LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYDON

REPORT:	**OFFICER DELEGATED NON-KEY DECISION**	
DATE OF DECISION	**20 July 2026**	
REPORT TITLE:	**BENSHAM MANOR AREA – RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON POSSIBLE PARKING CONTROLS**	
CORPORATE DIRECTOR / DIRECTOR:	**VENETIA REID-BAPTISTE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF PLACE**	
LEAD OFFICER:	**DAVID WAKELING. PARKING DESIGN MANAGER** **Email: david.wakeling@croydon.gov.uk** **Telephone: 020 8726 6000 Ext. 28444**	
LEAD MEMBER:	**CLLR ALASDIAR STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR STREETS AND ENFORCEMENT**	
DECISION TAKER:	**VENETIA REID-BAPTISTE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF PLACE**	
AUTHORITY TO TAKE DECISION:	**DELEGATED OFFICER DECISION FROM THE EXECUTIVE MAYOR TO CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF PLACE** Ref: Executive Mayor's Scheme of delegation as updated on 28 June 2025	
KEY DECISION? [Insert Ref. Number if a Key Decision]	**YES**	The notice of the decision will specify that the decision may not be implemented until after 13.00 hours on the 6th working day following the day on which the decision was taken unless referred to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.
CONTAINS EXEMPT INFORMATION?	**NO**	Public
WARDS AFFECTED:	**Bensham Manor and West Thornton**	

1 SUMMARY OF REPORT

1.1 This report considers the results of the informal consultation on possible parking controls in the Bensham Manor area and recommends that the existing

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is introduced into 7 of the 27 roads consulted, subject to formal consultation (public notice) and consideration of any objections received.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 For the reasons set out in the report the Corporate Director of Place is recommended to agree to the proposal to extend parking controls into Penshurst Road, Haslemere Road, Norman Road, Torridge Road, Swain Road, Kemsing Close and Raymead Avenue as illustrated on drawing no. PD / HW / BENSHAM MNR AREA / PROPOSED CPZ BDRY / 01.

2.2 Subject to Part 7 of the Executive Mayor's Scheme of Delegation to the Corporate Director of Place it is recommended to the authority to give notice and further subject to receiving no material objections, to make the necessary Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) and comply with all other publication, procedural and substantive requirements to give effect to the proposal.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 The Council recommends introducing parking controls in 7 of the 27 roads consulted subject to consideration of any objections received to the public notice. It is considered that parking controls will improve parking conditions for residents and visitors whilst improving safety and access.

4. CONTRIBUTION TO EXECUTIVE MAYOR PERRY'S BUSINESS PLAN 2026-2030

Outcome 1: A Cleaner, Safer Croydon.	**Outcome 2: A town centre that is busy, confident and thriving.**	**Outcome 3: Stronger local high streets and economies.**	**Outcome 4: A fair deal for residents.**	**Outcome 5: Better roads, better journeys.**
X		***X***	***X***	***X***

4.1 The provision of parking controls will help to contribute to the Executive Mayor's business plan including priorities in making the streets safer and reducing carbon emissions in the borough by improving access. Safer streets and improved access will also support the regeneration of Croydon's town and district centres.

4.2 The proposals are a direct response to informal consultation with local residents in 27 roads in the Bensham Manor area and recommends parking controls are introduced into 7 roads where there was a positive response from

residents and businesses which contributes to outcome 1 – listening to residents.

4.3

5 DETAIL

5.1 Addresses in 27 roads in the Bensham Manor area between the N1 and Thornton Heath Permit Zones and roads to the northwest of Brigstock Road were informally consulted on whether they were in favour of parking controls. The consultation is the first of 5 areas adjoining the Croydon Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) following parking stress surveys that mostly took place in early 2025 as part of Croydon's Parking Policy adopted in 2023 and the data led approach to considering new parking controls rather than relying on petitions to drive the new CPZ programme.

5.2 The consultation took place between 15 December 2025 and 23 January 2026. The consultation documents comprising a letter, explaining the reasons for the consultation, a Frequently Asked Questions factsheet and a questionnaire are appended to this report. These documents were delivered to 2,207 addresses in 27 roads the Bensham Manor Area and are appended to this report.

5.3 A total of 373 responses were received with 361 responding on-line and 12 returning completed questionnaires by post. This represents a 17% response rate which is typically for an exercise of this type especially in areas where there are a higher proportion of rented properties and those of multiple occupation. A breakdown of the responses is shown below:

Table 1 – Results of consultation:

ROAD NAME	No. OF ADDRESSES	RESPONSES RECEIVED	% RESPONSE	YES	%	NO	%
Bensham Close	12	4	33%	2	50%	2	50%
Bensham Lane	104	18	17%	5	28%	13	72%
Bensham Manor Rd	233	26	11%	9	35%	17	65%
Berne Rd	61	8	13%	4	50%	4	50%
Beverstone Rd	131	27	21%	10	37%	17	63%
Boswell Rd	82	10	12%	2	20%	8	80%
Brigstock Rd	216	13	6%	2	15%	11	85%
Colliers Water Lane	122	5	4%	2	40%	3	60%
Dovercourt Ave	47	4	9%	2	50%	2	50%
Ecclesbourne Rd	168	22	13%	9	41%	13	59%
Geneva Ave	28	8	29%	1	13%	7	87%
Haslemere Rd	93	29	31%	21	72%	8	28%
Kemsing Close	15	2	13%	2	100%	0	0

Kynaston Rd	13	1	8%	0	0	1	100%
Lucerne Rd	66	17	26%	6	35%	11	65%
Lyndhurst Rd	97	14	14%	2	14%	12	86%
Malvern Rd	87	15	17%	1	7%	14	93%
Maplethorpe Rd	57	5	9%	0	0	5	100%
Marion Rd	67	5	7%	1	20%	4	80%
Norman Rd	36	5	14%	3	60%	2	40%
Penshurst Rd	130	63	48%	39	62%	24	38%
Raymead Ave	70	13	19%	11	85%	2	15%
Swain Rd	36	4	11%	4	100%	0	0
Torridge Rd	97	36	37%	28	78%	8	22%
Weybridge Rd	33	2	6%	0	0	2	100%
Woodland Rd	44	13	27%	7	54%	6	46%
Zermatt Rd	62	5	8%	1	20%	4	80%
TOTAL	**2207**	**374**	**17%**	**174**	**47%**	**200**	**53%**

5.4 There was strong support for parking controls in 7 of the 27 roads consulted and particularly for Haslemere Road, Norman Road, Penshurst Road, Raymead Road and Torridge Road where the response rate was high of which at least 60% indicated they were in favour of parking controls. Parking stress surveys generally showed high parking stress in these roads including Kemsing Road and Swain Road with figures of 80% + (expressed as a percentage of vehicles parked over the legitimate parking spaces available).

5.5 Comments from the consultation were also analysed and have been summarised in the two tables below; Table 2 for those in support of parking controls and Table 3 for those not in support of parking controls:

Table 2 – Comments from those in support of parking controls

No.	Comment	No. of comments
1	Controls are needed due to the difficulty in parking and end up parking streets away	92
2	Commuters including hospital staff cause issues including safety concern – controls needed to improve quality of life	15
3	Desperately needed to reduce disputes	8
4	Controls are needed to stop residents reserving spaces using bins which create a hazard	8
5	Longer hours needed such as 8am to 8pm or 24-hour controls	8
6	HMOs, commercial and abandoned vehicles cause problems	5
7	Vehicles are often parked across driveways	4

8	Permits should be free or be cheaper	4
9	Speed humps are needed in the road	4
10	Have dropped kerb so should be able to park across our driveway	3
11	Disabled bays need to be checked to see if they are still needed	2
12	Controls are needed but there should be dispensations for carers	1
13	Controls needed to be extended to all roads in the area with no roads left out	1
14	One-way working will be better	1
15	Controls should be Monday to Friday only	1
16	One hour zone needed to stop commuters	1
17	Proposals will only work with regular enforcement	1
18	Difficulty in crossing Bensham Lane with the parked vehicles	1
19	There are too many new residential developments with no parking	1
20	Individual bays needed	1
21	Visitor permits needed	1
22	Disabled bays needed	1
23	Footway parking bays are needed in Bensham Close	1

Table 3 – Comments from those not supporting parking controls

No.	Comment	No. of comments
1	Permits should be free / cost too high and would be a burden	65
2	Parking controls are not needed and will cause more problems	55
3	Parking controls will make it harder for visitors	6
4	The issues are 24 hours so no point in introducing a Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm scheme.	6
5	Parking controls will make no difference as commuters such as doctors will still pay	4

6	Parking controls should be introduced in all roads otherwise parking will displace into remaining uncontrolled area	3
7	Parking controls will be detrimental to Bosswell Road	2
8	There is a need to support local businesses	2
9	Parking controls will result in drivers using disabled bays outside home	2
10	Scheme should operate Monday to Friday and for 2 hours	2
11	There will be no benefit to residents, the Council should clean the streets	2
12	Parking controls are not needed in Norman Road as residents have driveways	1
13	Enforcement will be an issue	1
14	Parking controls will make it harder for those working unsociable hours	1
15	We have multiple vehicles so parking controls will be detrimental	1

5.5 For the respondents supporting the introduction of parking controls the most common comment made by 92 included those that stated the need for controls due to the difficulty in parking and issues parking in neighbouring roads. Fifteen responses sighted commuters including hospital staff causing the biggest parking issues and other popular comments included the need to reduce disputes and those that use bins to reserve spaces creating a hazard. Eight responses included requests for longer hours of operation of the scheme and 5 concerned with the number of commercial and abandoned vehicles.

5.6 For those against parking controls by far the most common theme was the cost of permits and that the scheme was a money-making project for the Council – 65 responses. Fifty-five responses highlighted that there was no need for parking controls and this would create more issues for residents. Six responses were that the controls would cause issues for visitors and the same number that a 24-hour scheme was required. There was concern from 4 respondents that commuters such as Doctors would pay for parking 3 responded that there would be displacement therefore controls should be extended to the whole area.

5.7 There is strong support for parking controls in 7 of the 27 roads consulted due to the growing problem with parking in this area. Those not supporting controls are generally in roads less affected by parking and where the parking stress surveys showed that levels were lower.

5.8 It is proposed to extend the N1 Permit Zone into Haslemere Road, Penshurst Road, Norman Road, Swain Road and Torridge Road. A small extension of the Thornton Heath CPZ into Kemsing Close is also proposed. There is strong support for parking controls in Raymead Avenue and it is proposed that a standalone scheme should be introduced in this road to improve parking conditions for residents and improve access and safety in the road. The proposed extension area is shown on drawing no. PD / HW / BENSHAM MNR AREA / PROPOSED CPZ BDRY / 01.

5.9 It is recognised that there are potential parking issues in Brigstock Road which is an important transport corridor which comprises residential, business and community centres including a school and library. The response rate from the road was very low at 6% with 85% indicating that they would not support parking controls. It is proposed not to include the road within the Controlled Parking Zone but to undertake a separate study and investigate whether additional parking restrictions and short term 2-hour parking bays, first hour free can be introduced to support local businesses.

6 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 The alternative option would be not to proceed with the proposed parking controls in the 7 roads proposed in this report. However, this would go against the wishes of the majority of residents that indicated in the consultation that they wanted controls to improve parking conditions which the parking stress surveys confirmed that are occurring. Not introducing controls may compromise safety and access for road users and could have a detrimental effect on the Borough.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 The introduction of new waiting restrictions requires the making of a Traffic Management Order. The legal process for making a Traffic Management Order requires formal consultation to take place in the form of Public Notices published in the London Gazette and a local newspaper (Croydon Guardian). Although not a legal requirement, this Council also usually fixes street notices to lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed scheme and writes to occupiers who are directly affected to inform as many people as possible of the proposals.

7.2 Official bodies such as the Fire Brigade, The Pedestrian Association, Age UK and bus operators are consulted under the terms of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Additional bodies consulted included Metropolitan Police, Ambulance Service, Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association, Appy Parking, Croydon Cycling Campaign, Royal Mail, TfL Buses, TfL London Routes and Places and London Travel Watch.

7.3 Once the notices have been published, the public has 21 days to comment or object to the proposals. If no relevant objections are received, the Traffic Management Order may then be made. Any relevant objections received following the giving of public notice will be considered carefully.

8 IMPLICATIONS

8.1.3 For the 2026 / 27 financial year there is a revenue budget of £55k for CPZ undertakings and £82k for yellow lines, parking bays (outside CPZs), footway parking and disabled bays.

8.1.2 The cost of introducing parking controls into 7 roads listed in this report is estimated £49,000. This includes the parking bay and yellow lines markings, signage and a contribution towards the legal costs.

8.1.3 These costs can be contained within the available capital budgets for 2026/27. Eight schemes are being considered this financial year, to date, with a combined cost of £102,300. As of the date of this report none of the above budgets were spent and the batch of schemes that are under consideration at this time will leave £34,700 remaining.

8.1.4 Summary of reports under consideration and the cumulative effect on budgets:

Revenue Position:	Budget £000s	Budget Opening Balance £000s	Cost £000's	Budget Closing Balance £000s
Opening budget for 26/27	£ 137.0			
Budget as at 4/26	£ 137.0			
Proposed introduction of new parking restrictions 1 – Various locations		£137.0	£10.0	£127.0
Proposed introduction of new parking restrictions 2 – Various locations		£127.0	£9.0	£118.0
Proposed introduction of new parking restrictions 3 – Various locations		£118.0	£11.0	£107.0
Proposed Parking Bays – Various Locations		£107.0	£8.0	£99.0
Proposed off-street Car Parks – Windmill Road and Forestdale		£99.0	£9.0	£90.0
Objections to proposed disabled bays		£90.0	£1.5	£88.5
Purley Rd & Rutherwick Rise – Footway parking & yellow line waiting restrictions		£88.5	£4.8	£83.7
Bensham Manor Area – Proposed CPZ extension		£83.7	£49	£34.7
Closing budget				£34.7

8.1.5 Comments approved Petrina Ennis Finance Manager Place.

8.2 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.2.1 Pursuant and subject to Part 7 of the Executive Mayor's Scheme of Delegation in the Council's Constitution, the Corporate Director is authorised to make the recommendations set out in this report.

8.2.2 Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124, Schedule 1 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provide the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.

8.2.3 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The 1996 Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage.

8.2.4 The regulations provide that before making an order, the order making authority shall consider all objections duly made under regulation 8 of the 1996 regulations and not withdrawn (regulation 13). This means that such objections need to be presented to the relevant decision maker and considered by the decision maker before the Order is sought to be made.

8.2.5 By virtue of Section 122(1) of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. Decisions by the Courts show that this duty needs to be balanced in substance against the factors which may point in favour of imposing a restriction on that movement specified in Section 122(2). Broadly, these factors are, the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises, the effect on the amenities of any locality affected, including the importance of regulating and restricting heavy commercial vehicles, the national air quality strategy, the importance of facilitating public service vehicles, and the safety and convenience of people using or wanting to use such vehicles, and any other matters appearing to the authority to be relevant.

8.2.6 The Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at Section 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant Section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.

8.2.7 The Greater London Authority Act 1999 places a duty on each London local authority to have regard to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy when exercising any function. This includes the exercise of its Traffic Management Duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 when deciding whether to make an Order.

8.2.8 The Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) reinforces the legal duty under the RTRA to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic. Part 6 of the TMA affects parking and is accompanied by statutory and operational guidance documents. Councils are legally obliged to 'have regard to' the former, while the latter sets out the principles underlying good parking management and recommends how this can be achieved.

8.2.9 In taking decisions and bringing forward these proposals, regard should also be had to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. In particular, the provisions of Article 1, of the First Protocol protection of property, and Article 8 the right to respect of private and family life, which has broad interpretation and extends to being in public place if there is reasonable expectation of privacy there. This right can be interfered with where lawful, necessary and proportionate to protect a number of other concerns including public safety and health. To the extent that it is considered that they are infringed, the proposals should only go ahead if it is considered that the infringement is necessary and proportionate.

8.2.10 Comments approved on 13.7.26 by Siddhartha Jha, Planning Lawyer on behalf of the Director of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer.

8.2 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

8.3.1 A Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council has a duty when exercising its functions to have "due regard" to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act and advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not. This is the public sector equality duty. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. "Due regard" is the regard that is appropriate in all the circumstances. The weight to be attached to each need is a matter for the Council. As long as the Council is properly aware of the effects and has taken them into account, the duty is discharged.

8.3.2 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed for the proposed parking controls in the Bensham Manor Area as appended to this report.

8.3.3 It is considered that there are no likely adverse equality impacts arising from the proposed parking controls. Parking controls regulate parking, reduce parking stress and provide greater opportunities for disabled blue badge holders to be able to park as they can park for free and for unlimited time in our shared-use Permit / Payment bays and for up to 3 hours on yellow line waiting restrictions when loading restrictions are not active. No loading restrictions are proposed in this report.

9 APPENDICES

9.1 Drawings as attached.

10 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

10.1 Consultation documents.

11 URGENCY

11.1 N/a