

Decision Maker: **Environment Portfolio Holder**

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on:

Date: **29th September 2016**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: **PENGE PARKING REVIEW**

Contact Officer: Paul Nevard, Traffic Engineer
Tel: 020 8313 4543 E-mail: Paul.Nevard@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Following concerns raised by residents and Ward Members about residents finding it difficult to park near their homes, an informal consultation exercise has been carried out with residents across Penge.
 - 1.2 This report sets out the initial findings from the informal consultation, and makes recommendation for more specific consultation and scheme progression to identified roads.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to agree that:

- 2.1 **Crampton Road, Kingswood Road, Phoenix Road, Lucas Road, Cottingham Road, Kingsdale Road, Southey Street and Raleigh Road are further consulted on the possibility of a Controlled Parking Zone being implemented to the area. The required plans will show the proposed changes.**
- 2.2 **Torr Road, Wordsworth Road, St Johns Road, Station Road, Barsons Close and Lucas Road are also further consulted with appropriate plans on the possibility of a Controlled Parking Zone / permit parking scheme being implemented.**
- 2.3 **Clevedon Road and Royston Road be further consulted on the possibility of a permit parking scheme also being implemented, given the likely introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone to Kenilworth Road and other adjacent roads within the area.**

2.4 Further to the formal consultation to be carried out, any scheme to be agreed to be subject to delegated authority to the Executive Director of Environment & Community Services with the input of Ward Members and the agreement of the Portfolio Holder on the final design.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Safer Bromley Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Cannot be calculated until the scheme designs are finalised
 2. Ongoing costs: Dependent on final scheme design and size
 3. Budget head/performance centre: TfL LIP Funding
 4. Total current budget for this head: £36.9k is the uncommitted balance available
 5. Source of funding: TfL LIP funding for parking schemes
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 80
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement for consultation
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents of the affected roads to be included within any Controlled Parking Zone installed. Users and/or commuters using the local area.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

Ward Members have been informed of the informal consultation that was carried out with residents and all the results and comments received. The final consultation results and comments have been issued to Ward Members for analysis. The Ward Members have subsequently all expressed support for a scheme to be progressed and for further consultation to the roads where support is evident for changes to be made.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 A number of roads in Penge have been identified as having parking problems, including commuter parking in roads surrounding Penge East Train station and parking associated with the High Street. This was determined by concerns raised directly by residents and via the Ward Members. Residents were advised that this informal consultation was only to gauge initial views on whether a scheme was required and to ascertain whether there was support for permit parking locally. A similar exercise was carried out in 2011 across Penge but only resulted in some minor changes across the area. However, there has been recent evidence of further parking issues and a demand for the possible introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone with permit parking. Nevertheless, any roads being considered for a parking scheme would be only where the majority of residents feel there was a problem with parking in their road, or where a proposal for a nearby scheme might affect the road.
- 3.2 A consultation letter, questionnaire and information leaflet regarding Controlled Parking Zones was sent out residents and the area of the consultation is shown on Plan 12335-01. The questionnaire asked residents whether there were parking problems in the road, whether changes were required, whether residents parked on street and questions aimed at identifying whether permit parking was necessary and whether parking permits would be purchased if a scheme was implemented.

4. CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 4.1 The majority of residents in the following roads indicated that they supported permit parking being introduced and therefore changes being made:
- ***Crampton Road, Kingswood Road, Pheonix Road, Lucas Road, Southley Street, Raleigh Road, Cottingham Road, Kingsdale Road and Kenilworth Road.***
- 4.2 The results of the consultation from these roads provided the following feedback:
- ***Do you feel resident parking permits are required in your road?***

Road	Yes	No	No View
Crampton Road	26	4	4
Kingswood Road	22	6	1
Phoenix Road	14	3	0
Lucas Road	18	5	2
Southley Street	8	2	0
Raleigh Road	16	10	1
Cottingham Road	24	4	1
Kingsdale Road	11	3	0
Kenilworth Road	21	10	0

- 4.3 However, following the previous consultation carried out in 2011, a petition against any form of permit parking was also received at that time to a number of the above roads where residents have again requested amendments and permit parking. Therefore, it is proposed that to progress a parking scheme it would be prudent for it to be drawn up and subject to formal consultation again with all residents. This would outline in further detail all the proposed

changes that could be made, the costs, the Controlled Parking Zone times, the location of bays, waiting restrictions (yellow lines) and amendments that would be required locally for the scheme to meet its objectives.

4.4 However, following the informal consultation, the residents of a number of other roads across the area have also been split in their view whether permit parking is required or not. This included a mix of responses from:

- ***St Johns Road, Station Road, Wordsworth Road, Torr Road, Clevedon Road and Royston Road.***

4.5 The results of the consultation from these roads provided the following feedback:

- ***Do you feel resident parking permits are required in your road?***

Road	Yes	No	No View
St Johns Road	6	7	1
Barsons Close	2	2	1
Station Road	8	6	2
Wordsworth Road	18	21	2
Torr Road	5	4	0
Clevedon Road	12	11	1
Royston Road	14	15	1

4.6 However, given that the residents of a number of adjacent and/or adjoining roads are in favour of changes being made, any scheme may have a direct impact on a number of the adjacent roads where current feedback is split on whether permit parking would be supported. If the above roads were not included within any proposed scheme, displacement is likely to occur and this could create a number of other issues for residents that may impact their view on whether a scheme should or should not be installed. As a consequence, a number of the roads where the feedback was mixed will also be included in any scheme design and subject to further consultation.

4.7 During the consultation, residents of some roads made it clear that they did not experience too many parking problems and would not support the introduction of parking permits. This included:

- ***Penge Lane, Mosslea Road, Queen Adelaide Road, Montrave Road, Westbury Road and parts of the High Street, Penge.***

4.8 The above roads will therefore be excluded at this time from any scheme design, given the clear indication from the informal consultation that showed there was very limited support for such changes.

4.9 During the consultation, residents also provided a number of detailed comments regarding their own individual parking issues and provided comments regarding other parking problems with suggested solutions. Therefore, any scheme design will take these into consideration and will help to shape any design. Given the close proximity of the High Street and the need to ensure that commuter parking is not simply displaced into other roads, any scheme will also need to consider other road users. This is likely to result in a need for additional Pay and Display parking.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council's approved Local Implementation Plan (LIP) states that it is necessary for parking schemes to strike a balance between:
- The demand for parking;
 - The need to support the local economy;
 - The need to provide for visitors generally;
- 5.2 The Council's parking approach and parking policy should therefore maximise the efficient use of on street parking in the various roads and be of benefit to residents and users of these roads.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The estimated cost for introducing the necessary changes of £8.2k would be met from the LIP programme budget within Transportation Planning for parking schemes, which has an uncommitted balance of £36.9k. This estimate could increase if additional posts and plates are required or if an element of Pay and Display parking was installed.
- 6.2 The feedback from the informal consultation suggested that if parking permits were installed to the roads where a majority have indicated support for the scheme, 139 residents would purchase resident permits. However, this is likely to increase because if a scheme was installed, there is likely to be additional roads that may be included that are to be subject to further consultation and subsequent demand for parking permits from residents and visitors of these roads.
- 6.3 The proposed permit times to be decided would have an impact on the cost set for permits. If a limited time resident parking permit was installed, the cost would be likely to be £40 in line with other similar Controlled Parking Zones borough wide. If the permit was to operate in excess of 4 hours or was operating all day, the cost would be £80. The projected income and administration costs would be subject to the detail design and scheme size.
- 6.4 Any Pay and Display installed would also result in additional scheme costs and income. The costs will be dependent on the number of machines required and the income would be determined by the number of bays provided and associated hourly charge and estimated usage.
- 6.5 At this stage, the full costs and income cannot be estimated until the detailed design has been completed and the size of the scheme agreed. Full financial details will be presented to the Portfolio Holder when the delegated decision is made.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Any new parking scheme will be subject to consultation and the necessary Traffic Management Order will be advertised to permit any changes. Any objections will be duly reported for consideration. All key stakeholders will be consulted and informed in advance of the changes planned.

Non-Applicable Sections:	PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	PENGES TOWN CENTRE PARKING REVIEW ES11020 (March 2011) PENGES PARKING REVIEW: LINDEN GROVE AND NEWLANDS PARK CPZ ES12035 (February 2012)