

REPORT TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 February 2020
SUBJECT:	KYNASTON ROAD AREA – OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CROYDON CPZ (N1 PERMIT AREA)
LEAD OFFICER:	Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director of Place
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Stuart King, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share)
WARDS:	Bensham Manor
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"> • 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 available budget.	
FORWARD PLAN KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: Not a Key Decision	
1. RECOMMENDATIONS That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share) that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Rescind the Traffic Management Advisory Committee's decision Kynaston Road Area – objections to the proposed extension of the Croydon CPZ (N1 Permit Area), Item 8 dated 16 October 2019. 1.2 Replace the Traffic Management Advisory decision Kynaston Road Area Item 8 dated 16 October 2019 with the following decision: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.1 Consider the objections, contained in this Report, to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (N1 Permit Areas) to Atlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road (SE of Swain Road junction), Palmerston Road, Pitt Road and Sandringham Road with a combination of Shared-Use (Permit/Pay-by-phone) bays and single yellow lines operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday. 1.2.2 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- 0402/1-3. 	

1.2.3 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 (N1 Permit Areas) to Atlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road (SE of Swain Road), Palmerston Road, Pitt Road and Sandringham Road 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 2 May 2019, where it was agreed to proceed to a formal consultation on the making of Traffic Management Orders to introduce the proposed scheme.
- 2.3 The Traffic Management Advisory Committee considered this matter in its October meeting. However, due to an administrative error, not all objections were included in this Report. Therefore it is necessary to rescind that decision and take the decision again based on all relevant information (which is included below).
- 2.4 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 Palmerston Road and Sandringham Road in February 2019 residents were consulted on a possible extension of the Croydon (North Permit Area) Controlled Parking Zone into the Bensham Manor Area which included Attlee Close, Haslemere Road, Penhurst Road, Norman Road, Torridge Road, Bensham Lane (north side), Lucerne Road, Berne Road, Geneva Road, Zermatt Road, Ecclesbourne Road, Boswell Road, Bensham Manor Road, Swain Road, Marion Road, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Road, Kynaston Crescent, Pitt Road, Sandringham Road and Sandringham Road.
- 3.2 On 2 May 2019, following informal consultation, it was agreed to undertake formal consultation (minute 9/19 refers) regarding proposals to extend the zone into Atlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Crescent, Kynaston Road (SE of Swain Road), Palmerston Road, Pitt Road, and Sandringham Road following a positive response from an overall majority of respondents in these streets (see results table below).
Table 1 – Roads (including part of Kynaston Road) which were formally consulted:

				Are you in favour of a CPZ?			
Street Name	No. of house-holds	No. of Responses	Response rate %	Yes		No	
Attlee Close	52	7	13%	3	42%	4	57%
Kynaston Avenue	125	36	29%	23	64%	13	36%
Kynaston Crescent	41	11	27%	7	63%	4	36%
Kynaston Road (SE of Swain Road)	59	13	22%	8	61%	5	38%
Palmerston Road	25	10	40%	10	100%	0	0%
Pitt Road	36	13	36%	11	84%	2	15%
Sandringham Road	33	12	36%	10	83%	2	16%
TOTAL	371	102	27%	72	71%	30	29%

- 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 September 2019.
- 3.4 With regards to operational hours, overall the majority of respondents supported copy of the relevant drawings and the public notice, and invited to submit objections and comments on the scheme by 26 September 2019.

4. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

- 4.1 A total of 8 objections were received during the formal consultation period. Full details of objections and officer's responses can be found in Appendix A.
- 4.2 The controlled parking scheme is proposed to be introduced in an area where the overall majority of households 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 footway cross-over applications as parking should become far easier for residents especially during the controlled hours with less need to reserve a parking space in their front gardens.

- 4.3 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. 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.

4.6 **Support for the Proposals**

Prior to the informal consultation petitions were received (from residents of Sandringham Road and Pitt Road) expressing a need for the introduction of a parking scheme. The messages stated that:

- Pitt Road suffers from commuter parking by staff working at the nearby shops.
- Since the introduction of permit parking on Pawson Road and Princess Road this has caused displacement of parking in the surrounding area. It has become impossible to find parking on Pitt Road and resulted in some residents parking obstructively to reserve parking spaces which exacerbates the problem.

4.7 **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 in Appendix A, it is recommended to proceed with the scheme as proposed and shown in drawing No. PD-0402

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 with £57k remaining. 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 be funding of £2k remaining in 2019/20.

6.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current Financial Year	M.T.F.S – 3 year Forecast		
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Revenue</u>				
<u>Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
<u>Capital</u>				
<u>Budget available</u>				
Expenditure	57	0	0	0
<u>Effect of Decision from report</u>				
Expenditure	20	0	0	0
<u>Remaining Budget</u>	37	0	0	0

6.2 The effect of the decision

6.2.1 The cost of introducing controlled parking into the Bensham Manor area has been estimated at £20,000. This includes the supply and installation of signs, lines and a contribution towards the legal costs.

6.2.2 These costs can be contained within the available capital budgets for 2019/20.

6.3 Risks

6.3.1 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.

6.4 Options

6.4.1 An alternative option is to introduce a Residents Only parking scheme. Virtually all permit schemes in the Borough are shared-use with Pay & Display 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.

6.5 Savings / future efficiencies

6.5.1 If controlled parking is introduced future income will be generated from paid for parking (Pay by Phone), together with enforcement of these controls through the issue of Penalty Charge Notices. CPZ schemes have typically been proven to be self-financing usually within 4 years of introduction.

6.6 Approved by: F Wright, Head of Finance (Place)

7. COMMENTS OF COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 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. 6.5The 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.
- 7.5 Approved by: Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law on behalf of Sean Murphy Director of Law and Monitoring Officer.

8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

- 8.1 Enforcement of new parking schemes will require increased enforcement duties by Civil Enforcement Officers. It is anticipated that this additional enforcement can be undertaken using existing resources.

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

9. CUSTOMER IMPACT

- 9.1 The introduction of a new CPZ into Attlee Close, Kynaston Avenue, Kynaston Road (Kynaston Avenue to Sandringham Road), Sandringham Road & Palmerston Road is proposed in response to support from local residents for controlled parking.
- 9.2 Occupiers of all residential and business premises in the area were consulted to ensure that all those potentially affected by the proposals were given the opportunity to give their views. Parking controls are only introduced in the area where the majority of residents are in favour of a scheme. The proposals are therefore likely to be seen as a positive move by the Council and should improve residents' and businesses' views of the work carried out by the Borough.

10 EQUALITIES IMPACT

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

11. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 11.1 Parking schemes are designed so that the signing is kept to a minimum to reduce the environmental impact. Narrow 50mm wide lines can be used in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas.

12. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

- 12.1 The fact that uniformed Civil Enforcement Officers will be regularly patrolling the area should have a deterrent effect on crime.

13. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.1 The recommendations are to give notice of the proposal to introduce a new CPZ into the roads listed in paragraph 1.2 and subject to receiving no objections on the giving of the public notice to make the necessary Traffic Management Order. It is considered that parking controls would improve parking conditions for residents and visitors whilst improving safety and access.

14. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 14.1 The alternative option would be not to proceed with publication of the public notice and formal consultation but this would not accord with the expressed preference of the majority of those who responded to this informal consultation.

REPORT AUTHOR:

Barry Copestake – Traffic / Parking Engineer
Highway Improvements, Parking Design

020 8726 7100

CONTACT OFFICER:

David Wakeling, Parking Design Manager,
Highway Improvements, Parking Design

020 8726 6000 (Ext. 88229)

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Representations received and
officer's comments

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None