

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 24 July 2019
SUBJECT:	LOWER ROAD AREA – RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF A CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)
LEAD OFFICER:	Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share)
WARDS:	Kenley
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:	
<p>This report is in accordance 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"> • Croydon Local Plan Feb 2018 • The Local Implementation Plan; 3.6 Croydon Transport policies • Croydon's Community Strategy; Priority Areas 1, 3, 4 and 6 • The Croydon Plan 2nd Deposit; T4, T7, T35, T36, T42 and T43. • Croydon Corporate Plan 2015 – 18 • www.croydonobservatory.org/strategies/ 	
FINANCIAL IMPACT:	
These proposals can be contained within the available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: n/a	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS	
That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they:	
1.1	Consider the responses received to the informal consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ into the Lower Road Area.
1.2	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.
1.3	Inform the organisers of the petitions of these decisions.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report considers the results of the informal consultation on the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone to the currently unrestricted roads Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue.
- 2.2 It is recommended that the Council do not proceed to the formal consultation stage with a proposal to introduce parking controls in this area which would include Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue.
- 2.3 On 20 June 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 2.2 above to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for onward recommendation and determination to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share).

3 DETAIL

- 3.1 A petition was received from residents in Lower Road last year for parking controls to be introduced in these streets, where demand for spaces is outstripping supply.
- 3.2 In response the Council commenced informal consultation on Friday, 10 May 2019 and continued until Friday, 7 June 2019. A total of 259 sets of consultation packs, which comprised of a letter, a map of the consultation area, frequently asked questions and a questionnaire were sent to addresses within the proposed extension area. Included in each pack was a pre-paid envelope for return of the questionnaire.
- 3.3 Consultees were requested to register their "Yes/No" preference votes to the question:
1. Are you in favour of introducing a CPZ Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue?
 2. Which operational period: Mon-Fri 9am to 5pm or Mon-Sat 9am to 5pm?
- Questionnaires were to be returned via the pre-paid envelope provided.
- 3.4 Over the course of the informal consultation a total of 111 completed questionnaires were returned, representing a 43% response rate which is considered excellent for an informal consultation exercise of this type. Table 1 shows the results and returns for the individual roads in the consultation area.

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

Road Name	Addresses	Responses	% Returned	Yes	% Yes	No	% No
Little Roke Rd	40	18	44%	4	22%	14	78%
Lower Rd	113	43	38%	14	32%	29	68%
Little Roke Avenue	106	50	47%	13	26%	37	74%
Totals	259	111	43%	31	28%	80	72%

3.6 The results show that the majority of those within the consultation who responded to the informal consultation are **not** in favour of introducing a CPZ to the Kenley area.

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

3.8 The questionnaire responses are considered to demonstrate that residents and businesses feel that there is no current need for parking controls in Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue. Surveys have shown that although parking stress takes place this is mainly during the evenings when most residents are at home and where a parking scheme will not give as much benefit as a daytime parking problem. It is therefore proposed not to progress parking controls for this area at the current time.

4 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 It is proposed not to introduce parking controls in Lower Road, Little Roke Road and Little Roke Avenue, therefore there are no financial considerations arising from this report.

4.2 *Approved by: Kate Bingham, Head of Finance, Place Department.*

5. COMMENTS OF THE SOLICITOR TO THE COUNCIL

5.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 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.

5.4 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. The Council needs to comply with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations must be considered before a final decision is made.

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

6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

6.1 There are no human resource impacts arising from this report.

6.2 *Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of HR for Place on behalf of Sue Moorman, Director of HR.*

7. CUSTOMER IMPACT

7.1 Occupiers of all residential and business premises in the area were consulted to ensure that all those directly affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views. The majority of responses showed that occupiers were not in favour of parking controls and it is proposed not to progress a scheme in this area which should appease most residents and businesses.

8. EQUALITIES IMPACT

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

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

9.1 There are no environmental impacts arising from this report.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

10.1 There are no crime and disorder reduction impacts arising from this report.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The recommendations are not to proceed with any further action in this area as a majority of respondents did not support parking controls and surveys have shown that most of the parking stress occurs during the evening when a parking scheme may not necessarily help residents.

12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 The alternative option would be to proceed with the formal consultation but this would not accord with the expressed preference of the majority of those who responded to this informal consultation and may not resolve the problems experienced by residents.

REPORT AUTHOR

Omar Tingling, Traffic Engineer,
Parking Design, Highway Improvements,
Streets, 020 8726 6000

CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager
Parking Design, Highway Improvements,
Streets, 020 8667 8229

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Consultation Documents