

<b>Briefing Note: Parking Operations</b>		
CPZ options for the uncontrolled areas of Hackney	September 2011	<b>Alistair Turk</b> <b>Gulgun Chelikhan</b>

## 1. BACKGROUND

There are approximately 310km of roads in Hackney (excluding red routes) of which around 276km are publicly maintained highway. Controlled parking zones (CPZ) cover 181km of public highway which equates to 65% of the borough highway network.

### 1.1 The Need for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)

1.1.1 Local authorities have a duty to maintain the free flow of traffic on the highway and ensure that it is as safe as possible for all highway users. Within that overarching requirement there is also the duty to manage the kerbside space and prioritise its use. Hackneys have developed a 'hierarchy of parking need' to categorise and prioritise the allocation of kerbside parking space and this is published within the Hackney Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP).

1.1.2 Controlled parking zones or derivatives of CPZs are the most effective tool available to local authorities to control and prioritise kerbside use and parking. They are used in almost every built up area in the UK and within greater London the growth in CPZ use has resulted in many London boroughs having CPZs covering the whole borough. This trend will continue in line with the growth of car ownership and wherever long stay and commuter parking remain an issue.

### 1.2 Controlled Parking Zones in Hackney

1.2.1 There are seventeen CPZs covering 65% of the road network in Hackney. These are concentrated on the southwestern side of the borough. Since 2005, CPZ development has followed a robust, systematic framework for the development of new controlled parking zones set out in the Council's PEP. The most recent CPZ to be implemented in Hackney Wick (zone K) became operational in 2011.

1.2.2 The implementation of a CPZ results in prioritising parking for local residents and businesses within the CPZ and providing a turnover of short stay parking for visitors. The downside can be that commuter or long-stay parking is displaced to the streets immediately adjacent to the CPZ. This in turn can result in unacceptably high parking occupancy levels, criticism of the local authority for implementing the CPZ and causing the problem to move, and calls for the introduction of further parking controls.

1.2.3 Displacement parking is almost impossible to control unless a natural boundary is reached or the CPZ is of a size where the walking distance to

CPZ options for the uncontrolled areas of Hackney desired destination(s) becomes unacceptably high for the motorist without a permit wishing to park for free.

### **1.3 Implementation criteria**

- 1.3.1 The current decision making process for implementation is based on a majority support from those who respond to the public consultation. Other factors which influence the introduction of controls is where there are issues relating to access, and health and safety which override other considerations. One of the perennial problems with parking consultations is the strategic voting that takes place amongst residents particularly in streets towards the edge of a potential zone. A person may vote 'no' on the basis that they don't want to pay to park or don't think they have a sufficient problem finding a space. Their road is excluded but is right on the edge of, but outside the CPZ. Displaced parking now becomes a problem and residents demand the local authority 'does something about it' or complain that the local authority has 'deliberately caused the parking problem'.
- 1.3.2 A number of Councils (including Hackney) have used 'the adjacent street question' within the consultation questionnaire with some success. It enables a resident to respond 'no' to the concept of a CPZ but to vote 'yes' if a zone was to be implemented. The use of such a question needs to be clearly explained and the analysis of the results should only take the views into account for finalisation of boundaries.

## **2. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CPZS IN HACKNEY**

### **North of the borough**

#### **2.1 Lordship Ward**

- 2.1.1 The eastern part of the Ward is currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. A Stage 1 consultation was carried out in the area in March 2011. Two areas responded with the majority saying it was hard to park and that they wanted parking controls implemented. They were:

- Manor Road – between Lordship Road and Bouverie Road;
- The western arm of Listria Park.

Both areas are residential. Includes approximately 150 properties.

- 2.1.2 The Manor Road section falls between two roads where parking controls already exist and where displacement parking is a factor to the parking problems. This section should have parking controls implemented. The middle section is predominantly residential with parking allowed on both sides of the road. The eastern section between Stamford Hill and Royal Close is

CPZ options for the uncontrolled areas of Hackney predominantly commercial and already has waiting and loading parking controls.

2.1.3 The west side of Listria Park is narrow and lined with terraced housing and is very heavily parked. The eastern arm is wider and has significantly less properties which equates to less of a parking problem. Respondents in this section and Martaban Road which links the two arms were not in favour of parking controls. Introducing parking controls for only part of Listria Park would be possible and would ensure that the Council had acted on resident's choice.

2.1.4 The remaining streets in the Ward to the north of Manor Road are predominantly residential. Every street said they did not have problems and did not want controls. Parking stress surveys confirm that parking is not an issue at present.

2.1.5 A large petition was received opposing parking controls in the whole area. The decision not to progress any controls was made in July 2011.

2.1.6 It is recommended to:-

- door knock frontagers in Manor Road between Lordship Road and Bouverie Road on extending parking controls as part of the E (ext) zone and implement if there is majority support for the proposal;
- door knock frontagers in Listria Park and Martaban Road on extending parking controls as part of the E (ext) zone and implement parking controls where there is a majority support on a junction to junction basis.

2.1.7 The income and expenditure for carrying out the recommendations are:-

Lordship Ward	£
Consultation	£500
Implementation	£2k
Income	(£5k)
Total	-£2.5k

List of streets included:

MANOR ROAD (part)
LISTRIA PARK
MARTABAN ROAD

## 2.2 Cazenove Ward

2.2.1 The whole Ward is currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in late 2010 and early 2011 show the network of streets between the A10, Stamford Hill which is also a Red Route and Kyverdale Road to be highly stressed during the day, overnight and at weekends. Typical occupancy is in excess of 90%.

2.2.2 The other parts of the Ward are generally less stressed at around 70% of occupancy or less. The exceptions are Forburg Road, Clapton Terrace and Braydon Road where parking occupancy is 90% or above.

2.2.3 It is recommended to:-

- Continue to monitor the parking occupancy in the area;
- Introduce waiting and or loading restrictions only where safety or access considerations require it
- To consult residents and businesses in the area detailed in paragraph xx to ascertain if there is support for the introduction of parking controls

2.2.4 The income and expenditure for carrying out the recommendations are:-

Cazenove Ward	£
Consultation	£8k
Implementation	£14k
Income	(£49k)
Total	-£27k

List of streets included:

GIBSON GARDENS
BELFAST ROAD
MARGARET ROAD
CAZENOVE ROAD
WINDUS ROAD
LAMPARD GROVE
LYNMOUTH ROAD
ALKHAM ROAD
WINDUS WALK
KYVERDALE ROAD
NORTHWOLD ROAD

## 2.3 Hackney Downs Ward

2.3.1 The southern part of the Ward is within the Hackney North D(n) zone. The network of streets north of Downs Road is currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in late 2010 and early 2011 show the network of streets from Evering Road and Northwold Road to be highly stressed during the day, overnight and at weekends. Typical occupancy is in excess of 90%. It is a similar situation in the roads West of Upper Clapton Road and the projection of Nightingale Road.

2.3.2 The other parts of the Ward are generally less stressed at around 50% of occupancy or less.

2.3.3 It is recommended to:-

- Continue to monitor the parking occupancy in the area;
- Introduce waiting and or loading restrictions only where safety or access considerations require it

- To consult residents and businesses in the area detailed in paragraph xx to ascertain if there is support for the introduction of parking controls

2.3.4 The income and expenditure for carrying out the recommendations are:-

Hackney Downs Ward	£
Consultation	£16k
Implementation	£38k
Income	(£136k)
Total	-£82k

List of streets included:

ALCONBURY ROAD
GELDESTON ROAD
EVERING ROAD
BROOKE ROAD
NORTHWOLD ROAD
STOKE NEWINGTON COMMON
OAK PARK MEWS
JENNER ROAD
NILE CLOSE
BENTHAL ROAD
MAURY ROAD
NORCOTT ROAD
NARFORD ROAD
REIGHTON ROAD
RECTORY ROAD

## 2.4 Leabridge Ward

2.4.1 The south-eastern part of the Ward is within the Homerton and Lower Clapton N zone. The remaining streets are currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in late 2010 and early 2011 show the network of streets south of Lea Bridge Road and west of Cornthwaite Road are highly stressed during the day, overnight and at weekends. Typical occupancy is in excess of 90%. The exceptions are Laura Place, Hilsea Street and Elmcroft Street all of which have schools as frontage.

2.4.2 The streets north of Lea Bridge Road are generally less stressed except for the sections of street closest to Upper Clapton Road. It is unlikely that the introduction of parking controls would be supported in this area.

2.4.3 It is recommended to:-

- Continue to monitor the parking occupancy in the area;
- Introduce waiting and or loading restrictions only where safety or access considerations require it
- Consult residents and businesses in the area detailed in paragraph xx to ascertain if there is support for the introduction of parking controls

2.4.4 The income and expenditure for carrying out the recommendations are:-

Leabridge Ward	£
Consultation	£1k
Implementation	£16k
Income	(£56k)
Total	-£39k

List of streets included:

ALFEARN ROAD
MILLFIELDS ROAD
MILDENHALL ROAD
CORNTHWAITE ROAD
RUSHMORE ROAD
ELMCROFT STREET
MAYOLA ROAD
SARATOGA ROAD
LAWLEY STREET
COLENZO ROAD
THISTLEWAITE ROAD
NEWICK ROAD
ATHERDEN ROAD
LAURA PLACE
CROSSWAYS TERRACE
LEA BRIDGE ROAD
LOWER CLAPTON ROAD

## 2.5 Springfield Ward

2.5.1 The whole Ward is currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in late 2010 and early 2011 show the network of streets south of Springfield to be more highly stressed during the day, overnight and at weekends. Typical occupancy is in excess of 90% only in sections of street closest to Upper Clapton Road and the roads in the area formed by Upper Clapton Road, Warwick Grove, Mount Pleasant Lane and Mount Pleasant Lane/Hill.

2.5.2 It is recommended to:-

- Consult residents and businesses in the area between Warwick Grove, Upper Clapton Road and Mount Pleasant Lane/Hill to ascertain if there is support for the introduction of parking controls
- Continue to monitor the parking occupancy in the remaining Ward area;
- Introduce waiting and or loading restrictions only where safety or access considerations require it

## 2.5.3 The income and expenditure for carrying out the recommendations are:-

Springfield Ward	£
Consultation	£8k
Implementation	£13k
Income	(£3k)
Total	£18k

List of streets included:

KNIGHTLAND ROAD
MUSTON ROAD
SACH ROAD

## 2.6 New River Ward

2.6.1 The whole Ward is currently unrestricted apart from waiting and loading restrictions to promote safety. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in late 2010 and early 2011 show the network of streets to be generally less stressed than other parts of the borough. The exceptions are Cranwich Road, Bethune Road and Northfield Road where parking stress levels are above 80% during the day, overnight and at weekends. Resident parking is thought to be the predominant reason for this and it is unlikely that the introduction of parking controls in isolation would be supported or help resolve the general parking level.

2.6.2 It is recommended to:-

- Continue to monitor the parking occupancy in the Ward;
- Introduce waiting and or loading restrictions only where safety or access considerations require it

## 3. POTENTIAL COST SAVINGS THROUGH REVISIONS TO CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 3.1 Two stage consultation process

3.1.1 The normal consultation process adopted in Hackney is to engage in the two-stage approach whereby we seek opinion on the 'in principle' introduction of parking controls, analyse the results, produce a delegated report and then repeat the process on the detailed design. This is the 'best practice' approach for local authorities newly introducing parking controls or where a local authority have not carried out any background parking data gathering. It enables the 'in principle' stage to be the essential market research process and the proposed zone boundary to be redrawn to a usually smaller area where the detailed design and second stage consultation are focused.

3.1.2 Based on earlier consultations in Hackney a typical budget price of £4 per property should be allowed for this approach.

### **3.2 Combined consultation**

- 3.2.1 Where a local authority has already done significant parking research by carrying out occupancy surveys or carried out previous consultation on parking options it is generally beneficial to combine the consultation process based on detailed proposals for an area where data indicates there is an existing parking problem.
- 3.2.2 Hackney have carried out detailed parking occupancy and stress surveys for week day, weekend and overnight parking for the non-CPZ areas except for New River Ward and the northern half of Springfield Ward.
- 3.2.3 Where parking occupancy/stress surveys have been carried out it is recommended that any consultation is carried out on a single, combined stage consultation based on a detailed design.
- 3.2.4 For budgeting processes a typical budget price of £2 per property should be allowed for this approach.

### **3.3 Door-knocking consultation**

- 3.3.1 Where a local authority has already done significant parking research or may have to deal with a particular and localised parking problem it may be desirable to carry out a very localised consultation for a single or few streets. In these circumstances there may not be the time or it may not be desirable to go to the full expense of producing a full consultation pack.
- 3.3.2 The use of door-knocking allows a one-to-one approach and enables face to face discussion to take place. It is reliant on the process being carried out when the maximum number of property owners are around but if well timed it can result in a significantly high percentage of responses to the consultation.
- 3.3.3 For budgeting processes a typical budget price of £1.70 per property should be allowed for this approach.

### **3.4 Parking zone reviews**

- 3.4.1 Residents and businesses in an existing zone already have experience of how a parking zone operates so the need for a detailed consultation pack setting out such details are not required. Residents are critical of documentation which they perceive as being wasteful of council resources and research done at other London boroughs have shown that a simplified letter and questionnaire approach have received good response rates and support to the more low-key approach.
- 3.4.2 The object of a CPZ review is to ensure that the current controls are working effectively and that the restrictions remain fit for purpose. Changes to building use can have a significant affect on parking demand locally which if not addressed can cause significant problems. Other opportunities may arise where changes in road use, traffic calming or increased compliance by motorists allow for additional parking provision by the reduction of yellow line restrictions. An example is the review of the Shoreditch zone where over one hundred additional parking spaces have been found as part of the review process.
- 3.4.3 The establishment of a rolling programme of zone reviews has several benefits:-



CPZ options for the uncontrolled areas of Hackney

- It ensures each zone continues to be fit for purpose;
- It ensures changes to building use are accommodated;
- It enables parking supply to be maximised wherever it is safe to do so;
- The local community can understand and engage with the local authority on a regular basis;
- Economies of scale available through a rolling programme of work.