

OFFICER DELEGATED DECISION 16 JULY 2020

Report title: Proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Streatham Hill East

Ward: Streatham Hill

Portfolio: Councillor Claire Holland, Deputy Leader of the Council (Sustainable Travel, Environment and Clean Air)

Report Authorised by: Bayo Dosunmu, Strategic Director of Resident Services

Contact for enquiries: Caroline Stanyon, Senior Parking Engineer, Capital Programmes, 0207 926 6707, CStanyon@lambeth.gov.uk

Report summary

This report considers the responses to the statutory consultation carried out in November 2019 relating to the introduction of controlled parking in the eastern part of Streatham Hill. It recommends proceeding with the proposal as advertised.

Finance summary

The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £140,000. This includes the publication of the Traffic Management Orders, road marking, traffic signs and traffic management. Provision has been made in the budget to meet these costs.

Recommendations

1. Following consideration of representations and objections received during statutory consultation, to make traffic management orders creating the following parking controls, all as illustrated in Appendix A to this report:
 - a. introduce a new Streatham Hill East 'M' controlled parking zone operational Monday to Friday between 10am – 12pm (noon);
 - b. extend the Tulse Hill 'H' controlled parking zone to include Probyn Road, operational Monday to Friday between 8.30am - 6.30pm;
 - c. extend the Brixton Hill 'F' controlled parking zone to include the remainder of Roupell Road, operational Monday to Friday between 12noon - 2pm; and,
 - d. introduce at any time (double yellow line) waiting restrictions:
 - i. at both junctions of Palace Road and Coburg Crescent;
 - ii. at the junction of Palace Road and Bushell Close;
 - iii. at the junction of Palace Road and Presentation Mews;
 - iv. across accesses to communal off-street parking areas on Palace Road;
 - v. at the junction of Hillside Road and Hillside Gardens;
 - vi. on the northern side of Kingsmead Road adjacent to No. 48;
 - vii. on the northern side of Leigham Vale from the flank wall of No.91 to a point level with the boundary of Nos. 3 and 5 Kingsmead Road; and,
 - viii. on the southern side of Leigham Vale from the flank wall of No.91 to a point level with the boundary of Nos. 101/102.

1. CONTEXT

- 1.1 In November 2017, all premises in Streatham Hill ward were consulted on whether to introduce a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in their road. Termed a stage 1 consultation, this involved a survey that sought to establish residents' and businesses' views on whether they considered there to be a sufficient parking problem for them to support the introduction of parking controls in their road. To help inform this decision, the consultation included an indicative layout of where vehicles would be able to park were a CPZ to be introduced and how much it would cost to do so. Officers used the survey results to inform whether to proceed to statutory consultation (in either an un-mended or amended form), or whether the proposal should be withdrawn.
- 1.2 At that time, the majority of respondents east of the A23 ("Streatham Hill East") opposed parking controls. In light of this, the decision was taken to withdraw proposals to introduce a CPZ on those roads but to proceed with statutory consultation on the introduction of a CPZ west of the A23.
- 1.3 During the statutory consultation to introduce CPZ in the area west of the A23, the Council received three separate petitions from the area to the east of the A23 demanding that residents be re-consulted.
- 1.4 Responding to petitioners' concerns and in anticipation of increased parking demand resulting from the newly introduced Streatham Hill West CPZ, approval was given in November 2018 to carry out a second stage 1 consultation on the introduction of parking controls in Streatham Hill East.
- 1.5 The results of this second stage 1 consultation undertaken between December 2018 and February 2019 were used to shape the Delegated Decision report of July 2019 by which approval to proceed to statutory consultation was given.
- 1.6 At the same time, a new stage 1 consultation was carried out with residents in the immediate vicinity of Hailsham Avenue, asking whether, to lessen the impact of any displaced parking, they would be in favour of having parking controls in their road as an extension to the proposed adjacent Streatham Hill East CPZ. The outcome of that consultation resulted in a Decision being made In September 2019 to include a reduced Hailsham Avenue area within the Streatham Hill East CPZ statutory consultation.
- 1.7 As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and subsequent "shielding" of parts of our community, work on all schemes requiring experimental or permanent traffic orders was stopped on 23 March 2020. Work has now restarted in recognition of the Governments' announcement on 25 June 2020 regarding the ending of "shielding".

2. PROPOSAL AND REASONS

Statutory Consultation

- 2.1 Statutory consultation was carried out between 1 – 29 November 2019. It comprised:
 - a) A newsletter posted to the following properties:
 - within the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ area (identified as Areas M and J during the stage 1 consultation);
 - on Roupell Road (where it was proposed to extend the Brixton Hill CPZ);
 - on Probyn Road (where it was proposed to extend the Tulse Hill CPZ);
 - all other streets in the ward of Streatham Hill east of the A23 where the council had decided that no parking controls would be introduced;
 - b) Legal Notices of the Council's intentions were attached to lamp columns throughout the affected area;

- c) Legal Notices of the Council's intentions were published in the South London Press and the London Gazette;
 - d) An announcement was made on the Council's website that the consultation was open, with links to all the above documents, and
 - e) Copies of the proposed traffic management orders (TMOs), detailed plans of the proposals and the Council's Statement of Reasons were made available for inspection at Brixton and Tate Streatham Libraries
- 2.2 The newsletter detailed the results of the then-recent stage 1 consultations, the decisions taken to proceed with the CPZ proposals, including the incorporation of some of the Hailsham Avenue area and an explanation as to how to respond to the statutory consultation. An email address was provided for residents and businesses to make their representation for or against the proposals.

Statutory Consultation Representations and Petitions

- 2.3 The response rate to the statutory consultation was 21%; this compares well with similar consultations carried out in the past and provides assurance that the consultation had good penetration in the target audience.
- 2.4 The statutory consultation generated 68 written representations: 32 objecting to the proposals, 28 in support and eight commenting. Their distribution is summarised in Table 1. Details of all representations received can be found in Appendices B, C and D.

Table 1 – Distribution of Representations

CPZ Proposal	Support	Comment	Object	Total
New Streatham Hill East CPZ (Zone M)	26	7	30	63
Probyn Road - Extension of Tulse Hill CPZ (Zone H)	2	-	2	4
Roupell Road - Extension of Brixton Hill CPZ (Zone F)	-	1	-	1
Total	28	8	32	68

- 2.5 In addition, three petitions were submitted by the same lead petitioner during the statutory consultation period. Two objected to the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ; one signed by local residents and the other representing shops and businesses from the local community (both inside and outside the proposed CPZ boundary). The third petition objected to the proposed extension of the Tulse Hill CPZ into Probyn Road. In total, these petitions carried 168 signatories.
- 2.6 After the statutory consultation period had ended, the lead petitioner emailed the council requesting that 83 signatures be added to the petitions objecting to the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ. He also submitted a new petition opposing the proposed extension of the Brixton Hill CPZ into Roupell Road.
- 2.7 Guidance on the appropriate procedure to respond to these late submissions was requested from the Council's Head of Democratic Services who advised that once a petition has been submitted it is not possible to add further signatures. Furthermore, [The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders \(Procedure\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 1996](#) make no provision for a council to consider any responses to statutory consultation that are received after the date specified on the published notice has passed.

- 2.8 Consequently, although these late submissions are not being considered as formal representations to the statutory consultation on these CPZ proposals, their receipt has nonetheless been noted, and used to help inform the decision making process.
- 2.9 Details of these petitions including numbers of signatures and properties represented can be found in Appendix E.
- 2.10 Analysis of the objections (including the petitions) indicates that there are eight recurring or similar themes that need to be considered before deciding whether to proceed, amend or abandon the proposals.

Streatham Hill East CPZ (Zone M) – Statutory Consultation Results

- 2.11 Objection 1: *“why is a CPZ proposed when the majority of residents opted NOT to have a CPZ during the original (2017) consultation”*

Officer Response

Disagreeing with why the council decided to subject a proposal to statutory consultation is not a basis for objecting to that statutory consultation.

Nonetheless, to aid transparency, officers advise as follows. As detailed earlier in this report, in 2017 approximately half of the respondents to the first stage 1 consultation from Streatham Hill East considered that they did not have a parking problem and the majority did not support the introduction of a CPZ. However, during the statutory consultation that subsequently took place for a CPZ on roads in Streatham Hill West (where the stage 1 had shown there to be majority support for a CPZ), the Council received three petitions demanding that residents of roads to the east of Streatham Hill be re-consulted on the introduction of parking controls. In November 2018 the Council acceded to these petitioners’ request and a second (“Streatham Hill East”) stage 1 consultation took place between December 2018 and January 2019. Irrespective of how consultees may have responded in 2017, the purpose of the statutory consultation was to elicit the views of consultees in late 2019. The results of this re-consultation (which were summarised in the 2019 statutory consultation newsletter distributed to all premises) evidenced that a Streatham Hill East CPZ was only being promoted where the second stage 1 consultation had shown there to be no majority against what had been proposed.

- 2.12 Objection 2: *“the low response rate to the second stage 1 consultation is not representative of residents’ views”*

Officer Response

As detailed in paragraph 2.1, the council made considerable efforts to consult everyone potentially affected by the proposals. From experience when consulting on traffic or parking proposals using letters individually addressed to householders of premises within the affected zone, a typical response rates is between 9-12%. The response rate of 14.2% to the second (2018) Streatham Hill East CPZ stage 1 consultation was therefore comparatively high. Still higher response rates may be achievable by ‘door-knocking’ those properties that have not responded to the consultation but this was not considered proportionate to the information that such an exercise would glean.

- 2.13 Objection 3: *“Permit costs will be a financial burden on residents”*

Officer Response

The Council’s Transport Strategy and its Air Quality Action Plan make clear that it will use CPZs to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport and to encourage the use of less polluting vehicles.

The current [Secretary of State's Guidance on the introduction of a CPZ](#) is that a scheme needs to be self-financing. This means that in order to cover the cost of implementing and enforcing the CPZ, the Council must charge for parking during controlled hours. In common with other highway authorities, the Council applies a fixed tariff that does not distinguish between a person's ability to afford the charges. Whilst this means that a CPZ will be proportionally be less affordable to those on low income, it would be disproportionate in terms of cost and complexity to operate a means-based cost model. Lambeth's pricing structure for parking permits for residents' cars offers a sliding scale of discounts according to the vehicle's carbon dioxide (CO₂) tailpipe emissions. Whilst the median annual resident permit price is currently Band 3 (£164.13), the price for electric and hybrid vehicles with emissions of up to 100 g/km of CO₂ is only £36.59.

Given that the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ would only operate for two hours on a weekday, the cost to residents can be minimised if their visitors and tradespeople avoid the controlled hours (i.e. visit before 10am, after 12 noon or at weekends). Where this is not possible, residents can purchase up to 50 visitor permits a year at a cost of £5.48 a day or £24.04 for a book of five days.

2.14 Objection 4: *"Lydhurst Avenue should not be included in the Streatham Hill East CPZ"*

Officer Response

The views of residents in respect of on-street parking within the Hailsham Avenue Area (which includes Lydhurst Avenue) was first carried out as part of the Streatham Area attitudinal survey in February 2018. At that time, the majority of respondents did not consider that they had a parking problem. However, support for their road being consulted for a CPZ was split 50:50 with a slight majority interested in being consulted if neighbouring roads were offered a CPZ.

Accordingly, when, in July 2019, the decision was taken to proceed to statutory consultation on a CPZ in adjacent roads, a stage 1 consultation was undertaken in the Hailsham Avenue Area in August 2019.

Although the majority of respondents to that consultation still did not consider that they had a parking problem, opinion as to whether they would like to see the introduction of a CPZ in their road was again split 50:50. When asked if they would reconsider and support the introduction of a CPZ in their road if adjacent streets were included in a CPZ, a slight majority said that they would.

The most consensual response to the detail of the actual responses was for the Council to remove Keymer Road and Mount Nod Road from the CPZ proposals but include Faygate Road, Hailsham Avenue and Lydhurst Avenue. Five residents of Lyndhurst Avenue signed the petition opposing the Streatham Hill East CPZ and one signed the similar petition that was collected on behalf of local businesses.

2.15 Objection 5: *"Hillside Road should be included in the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ"*

Officer Response

During the first (2017) stage 1 Streatham Hill CPZ consultation no responses were received from any of the 116 properties from Hillside Road.

In the second (2018) stage 1 re-consultation, the majority of respondents from Hillside Road indicated that they did not consider that they had a parking problem, did not want a CPZ to be introduced in their road and would not change their mind if a CPZ were to be introduced into adjacent streets. Consequently, the most consensual response was to delete Hillside Road from the proposed CPZ prior to statutory consultation.

2.16 Objection 6: *“parking controls should be introduced in Lanercost Road”*

Officer Response

During the first (2017) stage 1 consultation, 58.3% of respondents from Lanercost Road said that they did have a parking problem, yet 50% did not support a CPZ and 54.2% said they would not change their mind even if a CPZ were to be introduced in adjacent roads.

In response to the second (2018) stage 1 consultation, the majority of respondents from Lanercost Road now considered that they did not have a parking problem. The proportion of respondents who would not support a CPZ in Lanercost Road increased to 68.8% and the proportion whose opinion would not change if a CPZ were to be introduced into a neighbouring road increased to 63.8%. Consequently, Lanercost Road was deleted from the proposed CPZ prior to statutory consultation.

2.17 Objection 7: *“parked vehicles will be displaced from the new CPZ into adjacent unrestricted roads”*

Officer Response

Displacement of some parking is unfortunately unavoidable when introducing any parking controls. Some non-residents, who have previously been able to park on-street for free and for whom public transport or other more sustainable modes are either not available or considered inconvenient, will migrate to adjacent unrestricted streets.

In addition, a small proportion of residents living within the proposed CPZ, may not be prepared to purchase a parking permit and so also migrate to where on-street parking remains free.

Acknowledging the likelihood of displaced parking, the Council included a question in its consultation newsletters asking residents if, were they to oppose the introduction of parking controls in their road, they would change their opinion if a CPZ were to be introduced in adjacent roads.

The boundary of the proposed CPZ that formed the basis of the 2019 statutory consultation was chosen so that roads which sat outside were those where the majority of respondents to the 2017 attitudinal survey and the 2019 stage 1 re-consultation (a) did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road and (b) would not change their opinion if a CPZ were to be introduced on adjacent streets.

2.18 Objection 8: *“the CPZ would have a detrimental effect on the vibrant nature of the neighbourhood and disadvantage minority and working-class groups due to well-off people from outside the area buying on-street space”.*

Officer Response

Free unlimited parking, as currently operates, does not contribute to a vibrant neighbourhood. By preventing commuters from parking, the proposed CPZ will release kerbside space for a use that better contributes to the neighbourhood's vibrancy, such as short-stay parking for people who want to visit the area by car. By prioritising the needs of residents, their visitors and people visiting the area wishing to park for up to an hour, the CPZ can be expected to benefit all residents' quality of life due to fewer vehicles driving around to find a parking space, thereby reducing traffic, improving air quality and reducing the levels of road danger

The proportionate effects on people with low incomes is discussed in the response to Objection 3 above and on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic people in section 7 of this report.

Tulse Hill Zone H extension into Probyn Road – Statutory Consultation Results

- 2.19 The statutory consultation resulted in four representations: two in support and two against. In addition, a petition containing five signatures from five properties on Probyn Road was also received. Of the two objections, only one specified the reasons for their opposition.
- 2.20 No specific reasons were stated in the objection petition, only that the five petitioners would like the Council to abandon its proposals. However, all five residents stated that they had not received any information on the CPZ proposals from Lambeth Council.

Officer Response

As part of the first (2017) Streatham Hill CPZ stage 1 consultation, residents of Probyn Road were asked whether they had a parking problem and if they would like a CPZ to be introduced in their road. At that time, only seven of the 31 properties in Probyn Road completed the on-line questionnaire, with the majority of those advising that they did have a parking problem and would support a CPZ in their road. However, as none of the other nearby roads shared these views, it was decided not to proceed to statutory consultation on introducing a CPZ in Probyn Road.

In response to the second (2018) stage 1 consultation, the majority view of respondents from the 14 roads within Tulse Hill West Area was again that the introduction of a CPZ would not be supported. However, although only three of the 31 properties in Probyn Road completed the on-line questionnaire, the majority again supported its inclusion in a CPZ.

Given this continued support it was considered that, despite the low number of responses, the most consensual response would be to comply with respondents' preference and proceed to statutory consultation on introducing parking controls in Probyn Road but as an extension to the adjacent Tulse Hill CPZ (Zone H). This recognises that the parking pressures giving rise to Probyn Road's parking problems are related to displacement from the Zone H CPZ, not to those that have created parking problems west of Hillside Road.

With regards to the claim of non-receipt of the most recent newsletter, our records show that copies were posted to all five petitioners' addresses. Our records also show that no responses were received from these addresses to any of the three consultations that have been carried out. At least three of the petitioners are understood to live in houses of multiple occupancy which may have led to them not being alerted to the consultation by other members of the household.

Brixton Hill Zone F extension into Roupell Road – Statutory Consultation Results

- 2.21 The single representation received during the statutory consultation period requested a change to what was proposed.
- 2.22 Representation 9: *request that (a) eligibility to park in the proposed parking bay in Roupell Road be restricted to residents in the immediate vicinity and (b) assurance that a parking bay would not prevent a vehicle crossover being constructed in the future.*

Officer Response

Parking pressures giving rise to Roupell Road's parking problems are likely to be more related to displacement from the Zone F CPZ than to those that have created parking problems south of Downton Road. Shared-use resident and pay by phone bays have been proposed on the south-eastern side of the road to accommodate approximately twelve vehicles whereas parking on the north-western side of the road, outside the respondent's property, would be resident, business and pay by phone parking for approximately seven vehicles.

For a CPZ to operate successfully it should extend across a zone of sufficient size for peaks in residents’ own parking needs to be accommodated. For this reason, the proposal is to add Roupell Road to Brixton Hill Zone F rather than become a standalone CPZ. Ad hoc occupancy surveys of the roads nearby already in Zone F indicate that the bays in Roupell Road are likely to be only used by vehicles associated with nearby properties. However, as at present, because parking on the adjacent A205 Christchurch Road (Red Route) is heavily restricted, both parts of Roupell Road need to continue to fulfil a role as providing on-street parking for those Christchurch Road residents and their visitors who have limited or no access to off-street parking facilities.

In the circumstances, although the respondent’s request has been noted, the proposed shared-use resident, business and pay by phone parking bays will remain as per the advertised proposals.

With regards to the future provision of a vehicle crossover within a CPZ, the presence of a parking bay will not affect the eligibility for whether a crossover can be built, but it will typically make it £2,000 more expensive and result in the application taking six months longer. That such an application may be made in the future is not sufficient grounds not to proceed with the proposal.

Comments Made by Respondents

2.23 The majority of comments submitted by respondents were supportive of the CPZ proposal but queried the rationale behind the proposed operational hours and requested that they should be extended to operate all-day and possibly also on a Saturday. The rationale to these decisions was covered in the July 2019 Scheme Approval Delegated Decision report.

Representation received by the Metropolitan Police for entire consultation area

2.24 No representations were received.

Ward Councillor comments

2.25 All three Streatham Hill Ward Councillors support the recommendations made in this report.

3. FINANCE

3.1 The forecast cost of progressing the proposed schemes to implementation is detailed in Table 2. All expenditure is capital:

Table 2: Forecast Expenditure

Project task	2020/21 (£)	Total (£)
Legal costs (writing and advertising traffic orders, etc)	15,000	15,000
Implementation cost	125,000	125,000
TOTAL	140,000	140,000

3.2 Provision for this expenditure has been made in the Council’s Capital Budget, funded from Community Infrastructure Levy and the Parking Reserve Account.

3.3 As required by the Secretary of State’s Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions, the objective of civil parking enforcement should be for 100 per cent compliance. Accordingly, cost models for CPZ must assume that no penalty charges will be issued. If the Council does make a surplus on its on-street parking charges and enforcement activities, it must use the surplus in accordance with the legislative restrictions in Section 55 (as amended) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

4 LEGAL AND DEMOCRACY

- 4.1 With the following additions, the legal implications remain as stated in the July 2019 Scheme Approval Delegated Decision report.
- 4.2 Section 87 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 stipulates that the Council must have regard to the information contained in 2016's, "The Secretary of State's Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions" published in 2016. This sets out the policy framework for Civil Parking Enforcement. It explains how to approach, carry out and review parking enforcement. It attempts to strike the balance between
- a) as much national consistency as possible, while allowing parking policies to suit local circumstances; and
 - b) a system that is fair to the motorist, but also effective in enforcing parking
- 4.3 If the Recommendations are approved and a traffic management order (TMO) is made, a person may decide to challenge its validity on the grounds that (a) it is not within the relevant powers, or (b) any of the relevant requirements has not been complied with in relation to the Order. Application must be made to the High Court within six weeks of the date of the making of the TMO. However, the court can only quash a TMO if satisfied that the order, or any provision of the order, is not within the relevant powers, or that the interests of the applicant have been substantially prejudiced by failure to comply with any of the relevant requirements.
- 4.4 This report fulfils the requirement in the Council's Constitution whereby authority to consider objections received from statutory consultation as part of the TMO making process and the power to make, amend or revoke traffic orders, following the consideration of such objections is delegated to Directors and Assistant Directors (Delivery).
- 4.5 It is the view of the Deputy Leader of the Council (Environment and Clean Air) that Rule 17 of the Council's Constitution applies and that this Non-key Decision considers important or sensitive issues and so must be published on the website for five clear days before making the decision. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the Assistant Director before making this decision.

5 CONSULTATION AND CO-PRODUCTION

- 5.1 The stage 1, statutory consultations that have informed this report's recommendations, and responses, are described in sections 1 and 2 of this report.
- 5.2 The three councillors for Streatham Hill ward support this report's recommendations.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 With the following additions, the risks associated with introducing and operating a CPZ remain as reported in the July 2019 scheme approval report.

Table 3 – Risk

Item	Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Score	Control Measures
1	If the recommendations of this report are not approved, the Council will be unable to mitigate against the existing parking difficulties that some residents experience and will not gain the ability to further deter car-borne commuting in this area.	2	2	4	none
2	If the recommendations of this report are not approved the Council's staff resources allocated to progressing CPZs are fully committed until March 2022. This is 6 months after ULEZ is scheduled to be expanded to the South Circular. The effect of this expansion may include some commuters who drive non-compliant vehicles but who currently benefit from off-street parking at their workplace inside the South Circular to park just outside the zone in the manner of park-and-ride	2	4	8	none
3	If the recommendations of this report are approved, the lead petitioner has indicated his intention to seek a judicial review. There is a risk of this resulting in an injunction.	4	2	8	See para 4.3

Key

Likelihood	Very Likely	4	Likely	3	Unlikely	2	Very Unlikely	1
Impact	Major	8	Serious	4	Significant	2	Minor	1

7 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 The recommended waiting restrictions have been screened for their effect on people with one or more of the protected characteristics. Whilst this screening found there to be a net positive impact on such people (see Appendix G to this report), there is potential for some individuals within two of these protected characteristic groups to be disadvantaged:

- a) Disabled people who do not have a Blue Badge: due to there being more spaces in which to park and no charges being levied, disabled people whose vehicles display a blue badge would be expected to disproportionately benefit from a CPZ. However people who could be described as disabled from outside the CPZ but who do not qualify for a blue badge and need to visit the area by car (other than to visit a resident) during the controlled period and requiring a stay longer than the maximum period allowed for using Pay-by-Phone may be disadvantaged. In mitigation, the eligibility criteria for a Blue Badge is extensive and designed to capture anyone whose limited mobility defines them under the Equality Act as having a disability. It captures anyone who receives the higher rate mobility component of the Disability Living Allowance; anyone who receives a Personal Independence Payment (PIP) because they cannot walk more than 50 metres; anyone who receives the mobility component of PIP and is categorised as being unable to undertake a journey because it would cause overwhelming psychological stress; anyone who receives a War Pensioner's Mobility Supplement; and anyone who is blind. Whilst the council recognises that there are some people with limited mobility who need a car but do not qualify for a blue badge (for instance those who are recovering from surgery), there is no requirement under the Equality Act to consider the needs of such people any differently to those whose mobility is not impaired.

b) People from outside the CPZ whose faith may require them to attend places of worship inside the CPZ during controlled hours:

- Islam: the Friday prayer, Jumu'ah, is mandatory for all Muslim males who are of age. Jumu'ah takes place in the early afternoon (i.e. immediately after the proposed CPZ's controlled hours) every Friday at Streatham Hill Masjid, 106 Norfolk Mansions, Streatham High Road, SW16 1BW. Because the proposed CPZ is more than seven minutes' walk from the Masjid, its introduction should have no direct impact on worshippers.
- Judaism: although the South London Synagogue at 45 Leigham Court Road is only a 3 minute walk from the proposed CPZ, the controlled hours would end before sunset on a Friday and do not apply on a Saturday so its introduction should have no direct impact on worshippers.

The EqIA screening has identified people who worship Baha'i, Buddhism, Candomle, Christianity Hinduism, Jainism, Mormonism, Rastafari, Santeria, Shinto, Sikhism, Taoism or Zoroastrianism would not be affected due to either the day of congregational worship being a Sunday (when no restrictions apply) or there being no known place of worship for that religion within the proposed CPZ.

8 COMMUNITY SAFETY

- 8.1 All road space in a CPZ is managed by the introduction of parking controls. Because parking is only permitted where safety, access and sight lines are not unduly compromised, implementation of this report's recommendations would contribute towards a safer environment for all road users.

9 ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Environmental

- 9.1 By deterring car-borne commuting, CPZs align with the Council's [2017-2022 Air Quality Action Plan](#) to reduce air pollution and its ambition for Lambeth to be carbon neutral by 2030. The emissions-based tariff for residents' parking permits will encourage owners to drive vehicles that are less polluting.

Health

- 9.2 The CPZ aligns with the priorities of both the Councils Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment by reducing congestion and emissions from road transport contributing to improved air quality .

Corporate Parenting

- 9.3 None as a result of this report.

Staffing and accommodation

- 9.4 None as a result if this report. However, if the CPZ were to be implemented, there will be a potential increase of up to 0.5 FTE within the Parking Service's team to process permit applications, parking challenges and bay suspensions. The new CPZ zone will generate increased administrating and require enforcement, estimated to be the equivalent of 1 FTEs (0.5 with the enforcement contractor and 0.5 within the performance and development team).

Responsible Procurement

- 9.5 None as a result of this report; existing supply chains will be used.

10 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

ACTIVITY	DATE
Publish this report on the Council website (notice of intention to make a Decision)	17 July 2020
Deadline for call-in of Decision (5 working days)	24 July 2020
Distribute newsletter to residents and businesses within new/extended CPZs and surrounding areas	2 nd week August 2020
Publish “has made” Notice of Traffic Orders	3 rd week September 2020
Install traffic signs and road markings	September - October 2020
Deadline for courts to receive an application for judicial review (6 weeks after publication of Notice)	4 th week October 2020
“Soft” enforcement of parking restrictions starts	1 st week November 2020
Zone becomes operational	November 2020

AUDIT TRAIL				
Consultation				
Name/Position	Lambeth directorate/ department or partner	Date Sent	Date Received	Comments in para:
Councillor Claire Holland	Deputy Leader of the Council (Environment and Clean Air)	Briefed 13 January 2020		
Councillors Liz Atkins, Rezina Chowdhury, Iain Simpson	Ward Councillors, Streatham Hill	14.01.20	15-23.01.20	5.2
Andrew Ramsden, Finance	Finance and Investment	13.02.20	19.02.20	3.1
Jean-Marc Mocarne, Legal	Legal and Governance	13.02.20	13.02.20	
David Rose, Democratic Services Officer	Legal and Governance	13.02.20	17.02.20	2.18, 6.1, 9.2 & 9.3
Andrew Burton, Assistant Director of Highways, Capital Programmes and Sustainability	Resident Services	19.02.20	02.03.20	2.13, 2.17, 2.18, 4.2, 4.5, 6, 7

REPORT HISTORY	
Original discussion with Cabinet Member	Ongoing since July 2017
Report deadline	N/A
Date final report sent	
Part II Exempt from Disclosure/ confidential accompanying report?	No
Key decision report	No
Background information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lambeth Transport Strategy 2019 • Lambeth's Air Quality Action Plan 2017-2022 • 27/2/18 – Streatham Hill Area CPZ: results of public consultation and decision to proceed to statutory consultation: http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=4106 • 24/7/18 – Streatham Hill Area CPZ: statutory consultation results and decision to implement in the west: http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=4200 • 29/10/18 - Streatham Hill East CPZ: decision to undertake a second public consultation: http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=4244 • 9/7/2019 – Streatham Hill East CPZ: results of public consultation and decision to proceed to statutory consultation: http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=4383 • 30/09/2019 – Hailsham Avenue Area CPZ: results of public consultation and decision to proceed with smaller scheme to statutory consultation: http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=5438

Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendix A – Detailed Proposals following Statutory Consultation• Appendix B – Streatham Hill East Statutory Consultation correspondence• Appendix C – Probyn Road Statutory Consultation correspondence• Appendix D – Roupell Road Statutory Consultation correspondence• Appendix E – Petition Details and Response• Appendix F – Equalities Impact Assessment
-------------------	---

APPROVAL BY OFFICER IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEME OF DELEGATION

I confirm I have consulted Finance, Legal, and Democratic Services and taken account of their advice and comments in completing the report for approval:



Signature:

Date: 5 March 2020

Post: Caroline Stanyon,
Senior Parking Engineer

I approve the above recommendations:



Signature:

Date: 16 July 2020

Post: Andrew Burton,
Assistant Director of Highways, Capital Programmes and Sustainability

Any declarations of interest (or exemptions granted): none

Any conflicts of interest: none

Any dispensations: none