

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call-In Meeting – 19 February 2024

### Call-In of Decision -KD5545 List No: 43/23-24 (published on 23/01/24): Future Approach to Controlled Parking Zones

Call-In Lead: Cllr Alessandro Georgiou

Reasons for the “Call in” are detailed below:

#### Officer Response

<b>Reason for call-in</b>
This is being delegated to Officers with no Council input. This is a lazy approach which will yield results which harm residents rather than provide any form of value.
<b>Officer response</b>
<p>The report sets out a proposed programme or list of CPZ schemes for investigation over the next two years. Over that period there may be a variety of operational factors which may mean that some of the initially proposed schemes have to drop off the programme/ list and others added. The report therefore seeks to give authority for these operationally administrative changes to be made to the programme by the Director of Environment and Street Scene in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment. This is a similar approach taken to the highways resurfacing programme.</p> <p>However, the decision whether or not to implement individual CPZs is not delegated to the Director of Environment and Street but, in line with normal processes and practice, would only be made by the Cabinet Member following the outcome of consultation, consideration of all relevant issues and completion of the necessary statutory procedures are completed.</p>

<b>Reason for call-in</b>
It is morally unjust to introduce CPZs to create a mode shift. This approach would be to the detriment of residents and their visitors who do not have the luxury of a drive.
<b>Officer response</b>
<p>The advantages and disadvantages of CPZs are summarized in paragraph 10 of the report and it is acknowledged that they are more likely to be needed in those areas more dependent on on-street parking.</p> <p>Residents in each area will be given the opportunity to weigh up these advantages and disadvantages as part of the consultation process that will be carried out as part of the development of individual schemes.</p> <p>CPZs have been used for many years to influence mode of travel by managing kerb-side parking, with several of the Borough’s existing zones introduced specifically to deter commuter parking, whether around stations or in vicinity of town centres.</p>

More recently CPZs are frequently used as a tool to manage parking demand/mode choice from new development, making specific sites ineligible for on-street resident permits.

There is also strong policy support for actively managing on-street parking, with some of the key policies relating to planning, transport, climate change and air quality summarized in paragraphs 15 – 17 of the report.

In addition, as referred to in paragraph 55 of the report, the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 places a network management duty on the Council in its capacity as the local traffic authority for most roads in the Borough. Section 16 (1) states:

*“It is the duty of a local traffic authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:*

*(a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network; and,*

*(b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.”*

The Act specifically states that the term “traffic” includes pedestrians. So the duty requires the Council to consider the movement of all road users: pedestrians and cyclists, as well as motorised vehicles – whether engaged in the transport of people or goods.

The original guidance published by the Department of Transport in 2004 sets out a number of ways that the duty can be met, acknowledging that management of demand (including by the use of parking restraint) can help secure the more efficient use of the road network.

<b>Reason for call-in</b>
CPZs do not facilitate the new provision of housing – this is an inaccurate statement by Officers.
<b>Officer response</b>
The report makes a number of references to housing, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 10, where one of the advantages of a CPZ is stated as ‘Can facilitate higher density ‘car lite’ or car free housing whilst protecting the amenity of existing residents’.</li><li>• Paragraph 18(c), where it is stated that a CPZ may be considered where it ‘would facilitate the delivery of housing or employment’.</li><li>• Appendix 1, where various schemes linked to housing growth are listed.</li></ul>

Current planning policy is set out in the [London Plan](#). Policy T6 is an overarching policy relating to car parking which makes it clear that:

*'An absence of local on-street parking controls should not be a barrier to new development, and boroughs should look to implement these controls wherever necessary to allow existing residents to maintain safe and efficient use of their streets'.*

Policy T6.1 relates specifically to residential development and sets out maximum parking standards which vary with public transport accessibility levels.

In short, planning policy supports the provision of new residential development and the risk of vehicles 'overspilling' into the surrounding area cannot be a reason for refusal given that this risk can be mitigated by the introduction of parking controls, including controlled parking zones. It is therefore normal that planning permission is granted for new housing subject to a s106 agreement that secures funding for a controlled parking zone. Recent examples of major schemes where a CPZ has been considered necessary to mitigate the impact of residential development include that at: Arnos Grove Station, New Avenue, Electric Quarter and Alma Estate.

**Proposal:** Councillor Georgiou has asked that the decision is referred back to the decision maker.