

<b>COUNCIL</b>	<b>DATE</b> 24 February 2016
<b>REPORT TITLE</b> Petition Response Report	<b>ITEM NO.</b> 15
<b>LEAD OFFICER</b> Chief Executive	<b>WARDS</b> Various

I. Decision Required

Council is asked to;

- I.1 Note the action taken in response to petitions presented at recent meetings of the Council.

2. Summary

- 2.1 Under Standing Order A1.19 petitions presented to Council are required to be referred to the relevant Chief Officer and reported back to Council within two meetings.
- 2.2 This report is submitted for Members to note the action taken in response to petitions presented to recent meetings of the Council.

**The following petitions were submitted to the Council on 16 December 2015**

3. Petition – **Residents requesting parking restriction on Hector Street and Mineral Street Plumstead.**

- 3.1 The petition read as follows;

*Please find attached a list of signatures from residents of Hector Street and Mineral Street, Plumstead, who are asking you, Royal Greenwich Parking services, to put in place 'resident only parking and limited waiting restriction.'*

*We have reason to believe you are planning to consult on this matter in spring 2016. We respectfully ask if it is possible to bring this forward.*

*The current parking situation has become untenable. Due to parking restrictions on all nearby roads; our streets have become the only source of unlimited parking. Those commuting to work from Plumstead station are free to take up space all day on Hector Street and Mineral Street.*

*Residents are finding they are having to park further and further away. This is a problem for all, but in particular, those with mobility issues and those with small children. Note that since previous communications between yourselves and the residents. The demographic may well have changed. Those signed below are directly affected by the parking situation’.*

- 3.2 The petition, containing Circa 30 signatures, was presented by Councillor Angela Cornforth and referred to the Director of Regeneration Enterprise and Skills for investigation. The matter was considered by Highways Committee 28 January 2016 and the following response has been provided.
- 3.3 Hector Street and Mineral Street are public highways with no parking controls. They are located within the Plumstead ward a short distance outside the Plumstead Station (‘PL’) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). These streets comprise terraced housing with no off street parking.
- 3.4 In October 2013 both streets were included in a parking attitude survey, carried out over a wide area, to ascertain the level of support for introducing permit parking controls around the existing CPZ. The table below summarised the responses received from residents of Hector & Mineral Streets.

<b>DETAILS OF PREMISES</b>		<b>Supported inclusion in CPZ</b>	<b>Opposed inclusion in CPZ</b>	<b>% response</b>
<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Number of premises</b>			
Hector Street	34	3	3	18%
Mineral Street	82	4	15	23%

- 3.5 Residents in these streets were subsequently consulted on proposals to extend the Plumstead CPZ into streets other than Mineral and Hector Street. At no time during that consultation period did the Council receive a significant number of requests for these streets to be considered for inclusion within the proposals to extend the CPZ.
- 3.6 The limits of the CPZ now stop just short of the junction of Conway Road with Mineral Street, so the petitioners’ streets are among those that will have been impacted by displaced parking. Other uncontrolled streets on the periphery of the CPZ are experiencing similar pressures.

### 3.7 Issues

- 3.7.1 The current parking pressures in Hector Street and Mineral Street are, in part, a consequence of relocating the CPZ boundary. All residents were advised of this possibility during the consultation process and advised to consider such impacts before submitting their representations.
- 3.7.2 While it is likely that some railhead (commuter) parking has migrated to Hector Street and Mineral Street, the current pressures in these (and neighbouring) streets are also associated with commercial activities on Plumstead High Street and Brewery Road. Many local businesses depend on nearby side streets for business and customer parking, etc. Any extension of parking controls in this locality, therefore, would need to take account of these considerations. It is unlikely that the short controlled period of the Plumstead CPZ (Monday – Friday, 9.30 a.m. – 11 am), which is designed simply to mitigate railhead pressures, would be suited to managing this much wider set of parking demands in entirety.
- 3.7.3 It is Council policy to levy a charge for resident parking permits in all controlled parking zones. If a CPZ was introduced in Mineral Street and Hector Street, etc. those residents wishing to park in on-street places during the CPZ operational times would be required to pay for permits (and visitor vouchers). This may have been a factor in the lack of support from residents there when consultation on extending the CPZ took place.
- 3.7.4 The introduction of permit control results in the displacement of some parking into adjacent uncontrolled roads. To avoid simply pushing a parking problem from one road to the next, the Council aims to develop CPZs on an area-wide basis. The objective is to introduce controls in a way that either disperses parking over a larger peripheral area to the point where the residual pressures become ‘tolerable’ or removes it completely by changing motorists’ journey choices. A well constituted CPZ will achieve both outcomes in some measure.
- 3.7.5 One of the principles of the Council’s Parking Strategy (adopted July 2014) is that the Council will generally introduce new, or extend existing, CPZs, only where there is local support for doing so.
- 3.7.6 It appears that the petitioners are inconvenienced by the current parking pressures to the extent that they now support the extension of CPZ controls into Hector Street and Mineral Street. It is unfortunate that the residents did not recognise this possibility when the extensions to the CPZ were the subject of consultation.

3.7.7 The situation could be addressed by extending the CPZ controls following a review. However it would not be sensible to limit a further review of parking in this locality to Hector Street and Mineral Street. To do so could simply result in the problem being displaced into those other streets (outside the CPZ) that are close to Hector and Mineral Streets. Further consultation will need to be carried out over a wider area to give many more residents an opportunity to comment including those, currently unaffected, that could be impacted by a further extension of control.

### 3.8 **Actions**

3.8.1 It is recognised that the situation in Plumstead is changing rapidly with substantial new developments happening locally. The Council therefore is committed to an early review of parking controls in Plumstead. There may be a need for still further intervention in advance of the opening of Woolwich Crossrail station in 2018.

3.8.2 It is proposed to carry out another attitude survey in the spring of 2016, as part of the programmed review of the Plumstead Station CPZ with a view to consulting on further CPZ proposals during the 2016/17 financial year. The petitioners, therefore, will shortly have the opportunity to comment on the prospect of extending permit parking to their streets and the form that any new controls should take.

### 4. **Petition – Oppose the proposed boundary for the proposed Deptford Neighbourhood Forum.**

4.1 The petition reads as follows:

*Petition from MQ Action Group*

*‘We the undersigned residents of Deptford SE8 living in Greenwich West Ward urge Royal Greenwich Council to oppose the proposed boundary for the proposed Deptford Neighbourhood Forum.’*

4.2 The petition, containing 70 signatures, was presented by Councillor Aidan Smith and referred to the Director of Regeneration Enterprise and Skills for investigation and the following response has been provided.

4.3 The Localism Act 2011 sets out permissive powers which allow local communities to influence the planning of their area by preparing Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Development Plans are led by local people who set out how they want their local area to develop. They must

take account of national planning rules and be in 'general conformity' with the Council's policy framework. The Government's aim is that they will promote development; they are not about attempts to stop development.

- 4.4 The first stage in the process is the designation of a Neighbourhood Area and the creation of a Neighbourhood Forum. Royal Greenwich received an application from Deptford Neighbourhood Action in September 2015 for the designation of a Neighbourhood Forum for Deptford and an application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area for Deptford. A parallel application was submitted to Lewisham Council for the same Neighbourhood Forum and an adjacent area within Lewisham Borough.
- 4.5 The two Councils undertook a joint consultation with the local community regarding both applications, between 7 October 2015 and 19 November 2015. It was brought to officers' attention that a number of properties did not receive notification of the consultation, due to a failure of the leaflet distribution company. In order to ensure that all persons had the opportunity to comment on the applications, the consultation was extended for a further six weeks, from 15 December 2015 until 26 January 2016.
- 4.6 In addition to the petition, 73 further individual responses were received, comprising: 68 objections, four neutral representations from statutory consultees, and one supporting representation. Thirteen of those who signed the petition also submitted individual representations.
- 4.7 Sections 61 F and G of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted into the Act by the Localism Act, Schedule 9) sets out the conditions that applications for a neighbourhood forum and area must meet, as well as the considerations that a local planning authority should take into account when determining an application for the designation of a neighbourhood forum and area.
- 4.8 The applications are being assessed in relation to the above legislation, and the consultation responses received are being considered by officers now that the consultation period has closed. These responses, together with the petition, will be taken into consideration when making a decision on the applications. The decision will be taken by Chief Officer. The applications must be determined within 20 weeks from when they were first published, i.e. by 24 February 2016.

5. Petition – **Request to implement the Eltham Heights (CPZ)**
- 5.1 The petition read as follows;  
*We the undersigned ask Greenwich Council to implement the Eltham Heights (CPZ). It cannot impact on Bexley Borough as they already have their (CPZs) in place!*  
*Must we wait till someone is badly injured or killed in Colepits Wood Road?*
- 5.2 The petition, containing 58 signatures, was presented by Councillor Matt Clare and referred to the Director of Regeneration Enterprise and Skills for investigation. The matter was considered by Highways Committee 28 January 2016 and the following response has been provided.
- 5.3 Colepits Wood Road is a residential road running between Riefield Road and Crown Wood Way. The properties have off street parking and there are no parking controls in the road other than short lengths of single yellow line restrictions at the junction with Riefield Road.
- 5.4 The road is located close to close to Falconwood Station and the boundary with the London Borough of Bexley and is also reasonably close to the University of Greenwich campus at Avery Hill. The road is subject to extensive commuter/visitor parking. Motorists frequently park across or very close to driveways into the residential properties. Residents have been concerned for many years about the impact that this parking has on road safety and local amenity.
- 5.6 In response to those local concerns the Council has attempted to introduce permit (Controlled Parking Zone) parking controls in Colepits Wood Road and other roads in the Eltham Heights and Avery Hill areas.
- 5.7 In March 2013, following extensive local consultation, the Cabinet Member for Regeneration Enterprise and Skills agreed to the implementation of 2 CPZs in the area, subject to completion of the necessary legal (Traffic Management Order) processes.
- 5.8 In essence the proposals would see the creation of 2, immediately adjacent, CPZs, operating at different times. It was envisaged that the CPZs would significantly reduce visitor parking in the area so as to improve road safety, reduce local congestion and prioritise on street parking for residents and their residents.

- 5.9 A formal objection to the proposals was subsequently lodged by the Bexley Council on the grounds of possible parking displacement into Bexley roads. This was despite negotiations over the preceding 12 months and definitive parking survey data indicating that the proposals would have only limited impact in Bexley.
- 5.10 As a result the Council could not implement the CPZs approved plans.
- 5.11 In accordance with the provisions of Section 121B of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, Bexley Council's objection was referred to the Greater London Authority for adjudication by the Mayor of London. Highways Committee were advised of the referral in a report to the Committee on 6th June 2013.
- 5.12 After a protracted delay, the Mayor responded in a letter dated 13th December 2013 advising that he did not consider it appropriate to exercise his Section 121B power. Rather he felt this was a local issue that could "reasonably and preferably be resolved through local collaboration".
- 5.13 In order to reach a mutually acceptable way forward that would result in Bexley Council withdrawing their objection (or the Royal Borough agreeing to introduce modified proposals that Bexley would accept) it was agreed with Bexley that a further parking survey should be jointly commissioned to ascertain the extent of the problem at that time. The survey was subsequently completed and shared with officers at Bexley. Throughout 2014 and 2015, officer discussions have taken place in order that the likely impact of introducing the CPZs could be agreed.
- 5.14 On 30th July 2014 a petition from residents of Colepits Wood Road was presented to Council. The response to that petition was considered in a report to Highways Committee on the 29th September 2014. Recognising the continued problem with commuter parking, the petition requested that the Council "paints white lines across the drives of all properties in Colepits Wood Road in view of the continual difficulties we face due to inconsiderate parking across them". The Committee approved the provision of white "H bar" road markings across driveways in the area at a discounted price. Many of the properties in the area now have these road markings. The markings have no statutory status but will have encouraged motorists to park thoughtfully and are likely to have improved the situation in relation to parking close to or across residents' driveways.

## **5.15 Current Position**

- 5.15.1 Officers met with Bexley officers in August 2015 and discussed the results of the latest parking surveys and the probable extent of commuter displacement if the CPZs proposals were to be implemented.
- 5.15.2 Bexley officers have since confirmed that Bexley will not lift its objection to the Royal Borough's CPZ proposals. In essence they have decided to adopt a 'zero tolerance' approach to the prospect that any commuter parking in the Royal Borough might possibly displace into Bexley as a result of the scheme.
- 5.15.3 Bexley officers have accepted that the current Avery Hill CPZ proposals alone, would be unlikely to displace University related parking into Bexley and they have indicated that they may be persuaded to withdraw their objection to the Avery Hill plans if the Council was minded to reduce the size of the Avery Hill CPZ to suit their requirements.
- 5.15.4 However Bexley still objects unreservedly to the Council's proposals to introduce a Falconwood CPZ in the northern part of Eltham Heights (including Colepits Wood Road) because the proposal would see commuter parking displaced into local Bexley streets.
- 5.15.5 It is the case that parking displacement into Bexley is very likely to take place if the Falconwood CPZ were to be introduced but officers are of the view that (i) a similar displacement effect into the Royal Borough took place when Bexley Council introduced a CPZ (Bexley CPZ F) on the Bexley side of the boundary and (ii) Bexley has the ability to mitigate any impact by extending the existing CPZ within Bexley.
- 5.15.6 Bexley's response to officer's suggestion that they have the ability to mitigate the displacement effect by extending the existing CPZ was to advise that they will not engage in a development process to extend or create new CPZs unless the following criteria are met:
- A minimum of 50% of residents / businesses support the need for a CPZ scheme and that no alternative parking is available
  - The scheme 'promoters' carry out the consultation themselves using an information sheet provided by the Council
  - The consultees understand that all costs (development and implementation) must be fully recovered by the applicants through increased permit charges (over a period of time) unless external funding is available.



- 5.15.7 This has been Bexley Council policy since 2011. No CPZ measures have been implemented in Bexley since it was adopted. The policy effectively rules out any possibility of cross-boundary collaboration around Falconwood Station, as suggested by the Mayor of London, as it is inconceivable that Bexley residents would lobby in sufficient numbers to resolve a problem that is largely currently confined to streets in Greenwich.
- 5.15.8 The current situation at Eltham Heights is unique, frustrating and unfortunate. The Council cannot implement the Avery Hill and Falconwood CPZs in the absence of the necessary Traffic Management Orders and those Orders cannot be made until such time as Bexley Council withdraws its objection or the Mayor adjudicates in favour of the Council.
- 5.15.9 Despite extensive discussions, Bexley Council remains opposed to the implementation of the proposed CPZs unless they are reduced in area such that any displacement parking is contained within the Royal Borough. There is no sign that Bexley might relax its position.
- 5.15.10 Officers are of the view that the Council's proposals are (i) reasonable and (ii) a time honoured solution to the problem of visitor/commuter parking and that (iii) whilst the proposals may impact on roads within the Borough of Bexley, Bexley Council has the ability to manage that impact by introducing further parking controls in the area – regardless of their policy on the introduction of controls.
- 5.15.11 Officers are of the view that reducing the area of the proposed CPZs so as to lessen the impact on roads in Bexley would not be an appropriate way forward. To do so would simply improve the situation in certain roads (in the Royal Borough) whilst increasing parking pressures on other roads in the area.
- 5.15.12 It is not clear what decision the Mayor might make if the matter were to be referred back to the GLA with a request that he adjudicates on the issue in the face of the failure of the two Councils to identify a mutually acceptable solution. The arguments the Council put forward to the Mayor before he decided not to intervene have not changed and so there remains a risk that he may adjudicate in favour of Bexley Council – which would eliminate the opportunity for the Council to address local problems in the Eltham Heights area, through the introduction of CPZs, until such time as the situation changes significantly.

## 5.16 Actions

- 5.16.1 There are a number of options open to the Council. None of these would assuredly result in an improvement of the parking situation in Colepits Wood Road. The options range from deciding to “do nothing” until such time as Bexley Council’s policy or parking conditions in the area change to mounting a legal challenge against the Mayoral decision not to arbitrate.
- 5.16.2 Officers are currently preparing an options paper for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transportation.
- 5.16.3 Once that options paper has been produced officers will meet with the petitioners and ward members to ascertain their views on the most appropriate way forward prior to advising the Cabinet member on the most appropriate course of action.
6. **Petition – Requesting controlled residents parking, for Caletock/Flamstead residents parking be extended to Glenister Road.**
- 6.1 The petition read as follows;
- Petition for Parking*
- This is for all Caletock / Flamstead Residents for the Council to review their Wing Parking Allocations.*
- This is NOT to cancel Wing Parking Enforcement but to get the Council to consider Glenister Road as a resident parking allocation and to ensure the Council re-calculate parking spaces as there is clearly not enough.*
- 6.2 Officers have made contact with the lead petitioner to seek clarification of the above. The request essentially is for permit parking controls to be extended to the adopted roads within the estates – namely Armitage Road and Glenister Road.
- 6.3 The petition, containing Circa 73 signatures, was presented by Councillor Chris Lloyd and referred to the Director of Regeneration Enterprise and Skills for investigation. The matter was considered by Highways Committee 28 January 2016 and the following response has been provided.
- 6.4 The Caletock and Flamstead Estates are both managed by Greenwich Housing. Flamstead is a gated community with landscaped areas and courts in which permit parking is controlled by a Council contractor - Wing Security.

The estate roads - Commerell Place and Hatcliffe Street are unadopted and also fall within the remit of Wing Security for the management of parking.

- 6.5 The Caletock Estate comprises several roads and courts that have the appearance of public spaces, but are unadopted and managed by Greenwich Housing / Wing Security. These 'private streets' include a section of Armitage Road, Caletock Way, Davern Close, Helvelius Close, Lenthorpe Road and Rooke Way.
- 6.6 The estates are accessed from Armitage Road and/or Glenister Road. These roads are both public highways. Although the roads are located within the limits of the Westcombe Park ('W') CPZ, for historical reasons the on-street parking places in the roads are not subject to any permit controls (ie there is free, uncontrolled, on-street parking) .
- 6.7 In November 2015 the Caletock Estate was included in a review of the Westcombe Park CPZ. A parking attitude survey was conducted to ascertain residents' views on the operation of the current permit parking controls and to where these should be extended (if at all). The response to this exercise from is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1 - Caletock Estate Response to Parking Attitude Survey**

Property Data				Are you generally content with existing arrangements?			Would you like permit controls extended to include kerb space near your premises	
Road Name	No. Premises	Returns	% response	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes (if nearby streets are included)	No
<b>Armitage Road</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
Caletock Way (Wing Security)	35	4	11%	2	2	0	N/A	N/A
Davern Close (Wing Security)	30	4	13%	2	2	0	N/A	N/A
<b>Glenister Road</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
Hevelius Close (Wing Security)	53	2	4%	2	0	0	N/A	N/A
Lenthorpe Road (Wing Security)	50	2	4%	2	0	0	N/A	N/A
Rooke Way (Wing Security)	33	2	6%	0	2	0	N/A	N/A

5.7 As a gated community with its own private parking provisions, the Flamstead Estate was considered to fall outside the Westcombe Park CPZ so was not included in this consultation exercise.

## 5.8 **Issues**

5.8.1 Although the response rate is low, Table I shows that the majority of those residents that responded are dissatisfied with the current situation, and that the majority of respondents living on Armitage Road and Glenister Road now want these streets to be included in the CPZ 'W' permit provisions. These controls would not apply to the unadopted places managed by Wing Security.

5.8.2 Parking pressures in this area may have increased since the occupation of new premises in the Greenwich Centre development. Most of these new residents are not eligible to CPZ permits, so some are now taking advantage of the free parking elsewhere. These pressures may be exacerbated by visitors to the facilities at the Greenwich Centre.

5.8.3 It is Council policy to levy a charge for resident parking permits in all controlled parking zones, so residents who use parking places in the adopted streets during the CPZ operational times would be required to pay for permits (and visitor vouchers). The petitioners are inconvenienced by the current parking pressures to the extent that they now appear willing to accept the costs of permit controls.

5.8.4 Introducing permit controls on-street in this particular locality will raise issues of fairness concerning who parks where. This is because certain estate residents are not eligible for Wing Security permits and so are required to park on-street, while others with Wing permits may want to be eligible for CPZ permits so as to park in Armitage Road or Glenister Road.

## 5.9 **Actions**

5.9.1 Based on the outcome of the parking attitude survey, proposals to amend the arrangements so as to introduce CPZ permit parking provisions in Armitage Road and Glenister Road will be brought forward in 2016/17 for further consultation. The proposals will form part of a wider package of changes to the Westcombe "W" CPZ.

- 5.9.2 The petitioners, therefore, will shortly have the opportunity to comment on and influence plans to change the on street parking arrangements in Armitage and Glenister Roads. It is anticipated that any approved measures would be implemented during 2016/17 subject to normal Traffic Order procedures.
- 5.9.3 Officers of the Directorates of Community Services (Housing Management) and Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills will need to identify an arrangement which, so far as is practicable, provides equity over the eligibility for CPZ permits, recognising that the Estate already has an operational “housing permit” scheme.

Background Papers:

Petitions to Council

Departmental Responses

Report compiled by: Jean Riddler - Committee Officer  
Tel No: 020 8921 5857  
Email: jean.riddler@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Robert Sutton – Deputy Head of Democratic Services  
Tel No: 020 8921 5134  
Email: robert.sutton@royalgreenwich.gov.uk