled parking Monday to Friday.
- I am in favour of controlled parking but only when competition for parking space dictates it. There is much less competition on Saturday and Sunday.
- I believe that if Croydon Council had offered Monday to Friday as an option this is what residents would have chosen. The only option would be to re-consult Frant Road residents with Monday to Friday included as an option.

### **Objection 3**

4.4 An objection from a resident of Fairgreen Road was raised on the grounds that:

- I would like to reject the proposal only because I would have to pay for a permit.

### **Objection 4**

4.5 An objection from a resident of Fairgreen Road was raised on the grounds that:

- I don't believe it (the parking scheme) is needed.
- I paid for a dropped kerb and I have not been given the option to have a white line outside my home, instead of a yellow line, which I think is unfair.
- There will only be 12 parking spaces in the road should the scheme go ahead.
- There was no option for Monday to Friday restrictions.
- There was no mention of providing residents with visitor parking permits, even if it was 10 a year and any additional would have to be paid for.
- I consider Fairgreen Road as a private road.

### **Objection 5**

4.6 An objection from a resident of Kimberley Road has been raised on the grounds that:

- Parking is tight on this road so adding pay and display will not help residents.
- It will be a waste of money painting bays and installing pay and display machines as there is not much free parking space on this road.
- Kimberley Road would benefit from being turned into a one-way street entering from Queen's Road. There is a blind spot just as you turn the bend which can be very dangerous and cause a build-up of traffic.

### **Objection 6**

4.7 An objection from a resident of Bensham Lane was made on the grounds that:

- There is no valid reason for the zone – the objector is happy with the current parking status.
- There are other ways of raising money than to add more costs to residents' budgets.
- It's a well-known fact that parking zones kill business for small traders.
- It's not rocket science to semise (sic) that you will carry on zoning off the

remaining streets in our area.

### **Objection 7**

4.8 The seventh objection (from a resident of Kimberley Road) was on the grounds that:

- Kimberley Road is set back from main roads, trains and shops. There is really no need to have Saturday restrictions or penalise visitors on a Saturday.
- Any claims of consistency are a red herring as people know they have to check boards and variable speed limits. Is it just a matter of consistency for the Council – in which case for whose benefit should services be?
- If the rationale is to deter long-term parking (you have day and half day charges) why was parking between 12 and 2 not considered.
- There are a very few houses that were built without front gardens, the gardenless houses may or may not benefit from residents parking. However in some 90% of the homes people are converting or have converted their front gardens for parking. In a short time the very small number of front gardens that currently exist will also have gone regardless of this proposal. Thus it seems a poor use of public money to put in parking restrictions and service them when almost everybody will be parking off road.
- My window cleaner will not be cleaning if he cannot park; the charge for parking will outweigh the revenue for cleaning windows in the street. How many other services will be affected and for what benefit?

### **Objection 8**

4.9 The eighth objection (no address given) was made on the grounds that:

- 100% of the residents who have lowered their curbs (sic) object to the proposed fee as they have already paid hundreds of pounds to the Council to have the privilege of parking their vehicles outside of their houses.
- If this proposal, as you have stated in point 6. is to *“alleviate residents’ parking problems caused by non-residents, including commuters and improve road safety by regulating parking spaces,....”* then why are you causing a burden for the residents who have already paid the Council to have their curbs (sic) lowered.
- Surely the residents who have ALREADY PAID to lower their curbs (sic) should NOT be treated the same as those who park on the road. They should not be required to pay the same fees.
- We believe that payment should be increased for non-residents and commuters who want to park on this road to compensate.
- We would suggest, for example:
  - a) Non-residents pay 50p for 30 minutes or £6 for 8hrs (maximum).
  - b) Residents without lowered curbs pay the proposed fee of £80.
  - c) Residents who have lowered their curbs should pay half of the fee - £40 - for their second cars.
- We think this would be a fairer proposal for all residents.

### **Objection 9**

4.10 The ninth objection (from a resident of Queenswood Avenue) was made on the grounds that:

- Residents are paying Council Tax and not getting the services they deserve.
- The police do not treat crimes against residents with any priority so why are Councillors wasting money on the police?
- The Council is collecting millions in fines and road tax and there is still not a single street free from potholes. The money is going to pay Council Managers lucrative bonuses. The council should control these expenses instead of introducing another stealth tax in the name of controlled parking zones.

### **Objection 10**

4.11 The tenth objection (from a resident of Torridge Road) was on the grounds that:

- The introduction of a CPZ in the Lakehall Road area will have a detrimental effect on parking availability in Torridge Road. Particularly in light of the hospital's stated closure of Woodcroft Road carpark, which announces that staff and patients can use nearby roads including ours.
- It is unfair to all residents for the council to have such an incoherent and disjointed policy on CPZ implementation. We find it incredibly stressful that the council behaves in this manner. This is our homes and wellbeing that the council is messing with - and it's unfair.
- If a Torridge Road CPZ is granted in our road, however, then we would have no objections to the Lakehall Road CPZ.

### **Responses**

4.12 Residents and businesses were given two controlled parking options when the informal consultation was carried out. These were for 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday controls, or 8am to 8pm Monday to Sunday controls. The responses showed that the majority (55%) of respondents from the roads included within the proposed zone supported 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls as opposed to 45% who supported 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday controls. Consequently the proposal consulted on at the formal stage is for 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday controls as these are the controlled hours that received majority support. In addition, only three (just under 1%) of the 356 respondents who made comments in the comments box provided on the consultation questionnaire suggested that they wanted resident only parking.

4.13 The Monday to Saturday and Monday to Sunday options presented to residents and businesses in the informal consultation were chosen as they are the days when parking controls operate in the two nearest controlled parking areas. The controls in the nearby Canterbury Road / Sutherland Road area operate between 8am and 8pm, Monday to Sunday and in roads to the east (Croydon University Hospital side) of London Road operate from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday. Consultees were also able to use the comments box on the questionnaire to make any other comments or suggestions they wished. An analysis of these

comments shows that only 10 (3%) of the 356 respondents suggested that they would prefer a Monday to Friday option. On this evidence it appears that residents feel there is a need for Saturday parking controls and that there is no basis for a further consultation on the Monday to Friday option.

- 4.14 Controlled parking schemes are introduced in response to demand from and with the support of residents (for example, residents in the Lakehall Road area were consulted about a possible parking scheme following a petition from residents, and a scheme has been progressed because it received majority support). They are not introduced in order to raise income, however, any surplus income from parking schemes, including from enforcement, across the Borough, is reinvested into transport related projects including the Freedom Pass for concessionary fares. Legislation requires that all Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are self-financing and cannot be funded from Council tax and this means that charges must be made for permits and pay and display/pay-by phone parking, so that the income can be used to pay for the administration, maintenance and enforcement of the scheme. Parking schemes generally take approximately four years to pay for themselves. The current £80 charge for the first resident permit within a household equates to just £1.54 per week for parking.
- 4.15 Whilst two objectors feel that the parking scheme is not required, the majority of respondents within the proposed controlled parking area have voted in favour of the scheme, suggesting that they feel it is necessary. Although the results from some streets within the area (Fairgreen Road, Kimberley Road and Kingswood Avenue) were against the introduction of controls, the decision was made to include them within the proposed zone extension as to omit them would be likely to result in displacement parking in their roads.
- 4.16 The Council decided in November 2015, that white “access protection” markings would no longer be provided across driveways as they are only advisory and not enforceable in their own right. Even if these markings were still available, they would not be appropriate within a CPZ, where all kerb space is controlled, either by parking bays or yellow line waiting restrictions. Yellow lines are marked across driveway accesses within a CPZ to ensure that the access is kept clear during the controlled hours. Outside of those hours, residents (and those with their permission) can park on yellow lines outside their driveways but are still able to report unauthorised obstruction of their driveways to the Council for enforcement action.
- 4.17 In a CPZ, parking bays are marked where parking is deemed to be safe and appropriate and yellow lines are marked where parking is deemed to be unsafe or obstructive. Whilst this often results in fewer parking spaces being provided after controls are introduced than prior to their introduction, the removal of commuter parking and the restriction of visitor parking usually compensates and the overall result is generally more available space during the controlled hours. This is evidenced from recent zone extensions in nearby roads such as Pawson’s Road, Queens Road and Princess Road.
- 4.18 Residents were given full details of how the scheme would work when they were consulted informally and then formally about its introduction. This information

included details of visitor parking and the fact that visitors would need to pay for parking via a visitor permit or by using pay-by-phone or pay and display facilities.

- 4.19 Fairgreen Road (between its junction with Bensham Lane and the north-eastern boundary of No. 21 Fairgreen Road) forms part of the public highway and this is the section of road in which the parking scheme will operate.
- 4.20 Pay and display or pay-by-phone facilities form a useful part of controlled parking schemes. They help to regulate visitor parking and provide short-stay visitors, for whom a visitor permit would not be appropriate, with an alternative parking option. In this area it is likely that pay-by-phone parking will be used, which will not require any pay and display machines to be installed.
- 4.21 One-way working is generally only considered where the Council has received a petition from local residents which clearly shows that there is majority support for the proposal. Therefore, such a measure could be considered in Kimberley Road if a petition were to be received. The petition should ideally indicate why the request is being made and the direction that the one-way working should operate in. However, it should be pointed out that one-way working does not always bring about the road safety benefits that local residents are after. Traffic speeds can rise in one-way streets as motorists become aware that there are no vehicles travelling in the opposite direction. One-way working would also restrict local movements when entering and leaving the road and can result in additional traffic on neighbouring roads as traffic diverts to other routes. This can then cause other road safety problems in the surrounding area. As such, any proposal for one-way working would need to be considered most carefully and in addition, controlled parking often solves traffic conflict issues and removes dangerous and obstructive parking such as one objector has described, removing the issues that led to the request for one-way working.
- 4.22 Officers are not aware of any evidence to suggest that parking zones kill small businesses. Controlled parking can assist businesses by regulating visitor parking to provide a regular turnover of vehicles, thereby ensuring that customers can find parking spaces nearby throughout the day.
- 4.23 Further controlled parking schemes in this area will depend on the demand from and the support of residents of the area.
- 4.24 In Croydon the majority of CPZs operate all day (usually between 9am and 5pm). There are no two-hour zones. Whilst there are a few one-hour zones, these are in outlying rather than central areas and restrict parking during the controlled times to permit holders only. This type of control is specifically used to deter rail commuters and is not generally considered to be appropriate for busier, more central areas where visitors to local amenities and businesses may need to park at various times throughout the day. Of those respondents who used the comments box in their informal consultation responses, none suggested that they would like a much shorter one or two hour restriction.



- 4.25 The controlled parking scheme is proposed to be introduced in an area where the overall majority supported its introduction. The level of off-street parking throughout the area varies from street to street but the majority of residents do not have a driveway or garage. However, a CPZ can benefit residents with off-street parking by ensuring that their dropped kerb accesses are kept clear during the controlled hours and sightlines are not obstructed by parked vehicles. It also assists their visitors to park by ensuring on-street spaces are available. It is possible that the introduction of a CPZ will encourage residents not to apply for off-street parking if it makes it easier to park on-street close to their homes.
- 4.26 The current cost of pay-by-phone parking for visitors is 40p per 30 minutes (up to £6.40 for a maximum of 8 hours parking). There is no evidence from other CPZs in the borough to suggest that the introduction of parking controls prevents residents accessing services such as window cleaning and as parking controls are prevalent throughout London, most businesses have already adapted to them.
- 4.27 Residents who pay for a dropped kerb and also purchase a parking permit are paying for two different services – one to park off-street, one to park on-street. As explained in paragraph 4.12, the income from parking permits is used for the maintenance, administration and enforcement of the parking scheme and is kept in a separate budget from dropped kerb payments, the income from which does not contribute to parking controls. It is considered appropriate to ask residents accessing the same services to pay the same charges for them, and in this case, the charge is for a permit to park within a CPZ, which applies to residents regardless of whether or not they also have access to off-street parking.
- 4.28 Council Tax income does not contribute towards parking controls, the income from which is kept in a separate budget which can only be used for specific purposes (as referred to above). The police are funded by central government with a contribution from Council Tax.
- 4.29 The Council is not responsible for collecting road tax. Income from parking fines, like that from permits, is used firstly for the maintenance, administration and enforcement of parking schemes and (if there is surplus income) for the maintenance of the highway, including fixing potholes and other damage to the carriageway.
- 4.30 The Council is proposing to introduce this parking scheme in response to demand from residents. The charges involved were fully explained to residents when they were consulted (both informally and formally) about the possible introduction of the scheme.
- 4.31 It is sometimes the case that the introduction of a controlled parking scheme in one area will have an impact on an adjacent area, due to displacement parking (i.e. commuters and residents who do not wish to pay for parking moving their vehicles to the nearest uncontrolled streets). The Council does its best to avoid this by consulting over a wide area, rather than focussing narrowly on the street or streets from which a parking petition has been received. However, it would not be appropriate of the Council to decline to consider the introduction of parking

controls where they have been petitioned for and supported in a consultation solely on the basis that other roads where parking controls were not supported may experience some displacement parking. In the case of Torridge Road, which previously voted against parking controls in October 2018, residents there have recently been re-consulted following a further petition from roads in the area. The results of this further informal consultation are also being reported to this committee on 02 May 2019 and will determine whether or not a scheme is proposed to go ahead in that road.

#### 4.32 **Support for the Proposals**

During the consultation three emails were received (from residents of Frant Road and Kimberley Road) expressing support for the scheme. The messages stated that:

- Frant Road suffers from commuter parking by staff working at the hospital.
- This problem makes the resident hesitant to leave the house due to concerns about parking when they return.
- The resident applauds the council for introducing the restrictions in a planned way, rather than one street at a time which would push the problem into the next street.
- Parking on this street (Kimberley Road) has been difficult for several years and even more so since controlled parking was introduced on Queens Road - it has become almost impossible to park on our street. Some residents have started to park obstructively in order to save spaces, which is only making parking worse. The sooner controlled parking is introduced, the better.
- Since the introduction of permit parking on Queens Road, Pawson Road and Princess Road this has cause displacement of parking in the surrounding area. It has become impossible to find parking on Kimberley Road and resulted in some residents parking obstructively to reserve parking spaces which exacerbates the problem.

#### 4.33 **Recommendation**

In view of the majority support for the scheme, the low number of objections (relative to the number of occupiers in this area) and the responses to those objections given above, it is recommended to proceed with the scheme as proposed and shown in drawing No. PD-382.

## 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 2019/20. Total funding of £75k is included for controlled parking schemes in 2019/20.

### 7.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year 2019/20 £'000	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
		2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000
<b><u>Revenue Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from Report</u></b>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b><u>Capital Budget available</u></b>				
Expenditure	75	0	0	0
<b><u>Effect of Decision from report</u></b>				
Expenditure	21	0	0	0
<b>Remaining Budget</b>	<u>54</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

### 7.2 The effect of the decision

7.2.1 The cost of extending controlled parking into the Lakehall Road area has been estimated at £21,000. This includes the provision of signs and lines.

7.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available TfL LIP budget for 2019/20.

7.2.3 The ongoing costs of maintaining the controlled parking will be managed within existing revenue budgets.

### **8.3 Risks**

8.3.1 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

### **9.4 Options**

9.4.1 An alternative option is to introduce a residents' only parking scheme. Virtually all permit schemes in the Borough are shared-use with Pay and Display/Pay-by-phone users and this offers the greatest flexibility for drivers who may be visitors to residents and businesses in the area or the minority of commuters who are willing to pay for all day parking.

### **10.5 Savings/ future efficiencies**

10.5.1 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from Pay-By Phone 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.

10.5.2 Approved by: Flora Osiyemi, Head of Finance, Place, Residents and Gateway

## **11 COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

11.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance that Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provides the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.

11.2 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations

1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.

11.3 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as 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. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-

- The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
- The national air quality strategy.
- The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
- Any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

11.4 The Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.

11.5 Approved by: Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law, on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer.

## **12. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

12.1 Extending the North N & N1 Permit Areas into the Lakehall Road Area will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

12.2 Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of Human Resources.

## **13. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

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

## **14. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 14.1 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.

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

- 15.1 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.

## **16. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 16.1 The recommendation is to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone into the Lakehall Road area since a majority of respondents 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.
- 16.2 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.

## **17. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

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

---

### **REPORT AUTHORS:**

Clare Harris – Senior Traffic Orders Engineer  
Highway Improvements, Parking Design  
020 8604 7363 (Ext. 47363)

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager  
Highway Improvements, Parking Design  
020 8762600 (ext. 88229)

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

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

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None