

Traffic Management Advisory Committee

Meeting held on Wednesday, 8 July 2020 at 6.30 pm. This meeting was held remotely

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Stuart King (Chair);

Councillors Muhammad Ali, Simon Hoar and Karen Jewitt

Also Present: Councillors Jeet Bains (in attendance as Ward Councillor) & Margaret Bird

Apologies: Councillors Jeet Bains, Pat Ryan

PART A

6/20 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

7/20 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

8/20 Urgent Business (if any)

There were no items of urgent business.

9/20 Croydon (West Permit Area) CPZ - Objections to the Proposed Extension in Sussex Road & Sunny Nook Gardens

The Chair informed the meeting that item 6 on the agenda (Cheyne Walk Area – Objections to the Proposed Extension of the Free Parking Zone) would be taken first.

The Committee considered the objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to extend the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (West Permit Zone) to Sussex Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay via Ring-Go (8 hours maximum stay) bays and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday, and to Sunny Nook Gardens with Permit parking only, operating during the same hours.

The Parking Design Manager informed Members that the report provided details on objections which had been received on the proposed extension of the zone. It was recognised that nine objections had been received, however officers recommended with proceeding with the scheme to relieve parking

pressures in the area which would increase once new developments were occupied.

In response to questions the Parking Design Manager confirmed that the results of informal consultations were normally included in reports, however stated that in response to the informal consultation there had been 32 responses from Sussex Road, 17 in favour and 15 against, and seven responses in Sunny Nook Gardens, four in favour and three against. It was noted that objector 1 in the report had stated that they had changed their mind and was now against the proposal, however it was stated that if the council continued to re-consult it would get different results every time.

The Parking Design Manager confirmed there were a group of parking bays on Moreton Road and that it was proposed that these bays be moved from the South Permit Zone to the West Permit Zone. It was noted that these bays were under-utilised whereas the northern part of Sussex Road often suffered from heavy parking. The officer stated that parking stress should ease with the introduction of controlled parking in the area.

Councillor Clancy informed the Committee that he lived in the area, but did not live in the roads affected by the proposals. Concerns were raised that a resident had notified the council that they had changed their mind and as such the vote was tied in Sussex Road. It was further noted that objections had been received from businesses which were already under pressure due to the covid-19 pandemic and that the council should not implement a scheme which would cause further pressure.

In response, the Parking Design Manager informed Members that the consultation had taken place in January and February 2020 and so had not been impacted by covid-19. Whilst it was noted that objections had been received from businesses, many of them in the local area had off street parking and that parking controls should make it easier for businesses and their customers to park in the area. The Committee noted that some vans parked on yellow lines which also caused issues for buses to pass down the road and so it was anticipated that controls would ease the flow of traffic also.

Members of the Committee noted that the resident in objection 1 in the report had changed their mind due to the lack of information on the parking charges which would be applied, however it was felt that this information was available. Whilst there would be an impact on businesses in the area, it was stated that it was hoped that it would be a positive one with more parking available in the area.

The Chair noted that the consultation was intended to inform the council of residents' views on proposed scheme but that it was not intended to be a referendum. It was noted that parking stress was experienced in the area and that if the council did not proceed with scheme at this time that it would take over 18 months for the council to reconsider the scheme due to the limited resources in the council.

The Committee voted on the officer's recommendations and voted three in support and two in opposition. The Committee therefore resolved to support the recommendations.

RESOLVED: That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee agreed to recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) that they:

1. Consider the responses received to the formal consultation to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (West Permit Zone) into Sussex Road with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay via Ring-Go (8 hours maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday, and to Sunny Nook Gardens for Permits only operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.
2. Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (West Permit Zone) into Sussex Road in its entirety as well as into Sunny Nook Gardens as shown on drawing number PD 407.
3. Inform the objectors and supporters of the above decision.

10/20 **Cheyne Walk Area - Objections to the Proposed Extension of the Free Parking Zone**

The Committee considered the objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to extend the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (free parking area) into Cheyne Walk, Carlyle Road, Annandale Road and Fryston Avenue.

The Parking Design Manager explained that the proposals sought to manage commuter parking which was experienced in the area. Following the informal consultation in 2019 it had been decided to proceed, including Fryston Avenue, with the scheme. During the formal consultation an objection was received from a resident in Fryston Avenue and it was proposed that the zone should not be extended to include this road.

The Committee noted that there was an area at paragraph 12 of the report and that it was recommended to proceed with the proposed scheme with the exception of Fryston Avenue.

The Committee Clerk read the following statement, submitted by Daniel Golberg, an objector from Carlyle Road:

"I maintain my objection to the extension of the CPZ to cover Carlyle Road. I note from the document pack for the meeting that the feedback from the informal public consultation dating from October last year resulted in 7 households in favour and 5 against the proposal, a narrow majority in favour. I believe that the proposals were poorly presented with no key entered on the plans

to identify the notations on the plan. This resulted in the plans being not properly understood by residents, in particular how many households would no longer be able to park in front of their own houses. This amounts to 13 out of the 22 houses on the road. There was also no indication of how many parking places would be lost as a result of the proposals, which was confirmed as 10 in your email to me and as 6 in the document pack.

The informal survey conducted by a resident in Fryston Road recorded that 3 residents in Carlyle Road supported the scheme but 4 objected to the scheme. Although your response says that consultations organised by residents should be treated with caution, the majority of residents responding in Carlyle Road were against the proposal. Fryston Avenue has been excluded from the plans and I think Carlyle Road should be given the same opportunity.

I request that the committee instruct that a new official survey be carried out to establish the current views of the residents in Carlyle Road. This should be accompanied by properly annotated, clear plans along with explanatory notes clarifying the impacts of the proposals including loss of parking spaces and environmental impact -yellow lines and signs at both end of the road.

Finally I note that Section 12 of the report states that ‘The recommendation is not to proceed with the proposed scheme as there isn’t widespread support for the scheme among residents....’ I support this recommendation but I fear that this has been included in error.”

Councillor Jeet Bains addressed the Committee, in his capacity as a Ward Councillor, and clarified that he lived on the affected road, Cheyne Walk. It was stated that whilst he was sympathetic to those who were against the proposals it was not felt that the majority of residents in Carlisle Road were against the proposals. It was noted that residents in Carlisle Road did not experience the impact of commuter parking as much as those in Cheyne Walk.

Members were informed that people often parked and blocked driveways which prohibited residents from moving their vehicles. It was further noted that the proposals sought to extend the scheme at the top of Cheyne Walk to the whole road and surrounding area.

Following the points raised by the speakers, the Parking Design Manager confirmed that the response to the informal consultation residents of Carlisle Road had voted seven in support and five against. It was noted that the roads were relatively supportive of the scheme and that the scheme should reduce parking stress in the surrounding roads.

RESOLVED: That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee agreed to

recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) that they:

1. Consider the response received to the formal consultation to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (free parking area) into Cheyne Walk, Carlisle Road, Annandale Road and Fryston Avenue with a combination of free unlimited time parking bays and yellow line waiting restrictions between the bays operating 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.
2. Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (free parking area) into the above area except Fryston Avenue as shown on drawing number PD - 420.
3. Inform the objector of the above decision.

11/20 **Dunheved Roads Area - Objections to the Proposed Extension of the North Permit Zone**

The Committee considered the objections received from the public following the formal consultation process on a proposal to extend the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Dunheved Roads area with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay via Ring-Go (8 hours maximum stay) bays and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

The Parking Design Manager informed Members that the council had originally proposed introducing 8am – 8pm Monday – Sunday operation hours, however this had been opposed by residents and so the council had re-consulted on 9am – 5pm Monday – Saturday operating hours. Only one objection had been received in this consultation.

It was noted that this area was surrounding by roads with controlled parking restrictions and that it was close to Croydon University Hospital and Croydon Mosque.

In response to Member questions the Parking Design Manager confirmed that the council had only consulted on the timings on this occasion as it had previously consulted on the proposals. The officer also confirmed that there was flexibility to enable mourners to park to attend funerals at places of worship.

The Chair noted that controlled parking had been introduced in the surrounding roads and that it had been clear that restrictions would be required in this area, however residents had objected to longer operating hours. It was stated that the consultation responses, with 81% in support of the proposals, had shown that the current proposals were appropriate.

RESOLVED: That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee agreed to recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and

Regeneration (Job Share) that they:

1. Consider the response received to the formal consultation to extending the existing Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into Dunheved Roads North, South, West and Close and Sharland Close with a combination of Shared-Use Permit/Pay via Ring-Go (8 hours maximum stay) and single yellow lines operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday.
2. Make a minor adjustment to the existing disabled bays and loading bay in Dunheved Road South as shown on Plan PD – 421b.
3. Agree for the reasons detailed in this report to extend the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (North Permit Zone) into the Dunheved Roads area as shown on drawing number PD – 421a.
4. Inform the objector of the above decision.

12/20 **School Streets**

The Committee consider implementation and operation of the 10 new School Streets, outlined in the report.

The New Business and Projects Manager explained that the report sought the agreement to proceed to the next stage of introducing school streets at ten locations and not proceed with one location. The council had consulted up to 300 meters away from the school to understand residents' views in the surrounding areas. The consultation had found 53% of residents were in favour of the proposals, with views ranging from strongly in favour and very strongly in favour in the proposed zones and very strongly in against to very strongly in favour outside the zones.

The officer noted that it was proposed to introduce the zones in September 2020 using Experimental Orders which would allow the council to respond to any traffic orders implemented within the areas and enables residents to share their views ahead of a report going to Traffic Management Advisory Committee to consider ahead of a final decision.

The Committee noted that the proposals were in line with Department for Transport guidance to support more active travel.

Councillor Margaret Bird addressed the Committee, in her capacity as a Ward Councillor, and acknowledged that there were significant problems experienced at Keston Primary School in relation to school traffic however stated that a School Street was not the right solution for that area. The Committee were informed that the road was a through-road and the next roads along were too narrow to accommodate the additional traffic. It was further noted that the 404 bus route goes down this road which would be disrupted.

Councillor Bird raised concerns that the consultation had asked closed questions and so had not enabled residents to fully express their views. Furthermore it was noted that a GP practice was sited on Court Avenue and the proposals would restrict patients, many of whom were elderly, from accessing the GP practice at school drop off and pick up times as they would not be able to travel down Keston Avenue.

Councillor Bird concluded that it was not reasonable to impose the proposed restrictions when 72% of residents were opposed and that the council should look to proactive enforcement to find an alternative solution. It was stated that when she had previously visited the school she had spoken to enforcement officers who had been resistant to intervene as they did not want to be verbally abused by parents.

Following the points raised by the speakers, the New Business and Projects Manager confirmed that Keston Avenue was a through-road, however there were alternative roads that could be used to travel between Coulsdon Road and Caterham Drive. Furthermore, it was stated that School Streets which had been implemented elsewhere had demonstrated a 25% reduction in car usage within a few months of implementation.

In response to concerns that the consultation had been closed it was noted that there had been a question of whether the respondent supported or opposed the proposal, but that there had also been an open text box to allow respondents to provide details and this additional information had been taken into consideration.

The New Business and Projects Manager confirmed that there were existing problems experienced in Court Avenue and that it was felt that this would only worsen with car ownership in the borough growing by 2% annually. It was felt that the only way that the issue could be resolved was by encouraging less car usage and the proposed scheme would encourage more walking, cycling and scooting to school.

In response to the suggestion that further enforcement was the solution at Keston Primary School, the New Business and Projects Manager stated the council had exhausted the options available to it. It was suggested that physical enforcement had a limited impact as it was difficult to issue penalties as parents were quick to drop off and pick up. Previously, the council had utilised a CCTV car to support enforcement however the Deregulation Act 2015 had removed this as an option. The Committee were further informed that the council had responded to 44 complaints received from Keston Avenue in the ten months up until February 2020 and had undertaken patrols with the Safer Neighbourhood Team. This

In response, Councillor Bird raised concerns that the report suggested that 75% of students lived within 12 minute walk of the school, however informed the Committee that this did not take into account the topography of the area and that Keston Primary School was located at the top of a steep hill; as such it was not feasible for children and parents to walk to school.

Whilst it was recognised that only 12 houses would directly benefit from the proposal there were over 334 houses within 300 meters of the school and that those houses would not experience the same level of issues as the 12 houses closest to the school experienced as there would be dispersion.

Members of the Committee noted that at schools where a School Street had been introduced there had been significant reductions in issues and had created safe spaces for children to access school. It was noted that the scheme had been award winning and was considered to be the best approach to encourage young people to actively travel to school as it was not a feasible option to position staff at the school gates to enforcement zig-zags.

Concerns were raised in relation to the proposal at Keston Primary School as it was located on a very steep hill and so many residents were required to travel by car as there was only one bus which came hourly. It was recognised that previous schemes had shown that a gradual reduction in school traffic was realised and it was hope that this was realised at Keston also, if the scheme was implemented. Some Members requested that the proposal for Keston Primary School be reconsidered.

The Chair stated that the ambition of School Streets extended beyond the impact experienced by those living within the immediate vicinity of the school; it was to create a safer environment which encouraged parents to actively travel to school and evidence suggested that reductions of traffic of 25% was facilitating this.

It was recognised that the use of the CCTV car was no longer possible and physical enforcement had not been effective with dealing the issues. The Chair stated that he had enquired whether it was possible to include Court Avenue within the scheme however the GP practice made this not possible as patients would not be able to access it during operational hours.

Members stated that it was important to monitor the displacement experienced to fully understand the impact of the schemes.

In relation to scheme at Christ Church CofE Primary School, Councillor Hoar as a Ward Councillor, informed the Committee that he had spoken to the Residents Association in relation to the proposal. It was report that there was a large amount of construction taking place in the area with the Brick by Brick development on Montpelier Road and that a one-way restriction had been implemented to manage traffic. Residents had requested that this one-way be maintained following construction concluding. It was suggested that if the one-way road was maintained then residents supported the introduction of a School Street. The Chair advised that residents should submit a petition to maintain the one-way road and that the School Street may strengthen this request.

In response to questions, the New Business and Projects Manager confirmed that residents could apply for exemption permits for carers by emailing

schoolparking@croydon.gov.uk. Residents within the zones would be written to advise them of the introduction of the scheme and how to apply for exemptions.

The Committee voted on the officer's recommendations and voted three in support and two in opposition.

The Members which voted in opposition to the recommendations, voted against in relation to Keston Primary School only and supported the introduction of School Streets at the other nine proposed schools.

The Committee therefore resolved to support the recommendations.

RESOLVED: That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee agreed to recommend to the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) that they:

1. Note the summary of responses received to the informal engagement with occupiers within the areas potentially affected by 11 current School Street proposals.
2. Agree, for the reasons detailed in this report, to proceed with introducing Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders and the consultation under the experimental procedure regarding the proposal for new pedestrian zones to restrict, during the start (8.00am to 9.30am) and end (2.00pm to 4.00pm) of the school day (i.e during term time), the use of motor vehicle traffic (except permit holders and emergency vehicles) along the 10 School Streets. To clarify; pedestrians and cyclists would be allowed. The 10 School Streets are in the following locations as illustrated in Appendix 1 of the report:
 - a. Christ Church CofE Primary School (Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown)
 - b. Downsview Primary School (Norbury Park)
 - c. Ecclesbourne Primary School (Bensham Manor)
 - d. Harris Primary Academy Hailing Park (South Croydon)
 - e. Keston Primary School (Old Coulsdon)
 - f. Kingsley Primary Academy (Broad Green)
 - g. Oasis Academy Reylands (Woodside)
 - h. Ridgeway Primary School (Sanderstead)
 - i. St Thomas Becket Catholic Primary (Woodside)
 - j. St Joseph's Catholic Junior School (Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood)
3. Agree not to proceed with an experimental scheme and consultation in 2020 at: Harris Academy Purley Way (Waddon).
4. Agree to proceed with a formal consultation on extending the operational hours to 7.30am to 9.30am and 2.00pm to 4.00pm (during term time) of the pre-existing School Street in Fairfield Way, Dunsfold

.....
Rise and Meadow Rise, at the Woodcote schools (Coulsdon Town ward), as illustrated in Appendix 2 of the report.

5. If consultations are agreed at 1 to 4, delegate to the Highway Improvement Manager, Public Realm Directorate the authority to give the notice.
6. Note that the outcomes of the consultations indicated in 2 above would be a Key Decision and will therefore be referred back to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee in 2021 for advising the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (job share) on whether to change, withdraw or make permanent each the 10 individual proposals.

13/20 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

This item was not required

The meeting ended at 7.55 pm

Signed:

Date: