

REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS		
RESULTS OF IN-PRINCIPLE PARKING CONSULTATION (STAGE 1) FOR AREA AROUND STOKE NEWINGTON TRAIN STATION. FEB – APRIL 2007 [FP NO NR 07.08.07] Cabinet – 29TH October 2007	Classification PUBLIC	Enclosures APPENDICES 1 & 2
	Wards affected CAZENOVE AND LORDSHIP	AGENDA ITEM No 13

1. INTRODUCTION BY CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS

- 1.1 Parking and the regulation thereof is one of the most controversial aspects of the work of local authorities. The issue of whether or not to introduce parking controls is particularly contentious, so it is important that consultations on the subject are transparent.
- 1.2 This report, which recommends not proceeding with a CPZ around Stoke Newington train station - a clear majority of respondents chose this option, is a prime example of how we as a local authority actively seek dialogue with the public and use the responses to inform the decisions made by the Council.
- 1.3 I commend this report to Cabinet

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 On 27th November 2006 Cabinet granted approval for Parking Services to consult on the principle of introducing a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the area around Stoke Newington train station. This report presents the findings from this consultation exercise.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet is recommended:

- 3.1 **NOT to implement a CPZ in the area around Stoke Newington train station on the basis that a clear and absolute majority of respondents opposed the introduction of parking controls to the area.**
- 3.2 **To ask Parking Services to continue to monitor levels of parking stress in the uncontrolled area and consider the advent of the Olympics as specified in paragraph 5.11.**

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Prior to consulting with stakeholders in the area around Stoke Newington train station on the principle of introducing parking controls, the Council had received a number of unsolicited representations and a petition of 20 signatories from residents of Lampard Grove and neighbouring roads requesting the introduction of controls. Parking Services had also conducted a *Technical Assessment* that indicated sufficient levels of parking stress to warrant consideration.
- 4.2 The *Technical Assessment* outlined an area close to Stoke Newington train station that was experiencing high levels of parking stress (making it a parking “hotspot”). The Council is aware of the acute parking problems such stress presents, so it identified a primary consultation area covering stakeholders with similar parking problems. The locations of the primary and secondary areas are shown by the map in Appendix 1. The Council consulted in this primary area as well as in a wider, secondary area that recognises the effect of displaced parking if any CPZ were to be introduced nearby. The implementation of the zone is dependent on the decision to proceed in the primary area – no road in the secondary area would receive parking controls otherwise. If the decision is made to implement a CPZ in the primary area, then streets in the secondary area would be considered for inclusion on a street-by-street basis.
- 4.3 There are a number of housing estates in the area, including the George Downing Estate and Hugh Gaitskell House. The consultation necessarily included residents living on housing estates because they have access to and are affected by parking in nearby streets, regardless of whether their estates have parking controls. The consultation pack clearly stated that parking regulations on housing estates would not be changed by this consultation. Any changes to parking controls on Hackney estates would be made with the involvement of Hackney Homes.

5. CONSULTATION PROCESS AND RESULTS

- 5.1 In line with Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP), approved by Cabinet on 20th January 2005, the Council conducts a two-stage consultation process prior to implementing new CPZs. In line with the PEP and Hackney’s Consultation charter, Parking Services conducted the first stage of consultation with all stakeholders in the area over eight weeks between 5th February and 5th April 2007. For Council officers to proceed to the second stage of consultation, Cabinet’s agreement is required.
- 5.2 Stakeholders were engaged in the following ways:
- Consultation packs were delivered to approximately 2091 properties and included a single page consultation response form for stakeholders to complete and return in a pre-paid envelope;
 - Posters were displayed throughout the consultation area;
 - The consultation was advertised in two editions of Hackney Today;
 - Information was published on the Hackney website;
 - There was a ½ page advertisement in *The Heimishe Newssheet*, a local Charedi community publication;
 - An email and telephone advice service with members of the Parking Policy and Development Team was provided; and
 - Door step interviews were conducted with 440 (or approximately 20% of) residents and businesses across the consultation area by an external

supplier. 103 consultation forms were completed as part of a doorstep interview and have been included in analysis.

- 5.3 Stakeholders were also given access to a service offering information about the consultation in languages other than English, large print and Braille. Three stakeholders requested access to this service.
- 5.4 The recommendations made in this report are based on the responses to the consultation. 606 responses (29% response rate) were received. The target response rate for consultations is 20%, so the high response in this instance indicates the strong feelings of the local community on the matter.
- 5.5 A package containing 117 photocopied forms from various addresses, all opposing the proposals, was received. The chance of the responses having originated from a representative sample of stakeholders is statistically negligible, so they have been excluded from quantitative analysis of results and have been collectively treated as a petition. It should be noted that their inclusion would not have made a difference to the overall results of the consultation. A further 19 responses were either from outside the consultation area or received after the cut-off point – and so were excluded from analysis.
- 5.6 In addition to the above, a petition of 25 signatures from residents of Lampard Grove, opposing the introduction of parking controls, was sent in to Parking Services during the consultation process.
- 5.7 One of the main objectives of the consultation was to determine whether or not there was support for the introduction of parking controls in the primary area. The response from properties in this area is shown by Table 1, below, and shown as a map in Appendix 1.

Table 1 – Support for parking controls in the primary consultation area

"Would you support the introduction of a CPZ?"	Number of Responses				Percentage				Total
	Yes	No	Not Sure	No response to this question	Yes	No	Not Sure	No response to this question	
Street Name									
Belfast Road	4	24	1	0	14%	83%	3%	0%	29
Lampard Grove	3	16	3	0	14%	73%	14%	0%	22
Listria Park	15	30	3	0	31%	63%	6%	0%	48
Manor Road	18	11	7	1	49%	30%	19%	3%	37
Margaret Road	3	2	0	0	60%	40%	0%	0%	5
Martaban Road	4	6	6	0	25%	38%	38%	0%	16
Stamford Hill	18	32	7	0	32%	56%	12%	0%	57
Windus Road	7	14	8	0	24%	48%	28%	0%	29
Total	72	135	35	1	30%	56%	14%	0%	243

- 5.8 The consultation's findings are summarised in Tables 2 and 3, overleaf, and described in the maps found in Appendices 1 and 2.

Table 2 – Perceived problems with parking in the consultation area

“Do you have a parking problem?”	Number of Responses	“Yes”	“No”	No response to this question
Primary Area	243	48%	50%	2%
Secondary Area	227	48%	52%	1%
Overall	470	48%	51%	1%

Table 3 – Support for parking controls in the consultation area

“Would you support the introduction of a CPZ?”	Number of responses	“Yes”	“Yes” (only if a CPZ is implemented nearby)	“No” (unconditionally)	“Not sure”	No response to this question
Primary Area	243	30%	N/A	56%	14%	0%
Secondary Area	227	32%	11%	35%	20%	2%
Overall	470	31%	5%	46%	17%	1%

- 5.9 Although the *Technical Assessment* showed significant parking stress in the area around the station, less than half of respondents reported a problem with parking. Significantly, there was strong opposition to the introduction of parking controls from respondents in the primary area.
- 5.10 Following a decision by Cabinet, Parking Services would then write to all properties in the area, explaining that decision.
- 5.11 The advent of the Olympics will have particular implications for parking controls in the Borough – before, during and after the Games. An Olympic parking policy, considering the strategic context, will need to be developed by March 2008. All decisions to consult in uncontrolled areas until the Olympics would follow this policy. The policy should be written in the context of the PEP starting a new five year cycle from 2010.

6. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

- 6.1 The cost of the consultation in Stoke Newington was approximately £15k, in line with the estimate presented to Cabinet in November 2006. This consultation was funded within the Parking Services 06/07 revenue budget. No further cost are expected in respect of this consultation.
- 6.2 There are no cost and income assumptions built into the 2007/08 budget for this CPZ, other than the consultation costs so there will be no financial impact.

7. RELATED DECISIONS

- 7.1 The Parking & Enforcement Plan (PEP) was formally adopted by Cabinet on 31st January 2005. The PEP outlines the methodology and policies to which Parking Services should adhere.
- 7.2 The decision to consult in the area around Stoke Newington train station was approved by Cabinet in November 2006.

8. COMMENTS OF THE INTERIM BOROUGH SOLICITOR

- 8.1 The Council has power under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make a traffic management order to establish a controlled parking zone (CPZ). The Council's Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP) commits the Council to a two stage consultation process before implementing a new CPZ.
- 8.2 Where the Council conducts a consultation exercise it is obliged to consult with an open mind and while proposals are at a formative stage. It must then take into account the results of the consultation exercise when making its final decision.
- 8.3 In this case, the Lead Member is recommending that that Cabinet should decide not to implement a CPZ in the Area around Stoke Newington train station but to ask officers to keep the situation under review. His recommendation is made on the basis that the consultation exercise has indicated that there are more consultees opposed to controls than in favour. Members will wish to give due consideration to all the views expressed in response to the consultation exercise in order to satisfy themselves that a decision not to implement a CPZ is reasonable in the circumstances. However, the recommendation appears to be justified by the majority view against a CPZ as well as the recommendation to continue to monitor parking stress in the area.

9. EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment of the consultation forms was undertaken. This indicated no ongoing concerns about the consultation that was conducted but Parking Services will continue to assess the needs of Hackney's diverse population from the customer feedback it receives.

Cllr Alan Laing
Cabinet Member
Neighbourhoods

Fiona Fletcher-Smith
Corporate Director
Neighbourhoods and Regeneration

ENCLOSURES:

- Appendix 1 - Map: Local Stakeholder support for parking controls in the area around Stoke Newington train station
- Appendix 2 - Map: Support for parking controls if one were introduced in nearby streets

Report Originating Officer: Neville Best
Financial considerations: Joseph Abraham-Koranteng
Financial Controller: Tim Sylvester
Borough Solicitor comments: Amanda Kelly

☎ 020 8356 8814
☎ 020 8356 7247
☎ 020 8356 2020
☎ 020 8356 3345

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following documents were relied upon in the preparation of this report:

Description of document	Location	Date
<p>All consultation response forms received by Parking Services for this consultation</p> <p>All door-knocking questionnaires completed for this consultation</p>	<p>Held by Parking Services at 263 Mare Street.</p>	<p>February - April 2007</p>
<p>Analysis of responses for the in-principle consultation on proposed parking controls for the Stoke Newington train station area.</p> <p>Equalities Impact Assessment of the consultation on the Proposed CPZ around Stoke Newington Station</p> <p>Analysis of responses for the door-knocking interviews conducted for proposed parking controls in the area around Stoke Newington train station</p>	<p>Held by Parking Services and available on request</p>	<p>August 2007</p>