Agenda item:

[No.]

Cabinet	On 21 December 2010

Report Title. **Report of statutory notification for extensions of the Crouch End A and B CPZs**

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

Signed : N P Bolger. 6th Dec 2010.

Contact Officer :

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

Joan.Hancox@Haringey.gov.uk

Tony Kennedy, Group Manager 020-8489-1765

Tony.Kennedy@haringey.gov.uk

Wards(s) affected: **Crouch End, Muswell Hill, Hornsey, Stroud Green**	Report for: **Key**

1. Purpose of the report

1.1. To inform the Cabinet of the representations received during statutory notification for extensions of the Crouch End A and B CPZs.

1.2. To seek approval to proceed with the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

2. Introduction by Cabinet Member

2.1 This proposal has been developed following representations from local residents and ward Members regarding parking pressures experienced in Crouch End. Focus Group meetings have been held with resident and business representatives and ward Members to help shape the scope and format of the statutory notification process. We have also reported the representations received during statutory notification back to members of the focus group.

3. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:

3.1. The Council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) sets out the Council's intention to improve parking conditions in the borough, which includes the allocation of on-street kerb space within the defined hierarchy of parking need. It also seeks to maximise road safety throughout the borough through the fair and consistent enforcement of parking restrictions. The plan contains the policy framework for both parking and road safety and is summarised below.

3.2. **Local Implementation Plan (LIP)**

Parking: Section 7.0 of the Parking and Enforcement Plan (the 'PEP'), which forms part of the LIP, reiterates the Council's intentions to improve parking conditions in the borough. The overall aim of the PEP is to support a better and safer environment in the borough.

Key PEP policies include:

- The Council will assess the need for parking controls at junctions.
- The Council will allocate on-street kerb space in accordance with the Council's defined hierarchy of parking need.
- The Council will monitor, manage and review on-street pay and display parking to help manage long-stay commuter parking and promote short stay and visitor parking.
- The Council will maximise road safety throughout the Borough through the fair and consistent enforcement of parking restrictions.
- The Council recognises the need for a robust, systematic framework for future CPZ implementation in the Borough.

3.3. **Road Safety:** Section 6.0 of the LIP contains the Council's Road Safety Strategy, which details initiatives to make borough roads safer for all road users. The Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) also contains strategic transport policies for the benefit of road safety. The key policies include:

- To tackle congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas.
- To make the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users through traffic management measures
- To manage better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy.
- To improve the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas.
- Encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport

4. Recommendations

4.1. It is recommended that the Cabinet:

4.2. Note the feedback of statutory notification as set out in this report.

4.3. Authorise officers to take all necessary steps under the Road Traffic Act for the introduction of extensions to the Crouch End A and B CPZs, as set out during statutory notification, with the exception of Elder Avenue.

4.4. Approve the decision for the inclusion of Elder Avenue to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Director of Urban Environment following the consideration of further consultation with the residents of Elder Avenue.

4.5. Authorise officers to inform the public of the Cabinet's decision.

5. Reason for recommendation(s)

5.1. It is normal for the vast majority of representations submitted during statutory notification to be objections. During this process the Council is informing of its intention to introduce parking controls and those who agree with the proposals do not always feel the need to make representation confirming their support. During this process representations received were relatively low with a mix of both support and objection. This would indicate a low level of objection to the Council's intentions.

5.2. The Council has duly considered all objections received both individual and through petition. It does not however consider any of the objections to provide valid reason for upholding the said objection to amend or prevent progress to introduction of the proposals as set out during statutory notification.

5.3. Elder Avenue is located on the periphery of the proposed extension and is located in both the Crouch End and Hornsey wards. During meetings with ward members it was agreed that Elder Avenue be permitted to opt out of the scheme should representations received during the notification process justify its omission. In view of the mixed representations received from residents of this road the Hornsey Ward Councillors have requested further confirmation of support or opposition to inclusion in the extension. This request can be accommodated without delaying the introduction of the extensions.

6. Other options considered

6.1. N/A

7. Summary

7.1. The Council brought forward the proposals following representations from residents and the Crouch End Ward Councillors for the Crouch End CPZs to be extended at the earliest opportunity. Most of the resident representations came from roads adjoining or close to the existing Crouch End CPZs and displacement parking was given as the main reason.

7.2. The fast track process was therefore considered the most appropriate process to use and this way forward was agreed through member and officer meetings.

7.3. At the statutory notification stage the Council is notifying of its intention to introduce parking controls and the 21 day consultation period is open to any interested party to make representation. It is usual during this stage for the vast majority of representations to be objections as those in agreement with the Council's intentions do not always feel the need to confirm their support.

7.4. In view of the publicity generated around the proposed extensions, both in the local press and through the resident/trader representatives, the Council received a relatively low level of objections to its intentions.

7.5. The main reasons provided through the objections was centred around the following:

- No parking issues exist.
- Insufficient consultation conducted with the community.
- CPZ not required.

7.6. Although there will be a number of roads on the periphery of the proposed extensions that may not currently suffer from extreme parking pressures, they will inevitably suffer if omitted from the extension. It is not therefore recommended that they be omitted. The low level of representations received from these roads objecting to the scheme would not indicate this view is shared amongst the majority.

7.7. The process for consultation was agreed through officer and member meetings. Ward councillors supported the need for the fast track process to extend the Crouch End CPZs and stated the level of petitions submitted as evidence of support for this approach to be used. The relatively low level of objections received during the statutory notification process would indicate that residents are broadly supportive of the proposals.

7.8. A number of representations were received from residents in the roads surrounding the proposed extension, requesting inclusion. It is not possible to include additional roads through this process as it would require a further statutory notification. Residents of these roads were provided with notification of the proposed extensions and invited to write to the Council now, or once the scheme is introduced, to highlight any parking issues they may experience. This feedback will need to be closely monitored to establish if there is sufficient demand to consider entering into dialogue for the consideration of additional parking measures.

7.9. The representations received from businesses raised concerns with the proposed CPZ controls affecting their businesses. It is stated by some of the businesses responding that they do not think the controls will improve their parking situation. Businesses also raised concerns that there would not be enough parking spaces available to business use. As part of the proposals shared use businesses and resident parking bays have been proposed in several roads throughout the proposed CPZs.

7.10. Elder Avenue is located in both the Hornsey and Crouch End Wards as the ward boundary runs along the middle of the road. The Hornsey Ward Councillors requested that Elder Avenue be permitted to opt out of the extension should sufficient levels of objections be submitted through statutory notification. A petition was received from residents of Elder Avenue objecting to the extension and individual representations were also received both for and against the extension. The petition objected to the whole extension and did not specify Elder Road. As we are recommending the extension progresses Elder Avenue residents will inevitably suffer displacement if omitted.

7.11. In agreement with the Ward Councillors, officers will provide the residents of Elder Avenue with a final opportunity to have there say on whether they should be included in the zone, in the knowledge that the zone is recommended for implementation and they will suffer displacement if omitted. A letter will be distributed in early December and it is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Director of Urban Environment approves the way forward based on the feedback received.

7.12. A full list of all representations received along with the council's response is contained in Appendix II of this report.

7.13. If the extensions are approved, it is proposed to start implementation in February and for the scheme to go live in April. The precise timings will be dependent on the severity of the weather. Residents will receive a letter letting them know the outcome of the Council's decision and the timescales for the implementation of the extensions.

8. Chief Financial Officer Comments

8.1. The 2010/11 capital budget allocation approved for the parking plan is currently £600k. The approved budget allocated for the delivery of the extension of Crouch

End CPZ is £155k. The proposals in this report will include implementation for a number of schemes in and around the extension of Crouch End CPZ. The estimated costs of implementing the measures set out in this report will be met from corporate resources and should be implemented and completed by 31st March 2011. No additional funding is required or available from Council resources to support this scheme and costs must not exceed the current budget provision.

9. Head of Legal Services Comments

9.1. Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement a CPZ scheme, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act ("RTRA") 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations1996. All objections received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

9.2. The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.

9.3. When determining what paying parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.

9.4. By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 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:-

(a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.

(b) 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.

(c) the national air quality strategy.

(d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.

(e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

9.5. The statutory consultation detailed in this report complies with the requirements of the Local Authority Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. It is noted that under the regulations before making the order the Council must consider all objections duly made and not withdrawn. The decision maker must give careful consideration to the matters set out in paragraphs 9.3 and 9.4 before making a decision on this proposal.

9.6. The Council has the power to modify an order in consequence of any objections or otherwise before it is made. Where the changes are considered substantial, the Council must take the steps it considers appropriate to inform persons likely to be affected by the modifications and give those persons the opportunity of making representations. The Council must consider those representations.

10. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

10.1. Statutory Notification affords any interested party the opportunity to make a representation on the proposals regardless of where they live or work.

10.2. The statutory notification documents were distributed to all households and businesses within the agreed area.

10.3. The statutory notification document included a section offering translation into minority languages.

11. Representations received during statutory notification.

11.1. This section summarises the representations received as part of this process

11.2. As part of statutory notification, we received **381** representations.

11.3. Of these representations **214** were from within the proposed extensions either supporting or objecting, as follows:

45 were in support of the extension of the Crouch End A CPZ
39 were in support of the extension Crouch End B CPZ
64 were objecting to the extension Crouch End A CPZ
55 were objecting to the extension of the Crouch End B CPZ
11 were received from businesses objecting to the extension of the Crouch End A/B CPZs.

11.4. A further **134** representations were received from outside the proposed extension either supporting or objecting, as follows:

64 representations were received from residents outside the proposed CPZ boundary objecting to the extension of the Crouch End CPZ.
39 requested their road is included in the proposed CPZ.
24 representations were received objecting to the scheme and their origin could not be determined.

7 representations supported the council's proposals and their origin could not be determined.

11.5. The remaining **33** representations made general comments.

11.6. In addition to the representations above, the council received four petitions objecting to the Crouch End CPZs.

11.7. A full list of representations along with the Council's response can be found in Appendix II of this report.

11.8. **Statutory Bodies -** As part of the statutory notification process the views of the following bodies were sought: AA, London Transport, Police (local), Fire Brigade, London Ambulance Service, Freight Transport Association, Road Haulage Association, RAC, Metropolitan Police (traffic), Haringey Cycling Campaign, Enterprise. None of these statutory bodies provided comment.

11.9. We received a response from London Travel Watch the independent, statutory watchdog for transport users in and around London. Their response is as follows:

London Travel Watch is the statutory watchdog representing transport users in and around London. London Travel Watch supports the rational management of parking. However it would want to be assured that where there is the possibility that parking could be displaced onto nearby roads carrying a bus route (such as Park Road and Shepherd's Hill) Consideration is given to upgrading waiting and loading restrictions on the bus route .

We would like to be assured that as part of the scheme there are 24-hour bus stop clearways (lined and signed) on Shepherd's Hill to prevent obstructive parking to buses.

11.10. A meeting was held with the Hornsey, Highgate and Crouch End Safer Neighbourhoods Team on 7 October. The officers were concerned that if a CPZ were introduced due to the shift patterns access to public transport was not always available and they would require permits to parking in the area. Officer asked if there was any provision available to officers. It was explained that officers can apply for Essential Service permits however Parking Services would need to evaluate any application on a case by case basis to ensure they meet the criteria.

11.11. A meeting was held with the London Fire Brigade Hornsey Station Manager on 7 October. The purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed parking layout along Topsfield Road as residents had raised concerns with proposed waiting restrictions along the western side of the road. The Station Manager has since confirmed that the proposals can be revised by lengthening the existing waiting restrictions.

11.12. A meeting was held with representatives of Coleridge School on 13 October. The representatives of the school raised matters that consideration be given to introduce signs at the junction of Crescent Road and Crouch Hill highlighting it was an area that children would cross. It was also agreed that redundant School Keep

Clear markings could be converted to shared use and resident parking bays.

11.13. A meeting was held with residents of Topsfield Road on 7 October to discuss the proposed extension. The main concern raised at this meeting was relating to the proposed waiting restrictions along the western side of the road. As per Para 11.11 it has since been confirmed that the proposals can be revised by lengthening the existing waiting restrictions.

12. Service Financial Comments

12.1. If the measures proposed through statutory notification are approved, the cost of implementing the scheme will be met from £155k budget allocation identified within 2010/11 parking capital budget provision.

12.2. The annual running cost of the scheme after implementation will be £151,900 and the estimated revenue to be generated will be approximately £222k .The payback of set up costs in years is 2.2 years.

13. Use of appendices /Tables and photographs

13.1. Appendix I Statutory notification documents
13.2. Appendix II List of representations and council's response.
13.3. Appendix III Summary/minutes of focus group meetings with community representatives

14. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- Representations from statutory notification
- The Council's Local Implementation Plan

15. Background and Statutory Notification Process

15.1. Following the introduction of the Crouch End A/B CPZ in February 2009, the council received a number of petitions and representations from the local community requesting the parking controls be extended to include their roads.

15.2. Officer and member meetings were held to discuss the issue and agree a way forward to address parking issues in the Crouch End, Stroud Green, Hornsey and Muswell Hill wards. It was agreed to proceed with the fast track process for extensions to the Crouch End CPZs, review the Finsbury Park CPZs and monitor parking issues in the Hornsey and Muswell Hill wards.

15.3. Focus Group meetings chaired by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and attended by local resident/trader representatives, council officers and Ward Councillors were held to shape and agreed the notification process for the extensions. Minutes of the meeting are contained in Appendix III of this report.

15.4. **Statutory Notification and Fast Track process**

15.5. Statutory notification is the legal part of the process required before modifying or implementing parking controls. In summary, before making an order to modify or implement parking controls, the council must notify its intentions in the London Gazette and local press providing a period of 21 days for any interested party to make representation. In addition, although not a requirement, it is also good practice to advertise on site where the measures are proposed.

15.6. Statutory notification took place from 16 September and representations were accepted until 8 October 2010. A total of 4000 documents were also distributed to all properties within the agreed extension areas

15.7. As part of the notification process, letters explaining the council's intentions to extend the Crouch End CPZs were distributed to roads surrounding the proposed extensions. A copy of this letter is contained within Appendix I.

15.8. As part of the statutory process, the views of the following bodies are also sought: AA, London Transport, Police (local), Fire Brigade, London Ambulance Service, Freight Transport Association, Road Haulage Association, RAC, Metropolitan Police (traffic), Haringey Cycling Campaign, neighbouring boroughs, Enterprise and

15.9. A post statutory notification focus group meeting took place on 10 November. The intention of this meeting was to report the representations received and outline the way forward. The meeting was attended by 33 community representatives.

15.10. Before making the relevant Traffic Management Orders, the council must consider all duly made objections submitted in response to the statutory notification.

15.11. If the Council is satisfied that it has addressed all objections received, a Notice of Making can then be published in the London Gazette and local press notifying of the date the Traffic Management Order will come into operation. At this time, notification letters will also be distributed to all properties within the road/roads where parking controls are to be implemented. The notification letters will provide information of when the works will take place, operational date of the new parking controls and how to apply for a permit.

15.12. It should be noted that statutory notification differs from the informal consultation process that is usually conducted first to assess level of support for parking controls. Statutory notification is open to any interested party wishing to make representation regardless of where they live / work. The representations received are also analysed based on their content rather than a yes/no vote. It should be further noted during this process the majority of representations are normally objections to the proposals, as those in support may not feel the need to make representation.

Appendix I

Statutory notification documents and letter sent to surrounding areas

Appendix II

List of representations received and council's response

a) This section of the report provides summary of the comments/ key objections/ received together with the council's considered response. Each objection/comment with the appropriate response is considered in turn.

Summary of Comments

The council has not carried out consultation as per its policy.

Comments- I believe the consultation that has just been undertaken is at best flawed at worst a deliberate attempt to increase the zones via the back door without due and required consultation.

Your cabinet reported dated 15 July 2008, the most recent report on you the parking pages of your website and thus I presume the most up to date, granted permission to have a shorter consultation period (21 days) where a CPZ is to be extended. This is the method of consultation currently being used to consult about the extension to the Crouch End CPZ. However, the report in paragraph 2 is clear that this process should be used to 'extend zones to a small number of roads where there is clear evidence of support from residents and businesses'. The report goes on to explain in paragraph 12.6 that small areas are defined as ' one to five roads at a time' and where 'the majority' of residents and businesses clearly support parking controls for their road. I would contest that your current consultation fails on both of these tests. There are in excess of 40 roads to be included and even if you feel there are two extensions being considered the number of roads still far exceeds the requirement. The details given for representations from roads are copied below; none I would suggest are a majority of residents in the road.

Council's Response- The council has followed the correct legal statutory notification procedures for the proposed extensions as set out under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 and prescribed under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations 1996.

The fast track policy approved by the Cabinet in July 2008 was designed to speed up the process for CPZ extensions should evidence of support be provided by the community through representation, usually in the form of a petition or through ward councillors. Paragraph 12.6 to which you refer in your e-mail states the council should consider this approach for extending zones to smaller areas and uses 1-5 roads as an example not policy criteria as suggested. You will also be aware that paragraph 12.11 of the same report states that 'consideration should also be given to extending the statutory notification area to roads neighbouring the area of support'. This is to mitigate displacement parking issues and is considered and agreed in consultation with the ward councillors.

The roads identified for inclusion in the extension were discussed in detail with the ward councillors and have taken into account the potential of displacement parking arising from the introduction of a smaller scheme. The Statutory Notification process affords any interested party the opportunity to make representation regarding the council's intentions and we are legally obliged to consider all objections as part of this process.

Impact on visitors/visiting tradesmen

Comments: Why are there maximum allocations to some forms of permits (e.g. 12 weekend vouchers in a 12 month period) You to pay for permits for visitors and carers, not just people with cars and the number of cars will be limited. A CPZ would cause disruption to normal routines giving nowhere to park for traders who we want to call.

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. The charges for visitor vouchers are considerably less then on street pay and display. A concessionary rate of 50% less on the charge and increased allowance applies to residents over 60 or registered Disabled. The weekend visitor voucher allocation will not apply to this proposal.

Will increase the pressure of driveways

Comments: It will increase the pressure for driveways to be constructed, gardens lost and subsequent further loss of space to park/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.*

Comments: What is the objective of CPZ? Other than mentioning that its purpose is to ease congestion, the document does not adequately describe what the objective of the CPZ – it mentions what a CPZ is, but not why. Please could you clarify.

Council's Response: The proposals considered in this report developed with residents and are in accordance with the objectives of the Council's Local Implementation Plan. This plan contains the policy framework for both parking and road safety and is summarised below.

Local Implementation Plan (LIP)

Parking: Section 7.0 of the Parking and Enforcement Plan (the 'PEP'), which forms part of the LIP reiterates the Council's intentions to improve parking conditions in the Borough. The overall aim of the PEP is to support a better and safer environment for the borough.

Key PEP policies include:

- The Council will assess the need for parking controls at junctions.
- The Council will allocate on-street kerb space in accordance with the Council's defined hierarchy of parking need.

- The Council will monitor, manage and review on-street pay and display parking to help manage long-stay commuter parking and promote short stay and visitor parking.

Road Safety: Section 6.0 of the LIP contains the Council's Road Safety Strategy which details initiatives to make borough roads safer for all road users. The Council's UDP also contains strategic transport policies for the benefit of road safety. The key polices include:

- To tackle congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas.
  - To make the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable street users through traffic management measures.
  - To manage better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy.
  - To improve the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas.

Encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport

CPZ should be removed

Comments: The existing Crouch End CPZs should be removed/ The council is responsible for causing the parking problems in this area by introducing the original CPZ.

Council's Response- The introduction of the original CPZs were introduced following a public consultation and statutory notification process as a direct result of requests from local residents for protection against long stay non-resident/commuter parking.

Comments: The council has not considered 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 locations in Hurst Avenue and Hatherely Gardens. Having Car Club bays in residential areas can contribute to reducing commuting by offering an alternative to a private vehicle.

Comment: Opposed as it will cause displacement parking to my road.

Council's response: The aim of a CPZ is to prioritise parking in line with the Council's hierarchy of parking need. As part of this process letters informing of the proposed extension of the Crouch End CPZs were sent to residents of roads surrounding

Comments: Since CE-A in that area was introduced the teachers have to park in nearby non-CPZ (an example of displaced parking).Extending the proposed extension will make it impossible for them to park anywhere near the school. Most of the teachers live quite a long distance from the school. They need to drive.

Council's Response: Prior to the introduction of the Crouch End A CPZ officers met with St Gildas/Peters schools to discuss the provision of 'Essential Service' permits for staff requiring travel by private vehicles. It is a matter for the school to determine which staff have access to these permits

Comments: Firstly, there will be no guarantee of getting a place on the road to park as more permits (residents and visitors) will be issued than spaces.

Council's Response: The council acknowledges that CPZs do not guarantee a space to park, however the nature of a CPZ means it will prioritise kerb-space for residents in the area and reduce the competition between residents and non-residents for spaces.

Comments: it will decrease safety as more cars cruise around trying to find somewhere to park

Council's Response: The proposed hours of the extension are 10am to noon and 2-4pm, Monday to Friday. This will lead to an increase in available kerb space for motorists to utilise.

Comments: Process to apply for permits is inconvenient/ You have to go to Wood Green to purchase a permit/ I believe that in order to obtain one of these permits you have to go to the town hall in person

Council's Response: Residents permits can be applied for in person at the customer services centre in Crouch End and applications can be made via post.

Objections

Objections: There is no parking problem in the area

Council's Response: The original Crouch End CPZ was introduced as a direct result of requests from local residents for protection against long stay non resident commuter parking.

We were approached by residents on the periphery of the existing CPZ to investigate the parking pressures in the area. The proposals to extend the CPZ are in response resident's requests in the area for the consideration of parking controls.

Objection: Various Financial implications It's a stealth tax/ residents shouldn't have to pay/It should be free/The scheme is being introduced to combat government cuts/ I pay road tax for my car that already reflects the CO2 emissions of the car and also pay Council Tax so shouldn't havt to pay for a permit/ I do not want to pay for something that is currently free.

Council's Response: If the scheme does go ahead it must be self financing. Any surplus may be spent on highways improvements, highways maintenance and on concessionary travel.

Objections: Why are different engine sizes/emissions levels charged at different rates ? Why is engine size a factor when there is no specific correlation between the size of a car (and therefore the space used to park it) and its engine capacity.

Council's Response: Haringey Council has signed the Nottingham Declaration, committing itself to take positive steps to reduce the impact of local green house gas emissions on climate change. The introduction of parking controls will have an impact on CO_2 emissions by prioritising parking availability.

Objection: Impact of local businesses. I believe that CPZ would adversely affect local shops/ A CPZ would damage local shops and businesses discouraging passing trade and making it hard for local workers.

As things are at present, with most of Crouch End without a CPZ, it is a magnet for shoppers wanting to come to an area where they can find good, independent shops without having to worry about parking restrictions of any kind. Start bringing in restrictions, and the effect on shops could be devastating.

Council's Response-. As part of the proposals several shared use resident/business pay and display parking bays have been proposed to assist businesses. These parking bays will facilitate parking for visitors to the area. Businesses are entitled to apply for permits for their staff provided they meet the relevant criteria. We will also be providing pay and display bays at strategic locations within the CPZ to encourage short-stay parking to assist local businesses. Business permits were reduced from £300 to £200 in an effort to assist business. Following a review of permit charges it has been agreed that that business permits will be increased to £240 which still represents a 20% saving from the previous fee of £300.

Objection: My road has not made any representations requesting for a CPZ

Council's response: It was stated in the statutory notification documents '*Although we received a large number of representations, not all roads listed above petitioned for inclusion in the zone. Given, however, the likelihood that displacement parking would otherwise be a problem in these roads, they are included in the proposed extension'* It should also be noted that the boundaries of the proposed extension were discussed with community representatives and the ward councillors before proceeding with statutory notification

Objections: It will have negatively effects for local key workers for example Whittington Hospital.

Council's response: Whittington Hospital falls within the London Borough of Islington (LBI). Staff should approach LBI should they require provision to park in the area. The council's runs an essential service permit scheme, which affords workers an opportunity to apply for an Essential Service Permit should they meet the required criteria.

Objection: Reduction of parking spaces CPZs will reduce the amount of parking spaces in the area/ I oppose the extension to the CPZ in Crouch End as it will reduce the number of available parking spaces in the area, making it harder to park near one's home/

Council's Response- The proposals are clear in their aims of prioritising parking in line with the council's hierarchy of parking need and will maximise the parking space available.

Objection: The CPZ will be detrimental to the look of the area much of which is in the Crouch End Conservation area

Council's Response: As the proposed extension covers roads within a conservation area it will be possible to introduce low level posts and consider the introduction of narrow yellow lines. All existing street furniture will be utilised where possible and post will only be introduced where necessary.

Objection: Previous consultation has demonstrated there is a majority against/ Why consult again.

Council's Response: The proposed extensions were developed in conjunction with the ward councillors and community representatives that had been experiencing parking pressures from non-resident long term parking.

Objection- There is no evidence that there is illegal parking in the area, which requires parking restrictions which at present do not exist.

Council's Response- From site observations it is clear that obstructive parking takes place, for example double parking. This manner of parking can hinder visibility for pedestrians and motorists in the area.

Appendix II

Analysis and response to petitions

In addition to the representations above, we received four petitions all against the CPZs.

The first petition received objecting to the CPZ contained 20 signatures. The wording of the petition is as follows:

We the undersigned object to your proposal to introduce a CPZ scheme in our street for the following reasons:

1. We do not believe that there is a significant parking pressure to warrant CPZ
2. Introducing a CPZ will be damaging to the local trade of shops & businesses
3. This is a stealth tax, disguised as a parking issue, to raise revenue (Haringey Council already has the highest council tax in the England)

The details of where signatures originated on the petition are as follows:

- Crouch Hall road 19 signatories
- The Broadway 1 Signatory

Response to petitions

1, This proposal consultation is in direct response to petitions from residents and representation from the ward councillors for the urgent consideration of extensions to the existing Crouch End CPZs. It is acknowledged in the notification literature that not all roads submitted petitions or made representations requesting inclusion however roads would be included due to potential displacement parking.

2, The operating hours of the proposed CPZ are 10am to noon and 2-4pm Monday to Friday for the Crouch End A and B CPZ respectively. The limited hours of the CPZ will reduce long term non-resident parking for the benefit of visitors and shoppers to the area by increasing the available kerb space

3, If the CPZ extensions do go ahead, they must be self-financing. Any surplus from the enforcement of parking controls is by law ring fenced for investment back on highways improvements, highways maintenance and on concessionary travel.

The Council's Local Implementation Plan, which includes the Parking and Enforcement Plan (the 'PEP') sets out the Councils strategy and objectives to support a better and safer environment for the borough. Through the CPZ, the Council is reducing the levels of long term non-resident parking for the benefit of the local community. It also encourages sustainable modes of transport for entire journeys rather than using the private vehicle for short journeys and this in turn reduces congestion and associated pollution

The second petition received objecting to the CPZ contained 16 signatories the wording of the petition is as follows:

Petition Against Proposed Extension to Crouch End Controlled Parking Zone

We the undersigned, object to an extension to the controlled parking zone in Crouch End on the following grounds:

1. ***It will adversely affect local trade and may push some small independent traders out of business***

2. ***It would reduce the available amount of parking spaces. This will be detrimental for residents in the area as there is little off-street parking available and so we are forced to park on the road in most cases. Reducing the available space will make it harder to park near to one's home***

3. ***Following on from the above, there will be increased incentive for residents to transfer front gardens to use as parking areas. This will further reduced the number of shared spaces and is also know to be environmentally undesirable***

4. ***It will increase traffic congestion and emissions as people cruise around looking for available***

5. ***It will create additional street signs and markings to the detriment of the visual appearance of the area, much of which is part of the Crouch End Conservation area***

The petition was signed by 16 residents of in Elder Avenue but submitted by a residents of Ivy Gardens.

1. The operating hours of the proposed CPZ are 10am to noon and 2-4pm Monday to Friday for the Crouch End A and B CPZ respectively. The limited hours of the CPZ will reduce long-term non-resident parking for the benefit of visitors and shoppers to the area by increasing the available kerb space

2. Virtually all-existing kerb space in the proposed CPZ extensions has been allocated to either resident only or shared use parking bays. Waiting restrictions have only be proposed in locations requiring severe traffic management such as junctions and with the intention to facilitate traffic flow.

3. There is no evidence to support this claim. The council recognises the environmental impact crossovers may potentially have. In 2008 the council revised its guidance and introduced strict criteria to prohibit the

4. The hours of the proposed extension of the CPZs operate for two hours and will increase the kerb space available to motorists throughout the day.

5. Within a conservation area the council can introduce low level posts and will utilise existing street furniture wherever possible. Narrow width road markings can also be considered.

The third petition received objecting to **'CPZ in Crouch End'** contained 16 signatories the wording of the petition is as follows:

PETITION AGAINST CPZ IN CROUCH END

TO:JOAN HANCOX< HEADO SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT< HARINGEY COUNCIL

I/WE OPPOSE THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF CROUCH END "A" CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-

1) ***THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION FOR INTRODUCING A FAST TRACK STATUTORY NOTIFICATION WHEN THERE HAS BEEN NO CONSULTATION WITH RESIDENTS TO SEE IF THEY ARE IN FAVOUR OF A CPZ. THE LAST CONSULTATION IN 2006 SHOWED THAT RESIDENTS WERE OVERWHELMINGLY AGAINST A CPZ.***

2) ***THE CRITERIA FOR INTRODUCING A CPZ HAVE NOT BEEN SATISFIED. WE ARE NOT NEAR ENOUGH TO A TOWN CENTRE, TUBE STATION OR RAIL STATION AND THERE IS NO ILLEGAL OR OBSTRUCTIVE PARKINSON FERME PARK ROAD TO JUSTIFY INTRODUCING A CPZ IN FERME PARK ROAD.***

3) ***THE NOTIFICATION MERELY STATES THERE IS LIKELIHOOD OF DISPLACEMENT PARKING WITHOUT GIVING ANY EVIDENCE THERE IS NO SUCH PROBLEM IN FERME PARK ROAD.***

4) ***THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION FOR INCLUDING AN ADDITIONAL 25 STRETS IN THE CPZ AREA. WHILE SOME RESIDENTS MAY HAVE PETITIONED FOR CPZ , THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT RESIDENTS IN AREAS WHO HAVE NOT PETITIONED ARE IN FAVOUR OF A CPZ.***

The petition was signed by 32 residents of Ferme Park Road.

Council's Response

1) This proposal is in direct response to petitions from residents and representation from the ward councillors for the urgent consideration of extensions to the existing Crouch End CPZs. It is acknowledged in the notification literature that not all roads submitted petitions or made representations requesting inclusion however, roads would be included due to potential displacement parking.

2) The introductions of CPZs are not restricted to areas surrounding underground/train stations. There is regularly a need to manage parking in areas where there is high density of residents and high levels of car ownership, which naturally leads to more competition for kerb space. CPZs are a proven method in reducing the levels of long-term non-resident parking and consistent with central government policies in encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.

3) Due to the nature of parking controls there may be levels of displacement on roads close to a CPZ. The levels of displacement can vary and will depend on a different factors such as the distance of the road to a place of interest etc.

4) Please see 1

The fourth petition received objecting to the Crouch End CPZ contained 455 Signatures objecting to the Woodside CPZ. The wording of the petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned, object to an extension to the controlled parking zone on the following grounds.

1. ***It will harm to the Independent, laissez-faire atmosphere that prevails in Crouch End.***

2. ***It will adversely affect trade, and may push some small independent traders out of business.***

3. ***This would be a). Disastrous for them; b). Bad for the area; and c) The harmful effect would be compounded if that shop\business reopens in a year or two's time as part of a chain as it would then further adversely affects the identity of Crouch End.***

4. ***In an economic downturn, not having parking controls in a large part of Crouch End is a positive boon to the area, acting as a draw to visitors\shoppers, who do not have to worry about parking controls. Conversely, imposing parking controls will deter people from coming to an area that is, in any case, poorly served by public transport.***

5. ***It will result in an increase in traffic wardens patrolling the local roads, fining people, causing an unwelcome visual and physical intrusion in the area.***

6. ***Most of Crouch End is more than one mile from the Tube station. A controlled parking zone is simply not needed, and not wanted, by the overwhelming majority of local people, and this would just serve as an extra tax on local car owners.***

7. ***We strongly object to the way the council is trying to railroad through this move, which will have a huge impact on the area, two years after the majority of local people stated they did not want a controlled parking zone.***

On closer analysis, the petition contains 298 signatures from residents within the proposed CPZ areas this represents 65% of the total number of signatures obtained. The following is a breakdown of the response received from within the proposed CPZ areas.

- Aubrey Road (8 Signatories)
- Barrington Road (4 Signatories)
- Berkeley Road (1 Signatories)
- Bourne Road (20 Signatories)
- Broadway Parade (4 Signatories)
- Bryanstone Road (1 Signatories)
- Clifton Road (3 Signatories)
- Coleridge Road (4 Signatories)
- Coolhurst Road (2 Signatories)
- Crouch Hall Road (1 Signatories)

- Crouch Hill (23 Signatories)
- Drylands Road (18 Signatories)
- Elder Avenue (2 Signatories)
- Fairfield Gardens (2 Signatories)
- Fairfield Road (1 Signatory)
- Ferme Park Road (3 Signatories)
- Gladwell Road (1 Signatories)
- Haringey Park (105 Signatories)
- Hatherley Gardens (2 Signatories)
- Ivy Gardens (2 Signatories)
- Landrock Road (31 Signatories)
- Middle Lane (6 Signatories)
- The Broadway (12 Signatories)
- Topsfield Parade (12 Signatories)
- Weston Park (21 Signatories)
- ILLEGIBLE (7 Signatories)

The remaining 157 signatures either originated from outside the proposed extension.

Council's response to petition

1)+2)+3)+4) The operating hours of the proposed CPZ are 10am to noon and 2-4pm Monday to Friday for the Crouch End A and B CPZ respectively. The limited hours of the CPZ will reduce long-term non-resident parking for the benefit of visitors and shoppers to the area by increasing the available kerb space.

The council has worked with trader's representatives when introducing the original CPZ and the proposed extensions.

5)If the CPZs are extended they will require enforcement by council Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO). Penalty Charge Notices will only be issues to motorist that are parking in contravention of the CPZ.

There haven't been any reports that CEOs in the existing Crouch End CPZ causing an unwelcome visual and physical intrusion in the CPZ.

6)The introductions of CPZs are not restricted to areas surrounding underground/train stations. There is regularly a need to manage parking in areas where there is high density of residents and high levels of car ownership, which naturally leads to more competition for kerb space. CPZs are a proven method in reducing the levels of long-term non-resident parking and consistent with central government policies in encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.

7)This proposal is in direct response to petitions from residents and representation from the ward councillors for the urgent consideration of extensions to the existing Crouch End CPZs. It is acknowledged in the notification literature that not all roads submitted petitions or made representations requesting inclusion however, roads would be included due to potential displacement parking.

Appendix III

Minutes of focus group meetings between officers, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, ward councillors and community representatives.

Haringey Council

FRONTLINE SERVICES

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

MINUTES

Title	:	**Crouch End A/B Focus Group meeting**
Date	:	27 July 2010 6:30 – 8pm
Venue	:	Public Gallery Hornsey Library
Present	:	Councillor Canver, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods Tony Kennedy (TK), Group Manager Transport Policy and Projects Vincent Valerio (VV), Project Engineer Councillor Weber, Crouch End Ward Councillor Jenks, Muswell Hill Ward Councillor. Invited Focus Group attendees (resident/business representatives)
Apologies	:	Councillor Winskill/Strang-Crouch End Ward Councillors
Minutes	:	Vincent Valerio

ITEM NO	ITEM	ACTION by
1		
	Introduction	
1.1	Cllr Canver opened the meeting by introducing herself and asked councillors/officers to introduce themselves. Rather than go though everyone in attendance residents were requested residents to state what road they represented and or lived in when speaking.	
1.2	Cllr Canver informed the group that various residents had approached the council and ward councillors regarding parking pressures they were experiencing and requesting inclusion in the existing zones.	
1.3	Cllr Canver informed the group that she had chaired meetings with officers and ward members to discuss the approach to take for the consideration of possible extensions. It was agreed that the fast track approach (statutory notification) would be followed.	
1.4	Cllr Canver then explained the statutory notification process the council was going to conduct and how it differed from formal consultation. She stated that the council would inform of its intention to introduce parking controls rather than ask yes/no views through a questionnaire format. Also that any	

	interested party was entitled to make representation and that all valid objections would be considered.	
1.5	TK outlined the contents of the pack provided to them containing the meeting agenda, Fast Track CPZ A/B documents and expected timescales with key milestones.	
1.6	TK explained that statutory notification provides a 21 day period affording any interested party an opportunity to make representations on the proposals. He emphasised that the process is a notification of the council's intention to extend the CPZ not a yes /no vote on whether or not residents want a CPZ.	
1.7	It was stated that it is usual during statutory notification for the majority of representations to be objections as not everyone who supports the council's intentions feels the need to make representation.	
1.8	Cllr Canver requested TK to explain in detail the statutory notification process and how this differs from formal consultation.	
1.9	TK stated: Statutory notification differs from formal consultation in that we are informing you of our intention to introduce parking controls rather than asking your views with a yes/no question. This process enables any interested party, regardless of where they may live or work to make representation to the council on its intentions to introduce parking controls. All objections received during this process must have a valid reason for the objection rather than merely stating non-support. The council is legally obliged to consider all objections received and this could result in roads being removed from any extension that may go forward. It is not however possible to include new roads as part of this process.	
2.0	**Question and answer session**	
2.1	Throughout the meeting residents requested for clarification of the statutory notification process and TK reiterated the above process.	
2.2	Residents asked if it was possible to omit roads from the zone. TK confirmed that this was possible but depended on the nature of the objections received and the location of the road in the proposed extension. For example, we would not consider excluding a road if it was in the middle of any extended zone that goes forward.	
2.3	A resident from Lynton Road stated that they already experience displacement from the existing zones and asked how the extents of the zone boundary had been decided.	
2.2	TK explained that the approach and extents was agreed at a meeting, chaired by Cllr Canver with officers and Crouch End, Hornsey, Muswell Hill and Stroud Green ward members.	
2.3	A resident from Shepherds Hill questioned why the council were going ahead	

	with a scheme and stated that the way the consultation is carried out is scientifically inaccurate. He also stated that any feedback the council received will be skewed, as not everyone is likely to respond.	
2.4	TK confirm that ward members had agreed this approach based on the representations made by local residents for inclusion in the zones. He reiterated the statutory notification process above and explained again that it is common for the majority of representations received during this process are likely to be objections.	
2.3	A resident representing Glassyn, Montenotte and Tivoli roads (GMTRA) made a general statement about how residents of his area were canvassed and asked how they felt about the parking controls being extended to their neighbouring roads. The general consensus was in support should the scheme be extended.	
2.4	A residents from Barrington Road expressed concerns about displacement and not being sent information about the proposals. TK explained that information on the Fast Track proposals would be sent at the same time as the fast track process. The resident also asked what the timescale would be from the delivery of the fast track scheme to the introduction of parking controls to roads on the periphery of the scheme. TK explained that this would be subject to the representations received from roads outside the proposed fast track extents and available funding.	
2.5	A resident from Claremont Road within the existing Highgate Station Outer CPZ spoke about her experiences with when living on the edge of the CPZ and the severe displacement experienced once the CPZ had been introduced. She spoke about the need to be organised with fellow residents when requesting CPZ controls.	
2.6	A resident from Drylands Road requested that the ward councillors air their views on why the Fast Track CPZ extensions had been proposed.	
2.7	Cllr Weber provided background on how displacement parking has arrived from neighbouring boroughs, particularly Islington. She spoke about the reaction of residents when the CPZ were initially introduced and explained that residents approached the council requesting them to address the displacement that has been caused by various factors	
2.8	Cllr Weber spoke about supporting residents that were both in favour, against CPZ controls, and accepted there were difficulties for both parties. Cllr Weber recapped on the work between the council and focus group meetings, which took place three years ago to discuss the problems at hand, and potential solutions of introducing parking controls. Through consultation with the community the Crouch A/B CPZs were introduced which unfortunately has led to some displacement to roads on the periphery.	
2.9	A resident from Bedford Road and business from The Broadway raised several points. Firstly, he expressed his concerns that there does not appear	

	to be any provision for employers/employees. He asked if permits are specific to individual vehicles. He felt that the Essential Use permits prices are very high.	
2.10	Cllr Canver responded to the resident /business by explaining that further discussion on his points can be taken up with officers after meeting.	VV
2.11	TK explained that that the CPZ is not intended to be a one size fits all and it would be necessary to balance the needs between residents and businesses.	
2.12	The Crouch End Traders Association representative explained that personally his employees would not experience problems with the CPZ as they use public transport or walk.	
2.13	A Barrington Road resident commented that the council's approach just leads to the whole area becoming a CPZ. TK explained that residents approached the council and requested that consideration is given extend parking controls to include their road. It was acknowledged that CPZs do provide displacement on the periphery of zones but this was the only current effective way to prioritise parking for residents.	
2.14	Cllr Weber expanded on the alternative ways the council are encouraging a modal shift in the way people travel i.e. through Car Clubs and work place travel plans.	
2.15	The same Barrington Road resident asked what groups cause the displacement and is it residents that did not want to pay the permit charge. Residents from Gladwell and Drylands explained from their experience that it was a variety groups i.e. residents/commuters/	
2.16	Cllr Canver explained that the current hours of the CPZ were designed to aid businesses by discouraging all day parking by allowing visitors to the area throughout the day.	
2.17	TK explained that enforcement of a 2 hour zone is often less intense than an all day zone as the CEOs (Parking attendants) can not always cover the whole zone in the two hour operational period.	
2.18	A Coolhurst Road resident asked for clarification on the impact the Hornsey Town Hall development would have on the process. TK responded by explaining that whilst planning permission has been obtained, no developer had as yet come forward. If and when the development progresses part of the planning approval ensures that funding is provided to review parking controls in the roads around the development.	
2.19	A Cecile Park resident outlined that she is suffering from displacement from the existing scheme and asked if it would be possible to issue permits to non-residents. TK explained it would not be possible to issue permits to non-residents as this would reduce the effectiveness of the zone. It was further explained that displacement parking is unfortunately a downside to CPZs. Cecile Park residents were against CPZ controls when consulted. It was also	

	explained that it is not possible to immediately re-consult areas, as the borough needs to be looked at as a whole. The resident stated there the council needs to consider ways of addressing displacement. TK stated that the level of displacement can vary depending on the distance of the place of interest.	
2.20	A resident asked is it the council's intention to introduce CPZs to the whole area i.e. Muswell Hill and Hornsey. TK explained that the council does not have any plans at present to introduce parking controls in these areas.	
2.21	A business stated that displacement is just likely to continue and what provision is there for businesses within the CPZ. TK explained that consideration can be given to introduce business bays and to discuss work place travel planning.	
2.22	Cllr Weber stated that the potential impact of the Health Centre would need to be considered.	
2.23	A resident asked what provision is made for tradesmen etc. TK responded that residents can issue visitor vouchers to tradesmen and explained they would only need a voucher during the 2-hour restriction.	
2.24	A resident from Shepherds Hill asked if the CPZ is cost neutral and what happens to the revenue generated. He went on to say that if residents and businesses are aware of the details there would be more acceptance of the process. Cllr Canver explained that it is her aim to have complete transparency with parking finances and to provide reports on the council's website.	
2.25	A business from the Broadway asked if the breakdown on revenue can be provided on warden enforcement etc. Will there be restrictions on parking for the Hornsey Town Hall development. Is the application for Business Permits under statuette? Cllr Canver stated officers will discuss this with him after the meeting.	**VV**
2.26	The GMTRA representative emphasised that residents must be organised and offered assistance to other roads.	
2.27	A resident from Carysfort Road asked how much money is put into Public Transport. TK explained that all revenue generated from CPZs is ring fenced back into transport improvements however; Public Transport is funded via Transport for London.	
2.28	A resident from Carysfort Road asked how long it will take to address any displacement occurring from the CPZ extension. TK stated that this would depend on the level of representation received.	
2.29	A business from The Broadway asked how the council selected the Focus Group attendees. TK explained that officers and councillors worked together to invite a cross section of residents that were spread throughout the areas and attendees that were both in favour and against CPZs.	

2.30	A resident from Carysfort Road asked why the council did not publicise the focus group more widely and why we did not leaflet all residents. TK explained that the purpose of focus groups was to have a manageable number of attendees. Inviting a large number of residents/traders would prove to be counter productive **Cllr Canver thanked everyone for their attendance.** **Meeting closed.**	