

Agenda item:

[No.]

Addendum to Cabinet report

On 23 March 2010

Report Title. **Report of Statutory Notification Woodside area CPZ**

Report of **Niall Bolger, Director of Urban Environment**

Signed :

Contact Officer :

Joan Hancox, Head of Sustainable Transport 020-8489-1777

Joan.Hancox@Haringey.gov.uk

Tony Kennedy, Group Manager Transport Policy and Projects 020-8489-1765

Tony.Kennedy@Haringey.gov.uk

Wards(s) affected: **Woodside**

Report for: **Key**

1. Purpose of Addendum

- 1.1. The purpose of this addendum is to provide the Cabinet with a full list of all representations received during the statutory process, as the closing date for representations was outside the submission date for this report.

2 Recommendations

2.1 Section 4.1 of the report recommends the Cabinet to proceed with the measures as proposed through statutory notification, based on feedback received during formal consultation and representations received during statutory notification at the time of submission of the report.

2.2 The above recommendation was however subject to a further update of all representations received to be presented by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation on the night of the meeting.

2.3 Recommendation based on full feedback

2.4 After full analysis of the representations and petitions received, it is recommended to introduce the CPZ as proposed in during statutory notification.

3. Representations received during statutory notification

3.1 Statutory notification is not confined to a defined consultation area and any interested party regardless of where they live/work is entitled to make representation on the Council intentions.

3.2 Individual representation

3.3 In total 196 individual representations were received during the statutory notification period consisting of:

From within the proposed CPZ roads

- 69 individual representations in support of parking controls.
- 52 individual representations objecting on various grounds.
- 2 individual representations commenting on the scheme.

From outside the proposed CPZ roads

- 46 individual representations objecting on various grounds.
- 17 representations requesting the inclusion of their road in the CPZ.
- 10 representations commenting on the scheme.

3.4 Individual representations received from within the proposed CPZ were generally in favour of the proposal. Of the 69 individual representations in support, 33 were of a standard template with names and addresses inserted. Of the 52 individual representations objecting to the scheme on various grounds, 21 were of a standard template with names and addresses inserted.

3.5 Individual representations received from outside the proposed CPZ were mainly opposed to the introduction of the CPZ. A number, particularly from Tintern Road, did however request inclusion of their road in the CPZ fearing displacement parking should they be omitted.

3.6 **Petitions**

3.7 The Council also received two petitions during the statutory period. One in favour and one opposed.

3.8 The petition in favour contained 132 signatures all from residents within the proposed CPZ roads and stated the following reasons for support:

- Non-resident parking demand is detrimental to residents and their visitors
- It unacceptable that we cannot park in our own road due to non-resident parking.
- More traffic in area as motorists seek parking availability.
- Have to double park to unload shopping or when vans make deliveries.

The roads of where the signatures originated from are as follows:

- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| • Perth Road | 44 Signatories |
| • Granville Road | 45 Signatories |
| • Paisley Road | 11 Signatories |
| • Melrose Avenue | 18 Signatories |
| • Saxon Road | 4 Signatories |
| • Eldon Road | 9 Signatories |
| • Elm Road | 1 Signatory |

3.9 The petition objecting to the Woodside CPZ contained 359 signatures but did not provide a reason for the objection.

3.10 Of the 359 signatures 151 were from residents within the proposed CPZ roads and are listed below.

- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| • Perth Road | 77 Signatories |
| • Fife Road | 4 Signatures |
| • Granville Road | 23 Signatories |
| • Paisley Road | 3 Signatories |
| • Melrose Avenue | 18 Signatories |
| • Saxon Road | 6 Signatories |
| • Eldon Road | 18 Signatories |
| • Elm Road | 2 Signatories |

3.11 A further 134 signatures are from residents in neighbouring roads to the proposed CPZ as listed below.

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| • James Gardens | 19 Signatories |
| • The Crossway/ Parade | 18 Signatories |
| • Norman Avenue- | 17 Signatories |

• Croxford Gardens	16 Signatories
• Granville (East of Perth road)	14 Signatories
• Grainger Road-	13 Signatories
• Lordship Lane-	13 Signatories
• Sandford Avenue-	10 Signatories
• Ellenbrough Road-	6 Signatories
• Tintern Road-	4 Signatories
• New Road	3 Signatories
• Homecroft Road	1 Signatory

3.12 The remaining signatures were from outside of the area.

3.13 **Objections with Council's considered response**

3.14 This section is split into two parts, Objections to CPZ controls and Objections/comments to the consultation process. Below are the salient objections received along with the Council's considered response.

3.15 **Objection to CPZ controls**

Objection- A CPZ would have a bad effect on our social and family life by discouraging visitors. It would isolate those who rely on visitors/carers and force everyone to pay for visitor permits. A CPZ would cause disruption to normal routines giving nowhere for tradesmen to park.

Council's Response- If a CPZ is introduced in the area residents can purchase visitor vouchers for use during the operational times of the CPZ and a concessionary rate of 50% less applies to residents over 60 or the registered disabled. Tradesmen can utilise the proposed pay and display bays or obtain visitor permits from the residents whose property they may be working on.

Objection- A CPZ would damage local shops and businesses discouraging passing trade and making it hard for local workers.

Council's Response- Shared use resident, business and pay and display bays have been proposed in several roads within the Woodside area including the side roads off Lordship Lane. These parking bays will facilitate parking for visitors to the area. There are also a number of free bays located along Lordship Lane that can be utilised during off-peak hours. Businesses are entitled to apply for permits for their staff provided they meet the relevant criteria.

Objection- A CPZ would be bad for the community turning neighbouring streets into overspill car parks whilst allowing less parking within the CPZ. A CPZ is not needed in this area. It will set one street against another as the council expands their schemes.

Council's Response- It is true that there will always be a level of displacement parking in neighbouring streets when parking controls are introduced. The proposals have however been developed following demand from local residents regarding parking issues they have been experiencing. Prior to carrying out public consultation several community Focus Group meetings were held to identify issues and agree a way forward, which resulted in formal consultation with the wider community. The feedback from public consultation demonstrated that there was an area in favour of parking controls.

Objection-The council is responsible for causing the parking problems in this area by extending the CPZ in the Noel Park and Scotch Estates.

Council's Response- The extension of the CPZ was introduced as a direct result of requests from local residents for protection against long stay commuter parking. A review of the Wood Green CPZ carried out in November 2006 confirmed that the zone was supported. Overall the feedback received from the review indicated that 53% of respondents are either Very or Fairly Satisfied with the CPZ.

Objection- The council does not appear to have undertaken an independent survey to determine the true scale of the problems of commuter parking, and associated traffic flows in the area, relying instead on anecdotal evidence to determine policy.

Council's Response- The proposals have been developed following feedback received during public consultation within a defined area and demonstrates that the Council has listened to residents concerns regarding parking.

Objection- The council has apparently failed to consider alternative solutions to the problems of parking commuter vehicles.

Council's Response-The council is constantly working towards more sustainable modes of transport. To date we have introduced 27 Car Clubs bays throughout the borough and will shortly be consulting on the proposed introduction of 42 extra spaces which include a location along Leith Road off Perth Road. Having Car Club bays in residential areas can contribute to reducing commuting by offering an alternative to a private vehicle. We will also promote the use of sustainable modes of transport as opposed to the private vehicle and this approach is reflected in our policies.

Objection-The council has failed to consider the rights of the voters, instead pursuing implementation of an anti-car owner policy.

Council's Response- The proposals considered in this report were developed in consultation with residents and is based on the feedback received. It is in line with Councils policy as outlined in the main body of the report.

Objection- *“Better traffic management-by reducing illegal and disruptive parking”* There is no evidence that there is illegal parking in the area, which requires parking restrictions. Disruptive parking is not defined in the text, but while there is shortage of space, no disruption can occur except in a process.

Council’s Response- From site observations it is clear that obstructive parking takes place, particularly close to junctions. This manner of parking can hinder visibility for pedestrians and motorists alike. It is therefore proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions throughout the area.

Objection- The council has arbitrarily decided full day parking restrictions, when commuter parking could be controlled by a restricted number of hours, requiring less costly administration. In addition residents will be parking outside the zone unless adequate parking bays are provided, and this is unlikely due to inadequate survey of car ownership.

Council’s Response- Question four of the Public Consultation document asked respondents to consider four different time periods or suggest another. On analysis of the feedback to question four regarding the possible timings for a CPZ it was seen that from the roads comprising of the proposed Woodside CPZ that a majority supported at least ‘all day’ operational times with 32 of 105 respondents in favour of this period. The operational times of a CPZ do not affect the administration costs. In all CPZs all Parking bays will be marked out where it is safe to do so taking into account the need to maintain traffic and road safety.

Objection- I am worried it will cause environmental impact when front gardens are change into off street parking.

Council’s Response- In February 2007, a revised policy for vehicle crossovers was introduced which imposed more stringent criteria on crossover applications. the new guidance included the following for consideration *‘in considering an application, the council will assess the need for safe and efficient operation of an existing operation of an existing CPZ. Applications will be refused where it is deemed that the construction of a crossover and subsequent loss of parking spaces would have a detrimental impact to an on-street parking within a CPZ.*

Objection- I will have to renew and pay again each time I change my vehicle.

Council’s Response- As permits are registration specific to the vehicle there is a £10 administration fee for amending a permit due to the change in vehicle, this fee does not apply to renewal.

3.16 **Objections/comments to the consultation process**

Objection- The Local Consultation was flawed in several respects: The council has failed to consult democratically in the first instance all the voters in the ward.

Surveys have shown the document was not received by every household nor by every voter.

Council's Response- The extents of public consultation was agreed amongst Focus Group members and documents were distributed by Electoral Services. Statutory notification is open to any interested party wishing to make representation regardless of where they live/work.

Objection- The local consultation was misleading in the following respects *"The aim of a CPZ is to prioritise parking for residents by restricting non resident and commuter parking"*: Unless specifically designed, a CPZ does not provide the number of parking spaces that would be needed by residents

Council's Response- The proposals are clear in their aims of prioritising parking for residents by restricting non-resident parking.

Comment- *" The feedback received from the consultation will be presented in a report to the December 2009 meeting of the Council's Cabinet, which will consider the consultation results, along with other factors such as safety implication and the need to ensure traffic flow is maintained, when making a decision on the way forward"* This suggested that the results would be considered by the Cabinet. In the event not only did the December meeting of the Cabinet not discuss the feedback, the decision to proceed to statutory consultation seems not to have been taken by Cabinet.

Council's Response- The feedback of the public consultation carried out in September/October 2009 was originally scheduled to be presented to the Council's Cabinet on 15 December 2009. Unfortunately, due to the postal strike in October 2009, the deadline for responses was extended and, a request for a further Focus Group meeting in late November meant that it was not possible to report back to the December Cabinet. The decision to proceed to statutory consultation was made under delegated powers and the feedback received during this process reported to the Cabinet for decision.

Comment- The Council's consultation has been incomplete. The council has not published full data on the returns. In particular the choices and numbers to question 4. *If a CPZ were introduced in your area, what do you think would be the most appropriate operating hours for parking control?* have not been published

Council's Response- The council has published full data on the responses to the September/October public consultation as appendix of II the Delegated Report, approved on 28 January 2010. This is available on the council's website.

Comment- The council has based the decision to proceed to statutory consultation on incorrect information. Surveys show that many more people than those who responded are opposed to the CPZ, particularly in the roads identified

as part of the statutory consultation. There is anecdotal evidence that the results do not reflect the actual polling response, some households being recorded as voting for the proposals, when in fact the vote was against.

Council's Response- The council does not agree that the information provided in the delegated report is incorrect. The returned questionnaires are available for public inspection. The Council will only consider returned questionnaires when making recommendations to the way forward as there is no way of knowing the views of non-respondents.

Comments- The council has selected a group of roads from which majority responses were for the CPZ. The low level of returns however makes these proposals self-serving the council failed to confirm if the real majority are supportive, in contravention of democratic principles

Council's Response- It was stated on page 3 of the public consultation document that the consultation is not a vote on whether the whole area should receive a controlled parking zone and that the feedback will be analysed on a road by road basis to identify roads or areas that are in favour of measures and those roads that are not in favour. It was also outlined that the feedback will also enable to determine the way forward, based on the responses received, regarding the possible introduction of a zone or zones to address identified parking problems.

Comments- The original voting system based on one house one vote was totally undemocratic. Why can't we have one-person one vote like in any other election? For example, it's possible that two people in a shared house can have different views, yet under your system this can't be represented.

Council's Response- It is our corporate consultation policy to accept one response per household during the public consultation process. This is to ensure that each household has an equal opportunity to respond. Statutory notification affords all interested parties an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Comments: We did not receive any documentation on the proposals.

Council's Response: The documents during public consultation and statutory notification were distributed by Electoral Services who are responsible for the distribution of polling cards. We are satisfied documents were distributed.

- 3.17 A complete list of all representation and petitions received during this process is available to view at the Transport Policy and Project Groups offices.
- 3.18 **Summary of representations, comments and objections-**
- 3.19 Representations received from within the proposed area are generally in favour of parking controls whereas representations received from neighbouring roads

are opposed. This is expected and reflects the views received during the initial public consultation.

- 3.20 The Council received two petitions during the statutory process and these should be given due consideration. It should be noted however the petition opposing the CPZ did not provide a reason and cannot therefore be regarded as a valid objection.
- 3.21 It should also be noted that some residents signed both petitions whilst others signed a petition but made individual representation contradicting the petition.
- 3.22 Although both petitions were submitted as part of the statutory process, it is unclear as to when the signatures were obtained as dates have not been provided. If the petitions were collated during the initial formal consultation stage signatories views may have changed at the statutory stage once the Council's intentions were known. This may explain why some have signed both petitions and also sent in individual representations.
- 3.23 A number of representations were questioning the consultation process. The Council is however confident that its consultation process was robust and transparent.
- 3.24 When ward councillors and officers met with businesses it appeared that the most prominent concerns was parking for staff and customers and the operational hours of the bus lane in front of their properties, which they believed to be detrimental to their customer parking. If a CPZ were introduced this would assist in prioritising kerb space for business permit holders and visitors to the area. The council's bus priority team will be asked to consider placing a review of the bus lane as part of next years programme.
- 3.25 Based on the feedback received during the initial consultation stage and representations received during statutory notification it is officers recommendation to proceed with the proposals as advertised and recommended in the main body of the report.