

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 19/1/06	Meeting Name: Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure
Report title:		Herne Hill and North Dulwich Controlled Parking Zone Review	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Village	
From:		Nicky Costin	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. It is recommended that the Herne Hill 'HH' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is modified, via an experimental traffic management order, so as to reflect the detailed design set out in Appendix B and summarised as follows:
 - extend the boundary of the CPZ so as to include to Carver Road, Hollingbourne Road, Howletts Road, Ruskin Walk and Warmington Road with permit eligibility for addresses, within the zone boundary, of Herne Hill and Half Moon Lane;
 - increase all short-stay parking places to operate 30 minutes; and
 - amend the hours of CPZ operation to 11.00 to 13.00, Monday to Friday
 - to give opportunity to evaluate the restrictions on-street the necessary Traffic Management Orders should be drawn up on an experimental basis in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations, 1996
2. It is recommended that the proposed North Dulwich 'ND' proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is not furthered for implementation.
3. It is further recommended that:
 - residents and businesses in the CPZ are advised of the agreed changes and advised where to obtain further permit information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. Herne Hill CPZ was introduced, following a standard two-stage public consultation, in April 2004 under experimental Traffic Management Orders. The first stage consulted upon the principal of parking controls over a wide geographic area (including North Dulwich) and was followed by second-stage consultation around the more tightly drawn areas of Herne Hill and East Dulwich/Lordship Lane.
5. Legislation requires the Council to consider any comments or objections received during the first 6 months of operation. Resources were not available to complete this aspect in October 2004 and it was determined that a complete review of objections and a public consultation exercise would be carried out by consultants Mott MacDonald, commissioned in January 2005.
6. During 2004 and early 2005 representations were made by residents and some Ward Members that the area around North Dulwich station also be considered, as part of the Herne Hill review process, as an area for consultation on the principle of a new CPZ. It should be noted that this area was consulted on the principle of a CPZ in 2002, but was rejected due to a lack of support.
7. This report gives explanation and reference to the recommendations set out in paragraphs 1 to 3. The report draws upon the consultation report (Ref: 218759/Consultation Report C1, see Background Documents) completed by Mott

MacDonald (henceforth referred to as the 'Mott MacDonald report'), government legislation, parking enforcement experience, good parking practice, financial considerations and upholds the Council's overall policies on parking.

CONSULTATION STRATEGY

8. Full detail of the consultation strategy can be found section 4.0 of the Mott MacDonald report.
9. Consultation was carried out between 10 June 2005 and 8 July 2005 and involved the hand delivery of an approved leaflet and questionnaire (tailored to each zone area) to all addresses within the defined areas of Herne Hill and North Dulwich.
10. The streets included in the consultation were determined following recommendation by Mott MacDonald who identified areas of high parking stress and from residential correspondence and Ward member comment.
11. Two half-day day public exhibitions took place with notification of the event included within the consultation documents, on the Council website, press advertisement, street notices and statement to Dulwich Community Council.
12. The total response rate was 34%, a highly satisfactory level that exceeds the threshold at which a lower weighting is attributed to the consultation return, as experienced in other areas of Southwark.
13. Notification of the on-going consultation was also provided to 'fringe' streets who were on the periphery of the consultation area who may be concerned about a possible displacement effect. The residents of the fringe street Hollingbourne Road made representation during the consultation exercise that they considered is appropriate that their street should be given opportunity to provide input to the final scheme if support was shown to exist in neighboring streets. This brought about the secondary consultation that was carried out in October 2005 of Hollingbourne Road, details of which can be found in the Mott MacDonald Addendum report. A response rate of 55% was achieved.

OVERVIEW – PROPOSED NORTH DULWICH CPZ

14. When considered as a group of streets, the recommendations and consultation returns set out by the Mott MacDonald report clearly demonstrate an absence of support for Controlled Parking in North Dulwich (Question 8, Figure 5.12). A combined figure of 54% 'strongly against' and 'against but could support if changes made' and 40% 'strongly support' and support but with concern. The level of support falls with distance from North Dulwich station, with 95% of Wyneham Road residents stating that they do not have a parking problem.
15. Concerns were also raised by North Dulwich fringe roads who considered that there was no parking problem in their, or surrounding, streets.
16. There is support when the group of streets Half Moon Lane, Red Post Hill and Ardbeg Road are considered together (64% 'strongly support' and 'support with concern'), but actual support figures are not overwhelming. However, the default for such a review always remains with the larger group where there is an overall absence of support. The technical logistics of such a small zone in terms of signage and enforcement would make a three-street CPZ impractical. There is also an absence of strong support for controls. For this reason the recommendation is that proposed North Dulwich CPZ should not progress.

OVERVIEW – HERNE HILL CPZ

17. The Herne Hill review was carried out in order to analyse the operation of the existing CPZ, as part of its experimental period, and to review parking pressures and support for controls in surrounding streets.

OVERVIEW – HERNE HILL (EXISTING CPZ)

18. The existing CPZ appears to be working very satisfactorily with a clear majority of residents (Mott MacDonald report, Figure 5.2) stating that the general parking situation was much better. The exceptions to the group were Herne Hill and Norwood Road where the introduced parking controls were constrained by the existing bus priority routes and associated waiting restrictions which resulted in a lack of available kerb-space for permit parking places.
19. Satisfaction (69%) was shown in the application of shared-use parking bays (permit holders and pay and display) throughout the CPZ.
20. The key issue arising from the review was related to hours of control. A significant (59%) proportion of those who responded were of the opinion that the CPZ hours should be shorter. CPZ hours are considered in further depth in paragraph 30 to 36 to this report

OVERVIEW – HERNE HILL (PROPOSED EXTENSION)

21. Figure 5.7 of the Mott MacDonald report summarises the results from the extension area.
22. Carver Road was originally intended for introduction into the Herne Hill CPZ but was removed at the last stage, there is clear support for introduction of CPZ controls into the road.
23. When the core group of streets – Howletts Road, Warmington Road and Ruskin Road – in the proposed extension area are considered together there is 50% for and 47% against the CPZ. Whilst the Parking Enforcement Plan notes that questionnaire responses will be given major weight if at least 50% of respondents are in favour of the proposals, further examination of the results on a more detailed street-by-street basis is necessary.
24. The highest levels of support come from the two roads of Warmington Road (100%) and Howletts Road (100%) that are interconnected and situated off Ruskin Walk and Half Moon Lane. Although the southern end of Ruskin Walk is closest to the Herne Hill station, the properties of Warmington Road are closer than those on Ruskin Walk and this is likely to explain support levels.
25. Ruskin Walk is the closest street to the parking generator (Herne Hill station) of the existing zone and is therefore most likely to be affected by commuter parking displaced following introduction of the CPZ in 2004. Although majority support was not shown to exist in Ruskin Walk (38% for, 59% against) the house-by-house analysis showed support did exist at the southern end. There is also evidence of head-on congestion along the road, the regulation of parking places and removal of commuter parking will help alleviate the situation.
26. Taken as a complete group of streets the core area has an overall majority in support (53%) of the extension. When the addendum results of Hollingbourne Road are added to this group there is clear support (62%) for the extension, it is considered that the empirical evidence that spill-over into the northern part of Ruskin Walk justifies inclusion of the whole street.

	For	Against	Don't Know	Total
Ruskin Walk	15	23	1	39
Warmington Road	9	0	0	9
Howletts Road	3	0	0	3
Hollingbourne Road	30	11	0	41
Total	57 (62%)	34 (37%)	1 (1%)	92 (100%)

27. Burbage Road (between the existing zone and Turney Road) has 49% for and 46% against extending the CPZ. The consultation results for this individual street extension do not provide sufficient support for the extension and no clear results pattern are observed. Modifications elsewhere in the CPZ will not magnify (and are likely to lessen) parking pressures in this stretch of Burbage Road, for this reason no extension is recommended.
28. The recommended extension of the CPZ will more than double the number of households within the extent of the zone.

ISSUES OF KEY SIGNIFICANCE

HOURS OF OPERATION

29. Throughout the review process there has been an overwhelming support (59%) for shorter CPZ hours. It is proposed that in principle the residents request for shorter hours of operation should be met. This is consistent with the indicative policies contained in the draft Parking and Enforcement Plan, where it is suggested that operational hours for less than the working day may be appropriate in some areas where the principle issue to be addressed is commuter parking.
30. This change requires a number of consequential issues to be considered, and will have financial implications for the Council's overall Parking Account.

CONSIDERATION OF CONTROLLING HOURS

31. Operation hours must achieve the two objectives of controlling commuter parking whilst giving opportunity for effective enforcement.
32. Consideration has been given to operating for 2 hours or 4 hours per day, Monday to Friday. 4 hour operation around the middle of the day would control both all day and half day commuter parking. But in practice enforcement would be difficult in a relatively outlying location. It is therefore recommended that the zone controls operate for 2 hours.
33. The time of operation recommended is 11.00 –13.00. This will be effective in eliminating all-day commuter parking. This is the period at which most yellow line parking offences take place and there is greatest pressure on and potential for misuse of the free short stay parking bays. The recommended hours are consistent with resident comments. Regular enforcement during this period, supplemented by random mobile patrol enforcement of yellow lines and short-stay parking bays at other times, will achieve greatest value in terms of preventing unacceptable parking.
34. Those hours of control will pertain to single yellow lines. In accordance with the regulations, double yellow lines will continue to operate at any time. It is

recommended that double yellow lines be installed at all junctions to discourage unsafe parking and improve sight lines that may otherwise be obstructed outside of the zones operating hours; this follows Parking Services current good practice. Lengths of single yellow line that provide protection to aid in the flow of traffic and along bus corridors will remain with the same operational hours as at present although a minor relaxation is recommended to allow morning parking in the southbound bus lane on Norwood Road (see paragraph 42).

35. Parking Services do note that the HH CPZ is on the border of the London Borough of Lambeth who operate a CPZ 8.30am – 6.30pm, Monday to Friday. The Lambeth CPZ is also currently under review but it is not thought to include that any relaxation of control hours. Parking Services have raised concerns over the implication of spill-over from Lambeth by visitors who wish to avoid parking charges by parking within the reduced-hours Southwark CPZ. As part of the experimental period this should be carefully monitored.

PAY AND DISPLAY MACHINES

36. It is proposed to retain pay and display machines. There was general support for shared use bays, and it is considered that it would not be fair to exclude casual users from access to these bays during the period when permits are required. The meters would be programmed to prevent purchase of a ticket more than half an hour ahead of the operational period, to prevent them being used by all day commuters, except those who work in the area and who are able to return to the vehicle.
37. Carver Road showed support for permit holder parking only. However in the interests of CPZ consistency, a strategy recommended by the GLA's Transport Committee, it has been recommended that shared-use parking be applied.

PERMIT RATES

38. It is recommended that the charges should be brought in line with similar CPZs within the borough. This will increase the pay and display tariff from £1.20/hour to £2.00/hour.
39. Some might argue that permit rates should be lower. But it is strongly recommended that rates are kept the same as in other CPZs. Enforcement will still be required along bus routes. Permits are not the equivalent of a parking ticket for a period of time, or a rental for a space. Permits form an exemption from controls. This exemption has a similar value whether it applies to part of the day or the whole day.

CAR CLUBS

40. There are no car clubs operating in the area and no firm expectations of any car club being established in the area.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY

41. It is recommended that the short-stay parking places be extended to operate with a maximum stay of 30 minutes (from 20 minutes).
42. Parking enforcement comment that short-stay parking bays are very difficult to enforce without a permanent vigil. It is enforcement experience that in short stay bays, unless there is some indication of the arrival time of each vehicle, it is very difficult to ensure that vehicles only stay for the permitted time. This is most

effectively monitored by way of pay and display tickets, with appropriate tariff. This will encourage turn-over of parking to assist traders. As a commitment has been made by Parking Services to evaluate, in 2006, the policy of short-stay parking across the borough it is recommended that the bays remain free limited-stay until the review is complete.

43. As noted in paragraph 35 the parking places on Norwood Road are recommended for a reduction in morning hours of control. The restrictions currently operate 7am – 4pm, these are recommend for change to 10am – 4pm, to assist early morning trade.

POLICY CONTEXT IN PARKING ENFORCEMENT PLAN (PEP)

44. The PEP sets out a number of considerations which will be taken into account in recommendations on CPZ reviews:

PEP consideration	Comments
Links to road safety measures including schemes in the vicinity of schools and other community facilities or area wide road safety schemes	There is general support for parking controls as contributing to road safety within the CPZ. Introduction of no waiting at any time on junction corners will be introduced to improve junction safety and sight lines. There are specific safety issues relating to the streets in the vicinity of the Schools in the area and the distributor routes passing through the area. But there are no concentrations of reported accidents in these areas.
Reduction of congestion caused by parking, in particular to improve the efficiency of bus routes	Junction protection by way of no waiting at any time will reduce junction congestion and traffic movement. Bus routes have been considered and evaluated as part of the recommendations.
Protection of local occupiers' interests in areas where there is pressure all day from visitors to specific destinations (such as hospitals, town centres, employment concentrations and points of access to public transport) or periodic or evening pressure for parking for special events or specific periods (including football grounds, places of worship, and major leisure venues)	The designation of each parking place has been allocated according to parking demand. Shared use is considered most appropriate throughout the zone to provide maximum parking flexibility of should be applied.
Management of parking in areas where demand by residents and businesses exceeds the streetspace available during	There is a significant number of houses converted into flats that contributes to over-demand for parking space

much of the day	
Discouraging commuting to work by car in support of policies to reduce congestion	The CPZ discourages commuting to work and commuting to transport hubs through the requirement to display a permit, only issued to those residing in the zone.
Widespread safety or access problems, including footway parking and inappropriate parking of lorries	There are no general safety and access issues.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

45. There will be a loss of income of around £25,000 pa from the reduced hours of meter operation.
46. There could also be some reduction in the take-up of permits in the existing area because of the shorter hours of operation – currently there is around one permit per household. But the number of households covered by the zone will more than double. This will in part be compensated by increased number of household permit income – if there is an 80% take-up of by car owners in the extended area the increased income could go a large way towards compensating for the loss of meter income.
47. There may be some reduction in income as a result of enforcement activities. But enforcement resources will to some extent be available for redeployment to other areas. It is not considered that there will be a significant overall impact.
48. Overall it is expected that there could be a net loss of income of £15,000 - 20,000. To the extent that the shorter hours of operation results in a reduced income priorities for programmes funded through the Parking Account will require to be adjusted.
49. It is estimated that the recommendations will require an initial expenditure of £25,000. This includes the purchase of new pay and display machines, (re)lining and (re)signing.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

50. The overall impact of the recommendations contained within this report would appear to have little impact in terms of age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race, ethnicity or sexual orientation.

CONSULTATION

51. The consultations carried out are summarized in the main body of the report and detailed within the Mott MacDonald report.
52. This report contains Parking Services final recommendations, following consultation with residents and businesses. Any representations made prior to decision (three weeks from Dulwich Community Council on 12/12/05) will be contained within a covering report to the Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure.

CONCLUSION

- 53. To give opportunity to evaluate the scheme in operation on-street it is recommended that the CPZ amendments be introduced on an experimental basis.
- 54. This will be carried out in accordance with The Secretary of State's Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations. It should be noted that this procedure defines the legal period for statutory objection to the Traffic Management Order (TMO) during the first 6 months of the Order being made (advertised) only. It is further noted that there is no 21 day period for objections before the TMO is made, this only applies under the permanent procedure.
- 55. If any modification takes place, the Order must have another 6 month objection period, but must be made permanent within 18 months.
- 56. After 6 months a review of the amended zone should be carried out, to evaluate the objections received during the objection period.

LEGAL CONCURRENT

- 57. The Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make traffic management orders to bring about or amend a Controlled Parking Zone.
- 58. The traffic management orders cannot be implemented without first completing notification of intent to introduce experimental Traffic Management Orders and opportunity for evaluation by the Police. The public are also notified by way of street and press notices.
- 46. The council has the power to overrule objections, but has to first consider all the representations received, and satisfy itself that its actions are reasonable.

FOR DELEGATED APPROVAL

Under the powers delegated to me in accordance with the Council's Financial Regulations, I authorise action in accordance with the recommendation contained in the above report.

Signature
Gill Davies, Strategic Director Environment and Leisure

Date

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Consultation Report Ref:218759/C1, Mott MacDonald.	Parking Section, Environment and Leisure Department	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021
Consultation Report Addendum Ref:218759/C1, Mott MacDonald.	Parking Section, Environment and Leisure Department	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021
The draft Parking and Enforcement Plan	Parking Section, Environment and Leisure Department	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

APPENDIX A

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	<i>Nicky Costin.</i>	
Report Author	<i>Tim Walker</i>	
Version	<i>Final (v6)</i>	
Dated	<i>19/1/06</i>	
Key Decision?	<i>Yes</i>	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	Yes	Yes
Chief Finance Officer	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services		