

**Report for:** **Traffic and Road Safety  
Advisory Panel**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	12 July 2022
<b>Subject:</b>	Parking Management Schemes Programme 2022 / 23
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Dipti Patel – Corporate Director, Place
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Anjana Patel – Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	No
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<p><b>Appendix A:</b> Borough wide map of Controlled Parking Schemes</p> <p><b>Appendix B:</b> Proposed priority list for 2022/23</p> <p><b>Appendix C:</b> Schedule of requests and significant Issues within borough</p> <p><b>Appendix D:</b> Controlled Parking Schemes – Scheme Development Process</p> <p><b>Appendix E:</b> Maps of areas to be considered on proposed priority list</p> <p><b>Appendix F:</b> List of CPZs and operating hours in the borough</p> <p><b>Appendix G:</b> progress on schemes from 2021-22</p>

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides information about the identification, prioritisation, development and implementation of parking management schemes in Harrow. It informs Members about requests for parking schemes received by the Council and also recommends a programme of work for 2022/23 based on the Council's agreed assessment criteria.

### Recommendation:

That any substantive new requests received to undertake a controlled parking scheme or review that are not included within the agreed programme or priority list in **Appendices B and C** to this report be referred to the Panel for consideration.

### Resolved to RECOMMEND (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety),

That:

1. The list of proposed parking management schemes for 2022/23 as shown in **Appendix B** be approved;
2. Scheme design and public consultation on the parking management schemes listed in **Appendix B** and the plans detailed in **Appendix E** be undertaken;
3. The proposed parking management schemes listed in **Appendix B** be implemented subject to further reports being provided on the outcomes of public and statutory consultations and receiving approval from the Portfolio Holder to proceed;

### Reason: (For recommendations)

To recommend to the Portfolio Holder the proposed Parking Management Schemes Programme for the 2022/23 financial year.

## Section 2 – Report

### Introduction

- 2.1 The annual review of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and other parking schemes generally takes place in February of each year. However, due to staffing and resourcing issues this was rescheduled for 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The annual review is the means by which the parking management schemes programme for the forthcoming financial year is set. This takes account of progress to date, available resources, budgets, new contract rates and current issues.

- 2.2 The Council's programme of CPZ schemes / reviews has historically been demand led and addresses parking pressures highlighted by local residents and businesses. This report includes assessments of existing CPZs and requests for new or extended CPZs, including petitions and other representations received in the last 12 months.
- 2.3 At the Council's cabinet meeting in July 2019 Cabinet agreed a new Parking Management and Enforcement Strategy (PMES). The strategy sets out the Council's approach to parking control and enforcement in the borough and will ensure that the parking policies in the approved third Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) are effectively taken forward to address the significant environmental and economic challenges faced by Harrow residents and businesses.
- 2.4 **Appendix A** is a borough map showing the locations of existing CPZ's in the borough. CPZs cover approximately (37%) of the length of roads in the borough road network and have been introduced over the last 25 years as a consequence of the increasing pressure to park on the public highway.
- 2.5 **Appendix B** shows the programme of work recommended for 2022/23 which consists of on-going schemes that are carried forward from the previous year (2021/22) to completion, as well as new schemes added from the priority list following an assessment. The estimated cost of the programme is shown and takes into account the Council's available staff resources and capital programme allocation for 2022/23.
- 2.6 **Appendix C** provides a priority list of areas in the borough with current parking issues and includes all areas which have not been included in the programme to date as well as any new issues that have been reported since March 2021.
- 2.7 Progress with implementing the 2021/22 CPZ programme of work agreed by this Panel in March 2021 is shown in **Appendix G**.

## **Options considered**

There are strong strategic reasons for introducing CPZs, as well as the local need to manage parking problems and parking demand as effectively as possible. CPZs are a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport policies. They form part of the Mayor for London's Transport Strategy, West London Regional Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the Council's local transport strategy in the form of a LIP.

## **Background**

- 2.8 CPZs incorporating residents parking schemes improve safety, access and residential amenity and assist management of parking in town centres to ensure more short stay shopper / visitor spaces are available. Restraint based parking standards in new developments, as required by national and regional policy cannot be effective unless on-street parking controls exist, otherwise parking can simply take place in local streets rather than reducing car use. CPZs also allow the introduction of "resident permit restricted" developments, which is in line with the strategy of reducing car parking provision at sites well served by public

transport. **Appendix F** provides details of the current CPZ`s and their operational hours within the borough.

- 2.9 Introducing parking control schemes also has a beneficial effect on air quality and public health. Air quality modelling in Harrow has identified road traffic as the main source of nitrogen dioxide and a major source of fine particle emissions within the borough and measures to restrain unnecessary car journeys will therefore help to reduce emissions from road traffic as well as reducing public health issues related to poor air quality. In addition, parking restraint measures encourage greater use of sustainable transport modes which will increase the number of people walking and cycling and lead to more active and healthy lifestyles.
- 2.10 Parking is not a static situation but dynamic and constantly changing. This can be due to factors such as new development, conversion of dwellings, changes to rail fares, economic situation. Existing schemes designed over 10 years ago to mitigate the problems at that time may now no longer be appropriate for the area covered or times of control.
- 2.11 The only available option to address parking demand pressures is to take forward parking management schemes because they are a key component of local and national transport strategies. These schemes make a significant contribution to the wider aspirations of improving safety, reducing congestion and encouraging modal shift and sustainable transport.
- 2.12 Any adverse impacts of introducing parking controls on the general public is mitigated by undertaking extensive public consultation and statutory consultation as required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, namely advertising the intended proposal by way of a public notice published in the London Gazette, local press and at diverse visible locations on site where the measures are proposed, seeking majority support for the proposals – even in some cases where objections have been received, and consulting with local ward councillors and TARSAP prior to consideration by the PH.

## **Parking management schemes**

### Area based controlled parking zones – how they work

- 2.13 A CPZ is an area of highway where parking is restricted and controlled under Road Traffic legislation during a specified period of the day. At its simplest, a CPZ is normally implemented via a combination of yellow lines and parking bays. The operational hours are specified on traffic signs located in and around the CPZ indicating the nature of restrictions and parking areas. Other parking restrictions operating at different operational hours can also exist within the zone, for instance on main roads, which will have separate traffic signing.
- 2.14 The main benefit of CPZs is that they provide preferential parking access for permit holders (e.g. residents and their visitors) during the operational hours of the zone. Whilst the zone hours in some instances may be for a short period during the day, this can still have the effect of protecting residential areas from

long stay duration parking by commuters or local workers. The longer the duration of the controls the more effective the CPZ will be.

- 2.15 Local residents who live within the designated CPZ boundary can apply for a parking permit to allow them to park on the road in the CPZ during the days and hours of operation. Marked parking bays can also be used by visitors who are displaying a valid visitors parking permit which the eligible residents can purchase for their visitors to use.
- 2.16 In commercial areas or shopping centres “pay and display” bays are used which allow for short term paid parking for customers during the working day. For flexibility some bays are designated for shared use, which allow them to be used by both permit holders and non-residents who can purchase a “pay and display” ticket.
- 2.17 Businesses may also purchase permits for business operational purposes only. These are strictly controlled and are limited to vehicles connected to the business, such as delivery vans for example. In practice very few business permits are issued for this purpose within CPZs. They cannot be used for employee’s workplace parking.
- 2.18 Other types of permits that can be issued are for doctors, traders and health care workers but there are strict eligibility criteria in place to control their use.
- 2.19 Disabled blue badge holders are allowed by statute to park free of charge in all parking bays except those designated for a special purpose, such as doctor’s parking bays for example.

Examples of different Permit Parking schemes used in Harrow



- 2.20 Permit holders only past this point signs are used to indicate a whole area which is used by permit holders only (see above). This restriction is communicated on signage at the point of entry to the area, rather than at intervals along the road.
- 2.21 Holders of a permit shown on this sign can park within the area, except where yellow lines indicate a waiting restriction is in place. These will be signed separately.
- 2.22 Permit parking only areas are most often used in confined locations such as dead-end streets or in conservation areas, such as Harrow on the Hill, where the use of

road markings and signage would have a negative impact on the historical nature and aesthetics of the conservation area.



- 2.23 In a controlled parking zone (CPZ) the kerbside is marked with either yellow lines or parking bays showing where it is safe to park.
- 2.24 The operational times of the CPZ are shown on the large zone entry signs which are located on roads entering the zone (see above).
- 2.25 The hours of control are also shown on the parking bay signs and pay and display machines. On all roads that exit from a zone there will also be placed a zone ends sign.
- 2.26 During the controlled parking zone operational times a driver must display the relevant permit, ticket or voucher to park.

#### CPZs - schemes with waiting restrictions only

- 2.27 There are some schemes in the borough which have historically used waiting restrictions only (yellow lines) in situations where there is no demand for on-street residents' parking. Whilst these schemes have the advantage of being cheaper because fewer signs are required (signs don't need to be repeated within the zone where the restrictions are the same as those shown on the entry/exit points) such schemes can disadvantage residents who do need access to on-street parking for themselves or their visitors.
- 2.28 These types of schemes penalise anyone with a legitimate reason to park in the road including local residents and often generate complaints. There is in practice no difference between a scheme that has yellow lines only and one that includes yellow lines and permit parking bays because the impact on long stay parking is exactly the same. The difference is that a scheme with bays facilitates some parking during the controlled hours to benefit residents.

2.29 The PMES, therefore, requires that any new schemes proposed will include parking bays where practicable to ensure all residents' needs are catered for as set out in the PMES.

#### CPZs - standardisation of operational hours

2.30 There is an extensive amount of variation in CPZ operational hours which can often be confusing to the motorist hence in the PMES it is required that parking schemes are standardised around three basic model schemes to resolve the main types of parking problems encountered.

2.31 The three basic standard solutions adopted within the Council's PMES are as follows:

- Commuter / workplace parking – zones that operate for a minimum of 4 hours in the middle of the working day (e.g., Mon – Fri, 10am – 2pm)
- Commercial centres / local amenities – zones that operate during the working day, typically 10 -11 hours per day, and facilitates business activity (e.g. Mon – Sat, 8am – 6:30pm)
- Pressures that extend beyond the working day in the evenings or weekends, typically 12+ hours per day (e.g., Mon – Sun, 8am – midnight)

2.32 All new parking schemes are now developed around these three options. This policy will ensure that there is an on-going consistency in the schemes designed and will help to minimise any negative impacts of parking displacement between CPZ zones.

2.33 Any request for very short duration schemes operating between one to three hours a day over one or two separate periods during the day will no longer be taken forward. The PMES has highlighted this policy because there are a very high proportion of short duration schemes across the borough that create a significant problem for undertaking operational enforcement. This means that there is only a limited resource available to oversee a large area of restrictions in the borough within a limited timeframe. This is very impractical and ultimately leads to areas not receiving sufficient enforcement, higher non-compliance with parking controls and the inefficient deployment of enforcement resources.

2.34 Where requests for CPZs are received from streets to be added to an existing zone which already operates for one to three hours duration per day then any proposals must be taken forward using one of the standard operating hours indicated above. In this situation the opportunity to amend the hours in the existing zone will be taken in order to standardise hours and this will be offered to neighbouring streets. Any streets interested in changing should then be included within the proposed scheme under development.

2.35 It is understood that residents in neighbouring streets across the wider zone can only be consulted on the possibility of changing the operating hours and can choose not to change because this would be subject to statutory consultation; however, this approach does set out the only possible method for amending these very short duration zones to standardised operating hours.

- 2.36 It is expected that this will be a gradual process because of the need to undertake statutory consultations and the fact that residents will need to agree the changes before any changes are introduced.

#### CPZs – use of zones and sub zones

- 2.37 Sometimes areas with parking issues experience different types of problems within the same area and do often need different solutions. The creation of different sub zones within the same zone is one way to allow the containment of parking to a specific area and also to introduce different operational hours and times.
- 2.38 The design of multi zone schemes does need to be carefully considered as these can have unintended consequences such as causing parking displacement or can make understanding the regulations in force more confusing for motorists. Therefore, zone segregation needs to be based on a clear rationale that introduces controls that are relevant to the parking problems being encountered and does not cause any detrimental effects on existing CPZs or surrounding areas.
- 2.39 Another consideration is that resident / visitor permits can only apply to one specific zone and so the creation of a number of smaller zones within a scheme will limit the size of an area that permit holders can park in and prevent them from parking in neighbouring zones. This will reduce any flexibility to accommodate variations in parking demand on-street and so very small zones are generally avoided and only used in exceptional circumstances.
- 2.40 The main principle in designing zones is to ensure that separate zones are only used where it is necessary to separate different groups of permit holders with different parking problems. Typical examples are as follows:
- In residential areas with a station - a small subzone around the station may be created within the wider zone, this prevents resident permit holders from across the wider zone from internally commuting to the station and improves parking access for those residents living close to the station
  - Different operational hours are required within a zone for different levels of demand – for example a large zone comprising of a commercial centre, and a wider surrounding residential area may need to be split into two subzones, the central commercial centre may have working day restrictions and the surrounding residential areas may have shorter duration parking restrictions required to deter workplace parking

#### CPZs - reducing street clutter

- 2.41 The Council has implemented an alternative style of signing and lining for some CPZs where conventional signing and lining could have a detrimental impact on the street scene. This arrangement reduces the number of signs and road markings required and are suited to locations such as cul-de-sacs, short sections of road, streets with limited footway width and streets in conservation areas.



- 2.42 It is not necessary in these cases to include marked parking bays to indicate areas for permit parking because any unmarked areas of kerbside parking space within the zone are therefore deemed eligible for permit parking. The only signing and lining used in these schemes are the CPZ entrance / exit signing that indicates permit holders parking only past this point during the specified times of operation. Yellow lines are still used to indicate restricted areas where it is necessary to keep junctions, bends narrow sections of road and turning heads clear of parked vehicles.

#### CPZs - safety at road junctions

- 2.43 The occurrence of dangerous or obstructive parking has continued in recent years due to increasing vehicle ownership and usage. It continues to represent a large proportion of complaints from residents or businesses and continues to be of concern to the emergency services and council refuse collection service. Where these problems occur within CPZs it is typically because operational hours have a very short duration (e.g., limited to 1 -2 hours) and cannot provide controls throughout the busy times of the day or evenings and weekends.
- 2.44 To address this “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are now being included at all junctions and bends within proposed zones and immediately surrounding CPZ zones.
- 2.45 The Highway Code states that drivers should not park within 10m of a junction and this distance is used as a guide to developing proposals. The actual distance required may vary subject to an assessment based on using a computer simulation programme to determine the swept path of a large vehicle such as a refuse vehicle or fire appliance so that only the necessary space is restricted.
- 2.46 Although the Council is under no requirement to provide on-street parking this process allows the Council to maximise as much on-street parking as possible without causing any obstruction.

#### CPZs - public perception of schemes

- 2.47 There is a public perception that CPZs will increase on street parking provision when, in practice, as parking pressures increase it might not always be possible to make space for all the vehicles that residents’ own. Whilst schemes are designed to maximise on street parking space, the overall quantity of spaces provided during the controlled hours may reduce due to the need to apply design standards such as yellow lines at junctions for example. This is of course compensated for by the fact that demand to park also reduces because vehicles that are ineligible to obtain permits are excluded, meaning that the available space is dedicated to permit holders (residents).
- 2.48 This is of particular relevance in residential roads with private off-street parking where there are many vehicle crossovers. In these situations, the application of the parking design standards may mean that a bay marked in between vehicle crossovers may only be able to accommodate one or two vehicles after taking account of the clearance required for vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of accesses.

- 2.49 This, together with waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions, bends, narrow sections of road and turning heads can lead to CPZs being more contentious with residents wanting the beneficial effects but not wanting any disadvantages. Consequently, the development of CPZ schemes is very customer focussed and resource intensive in order to deal with these issues.
- 2.50 Increasingly during consultation, residents respond that they consider the Council is trying to make money from schemes rather than to try to assist those residents who are requesting help. It is observed in consultation responses in recent years that references to money have increased and this is influencing people's decision making.
- 2.51 However, the position nationally under UK legislation is that where Council's introduce CPZs they are entitled to levy reasonable charges to act as a form of parking demand management and are allowed to reinvest any revenue from charges or penalty charges into the operational management of the schemes in order to ensure that they work effectively. The Council's parking enforcement activity is funded from this source of revenue.
- 2.52 Ultimately the public and statutory consultation processes ensure that residents can take account of the cost of having a scheme and decide if they support or oppose proposals. Decisions are made based on a majority view being demonstrated, unless other factors dictate.

#### Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme (LSPP)

- 2.53 In addition to the development and implementation of CPZs, an initiative to progress localised improvements (usually outside of the main CPZ areas) has been undertaken in recent years known as the Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme.
- 2.54 Examples of this type of initiative are where refuse vehicles and the emergency services have reported persistent access difficulties and "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions, bends, narrow sections of road and turning head, have been used as remedial measures. These schemes are generally outside the scope of CPZs and are a valuable initiative primarily targeted at improving road safety and facilitating adequate vehicular access.

#### Parking schemes funded from development contributions

- 2.55 Additional funding from developer contributions that could support the parking management programme can be secured via a section 106 legal agreement when planning applications are considered. Where a transport assessment indicates that a development is likely to effect on-street parking in the vicinity then funding to introduce parking controls to mitigate the impact of the development can be required.
- 2.56 The Council reviews planning applications and where appropriate, secures contributions from developers in order to address potential parking impacts and/or the public's aspirations for parking controls in the vicinity of development. These contributions can be used as set out in the legal agreement and are specific to the area affected by the development.

- 2.57 Additionally, members may consider that a particular parking issue in their ward is of high importance and may seek to take forward measures using Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy funds (NCIL) independently of the capital funding allocation for the Parking Management Programme.
- 2.58 In 2017 the Major Developments Panel approved a policy of allocating 15% of CIL receipts raised in each ward (except where received from within the geographical definition of the Harrow and Wealdstone Opportunity Area), back to the respective ward in which it was generated to be used on infrastructure projects that take account of the views of the communities in which development has taken place. Parking is often an issue affected by development and of local importance.
- 2.59 Any projects put forward by ward members would need to be assessed against agreed criteria to show compliance with the CIL regulations and also demonstrate the extent of consultation and level of community support. The Planning Service would assess the suitability of any requests.

### **Programme development**

- 2.60 The programme of schemes in **Appendix B** is developed by including those projects where the greatest areas of need are identified and where the assessment indicates the highest score.

### Assessment of service requests

- 2.61 To determine these areas of need, all requests for schemes or actions to tackle parking problems received by the Council are assessed against an agreed set of assessment factors. This allows the requests to be assessed and prioritised in a consistent and fair manner. At the Panel meeting in November 2012, the Panel agreed the Transport Programme Entry Procedure which formalised these assessment factors and a methodology making the process more transparent.
- 2.62 The report sets out for each category of transport related work the key factors that are used in assessing and prioritising the requests for parking schemes. In summary these are as follows:

<b>Area parking management schemes</b>	
Assessment factor	Typical areas of priority
a) Key stakeholders	Emergency services / Local services / Residents petitions
b) External factors likely to increase demand for parking	Parking displacement, development impact, commercial activity, etc.
c) How long since the location was last considered for the programme	Longer duration since last evaluation
d) Position on the current programme	Longer duration without implementation
e) Number of requests in close proximity within the location	Higher number of requests

<b>Minor localised parking issues (LSPP)</b>	
Assessment factor	Typical areas of priority
a) Key stakeholders	Emergency services / Local services / Residents petitions
b) Traffic accidents and speed	High numbers of accidents / high vehicle speeds
c) Vehicle flows	High vehicular flows
d) Pedestrian flows	High flow areas like shopping parades, schools
e) Level of accessibility and visibility	Continuous obstruction of sightlines
f) Other local factors with an impact	Adverse impact on bus services, the disabled

### Scheme reviews

- 2.63 The time taken to investigate and design a CPZ is influenced heavily by the extent of public and statutory consultation undertaken. A medium to large area scheme will typically take 12 -18 months from inception to completion.
- 2.64 In the past the Council had a policy of undertaking an automatic follow up review of a new scheme within 6-12 months in order to address any issues arising from implementation, the Panel however agreed to discontinue this process in February 2012. This was because the work involved in undertaking the follow up review was just as extensive as implementing the original scheme and was causing other schemes on the priority list to wait an excessive amount of time to be included in the works programme.
- 2.65 Public concern continues to be expressed that it takes too long to implement measures and that the programme is slow to respond to specific needs. At the current level of funding (£300k per annum) the Panel therefore agreed that any follow up scheme reviews will now only be considered where substantive issues are reported to the Panel and the Panel agrees in consultation with the PH to a change to the approved programme to include a review.
- 2.66 The reviews of existing schemes that are included in the programme will generally be areas where an existing CPZ has been operating for a long period of time and new parking pressures and operational issues are being highlighted. This is usually where the original scheme design is no longer suitable, and circumstances have changed since the original implementation. Typical issues concern the extent of the zone, operational times and types of controls in place.
- 2.67 In February 2015 the Panel considered a review of the existing scheme development and implementation process for area-based parking management schemes and agreed a revised process. **Appendix D** shows the currently approved scheme development and implementation process.

## Scheme design

- 2.68 The public consultation (stage 2 of the process in **Appendix D**) is one of the most important steps in developing a scheme and is where residents receive a consultation leaflet explaining proposals, a questionnaire with a set of questions and an opportunity to give comments. The results of public consultations are used to develop the scheme design, particularly zone extents, sub zones and operational hours.
- 2.69 There are some established principles to analysing consultation results and using this information to develop schemes as follows:
- The proportion of people responding to a consultation varies significantly based on the type of area. In order to be representative a minimum of 10% is preferable, however, if the response rate is lower than that then the local ward councillors and Portfolio Holder will be consulted on how to proceed. Decisions on schemes will always be based on the information provided by those people that choose to respond to consultation.
  - The extents of a CPZ zone are established in an area that reflects where a majority of consultees support particular options. Roads are analysed on a road-by-road basis initially to establish where areas of support for proposals are. One consultation response per property is permitted to ensure fairness.
  - Zones need to be holistic and so need to be formed from groups of roads and part sections of roads that are grouped closely together and share similar views. The results in individual streets are therefore not intended as an absolute decision on whether a street is included in a scheme or not. The designers look for common areas of majority support to demonstrate a case to take forward a proposed scheme.
  - Where the results indicate that a road does not support a scheme but also indicates that they would change their mind if a neighbouring road demonstrated support, then those roads may be included within a scheme. Questionnaires include a question to indicate this preference because it is recognised that parking displacement can occur from neighbouring roads with parking controls, and it is better to include roads that are exposed to this risk rather than leave them out.
- 2.70 The analysis undertaken to recommend a particular scheme is therefore not an exact science. It is based on a combination of a technical review of the consultation results by officers and a meeting with members where they can exercise their discretion to review the results and take account of their own knowledge and understanding of community views.

## Scheme Costs

- 2.71 The estimated costs of schemes shown in this report anticipate the likely costs of scheme development and implementation based on best practice and experience with delivering the programme in recent years. There is always a degree of variability in costs due to the requirement to take account of the results of public consultation and any resultant scheme design changes. The estimates take account of:
- a) Staff time in carrying out consultation and scheme designs including site surveys. This includes all correspondence, telephone and personal visits to the civic centre or site.
  - b) The preparation, printing and distribution of all consultation material, analysis of data, updating of website.
  - c) Arranging and staffing exhibitions where appropriate, including venue costs and display equipment (not during pandemic).
  - d) Preparation of reports and other documents such as briefing notes
  - e) Drafting and advertising draft traffic orders and orders of making.
  - f) Replacing existing CPZ signs (where relevant) that do not contain the operation times following the commitment by Cabinet a number of years ago.
  - g) Setting out and implementing scheme of lining and or signing.
  - h) Dealing with related complaints, freedom of information requests and comments both pre and post implementation.
- 2.72 There are significant costs associated with developing a scheme in terms of design and consultation in addition to the actual implementation of any physical works on the streets.

### **Footway parking**

- 2.73 Parking on footways or footpaths (pavements, grass verges, alleyways, etc), or in front of dropped footways or raised carriageways (for example driveways or pedestrian crossings) is prohibited on almost all streets in London at all times, including at night and weekends. If drivers park in such a way, then they could receive a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) – even if only one or two wheels are on the footway.
- 2.74 There are a few streets where footway parking is prevalent, and it will be necessary to either consider schemes to formalise footway parking where there is sufficient width to do so or enforce the prohibition. In many cases this will involve the implementation of formalised footway parking bays and associated signage which would be subject to consultation.

## **Parking management programme 2022 / 23**

- 2.75 To summarise, this report provides a comprehensive explanation of the types of schemes, sources of funding, assessment processes, costs and development processes required to deliver the parking management programme and is intended to assist the Panel in understanding how the programme has been developed.
- 2.76 A summary of the current parking issues within the various locations of the borough highlighted in the proposed programme is shown in **Appendix C** and has been organised in order of priority based on the programme entry system of assessment factors. This will assist the panel to refer quickly to the relevant issues in each particular area and relative priority when considering the programme.
- 2.77 The proposed programme for 2022/23 can be seen in **Appendix B** and is based on completing on-going projects rolled over from last year and commencing new projects in priority order as allowed by the £300k budget. Maps of the new projects proposed to be added to the programme with indicative consultation areas are shown in **Appendix E**. Members are recommended to ask the PH to give approval to implement this programme and approve the consultation areas.
- 2.78 Any surplus funds as a result of final scheme costs being lower than estimated and or schemes being abandoned will result in the next scheme on the priority list being selected to be taken forward following approval from the PH.

### **Staffing / workforce**

- 2.79 The delivery of schemes in the programme of investment will be undertaken by existing staff resources within the Traffic, Highways & Asset Management team supported by technical consultants as required.

### **Ward Councillors' comments**

None, because this report impacts all wards.

### **Performance Issues**

- 2.80 The implementation of schemes in the programme of investment will support the wider aims, objectives and targets in the Transport Local Implementation Plan 3 (LIP3) and help to deliver Harrow's corporate priorities and in particular building a better Harrow.

### **Environmental Issues**

- 2.81 The current Transport Local Implementation Plan 3 (LIP3) has undergone a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which has indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the proposed programme of investment.

- 2.82 Key population and human health benefits include reducing reliance on travel by car, reducing casualties, reducing congestion, encouraging active travel and improving air quality.

### **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.83 The delivery of each scheme in the programme of investment will be subject to separate risk assessments.
- 2.84 There is a requirement to undertake a design risk assessment during scheme development under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations in order to manage any potential health and safety risks.

### **Procurement Implications**

- 2.85 Where needed, consultants and contractors will be procured to investigate, develop and deliver some proposals. This is business as usual. The work will be procured in line with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

### **Legal implications**

- 2.86 The programme of schemes highlighted in this report will all involve introducing restrictions or controls on parking that require a legal process to be undertaken before they can be physically implemented.
- 2.87 Subject to statutory consultation requirements, the Council has powers to introduce, implement and change CPZs under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2.88 Transport for London (TfL) has not provided funding specifically for CPZs as it considers that these should be funded by boroughs because they have powers to raise income from the local administration and enforcement of parking schemes. Therefore, TfL only funds parking measures where they form a part of an identified traffic or transport scheme or initiative in the agreed Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment.
- 2.89 The approved allocation for 2022/23 from the Harrow Capital programme is £300k. The proposed programme of CPZ schemes is shown in **Appendix B** and is divided between area-controlled parking zones (£240k) and the local safety parking schemes programme (£60k).



## Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

2.90 The LIP sets out the relevant transport policies and objectives of the Council and was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment which identified that there was no negative impact on any of the protected groups. The transport mitigations in the report accord with the principles of the Council's LIP. Typical benefits are as follows:

Protected characteristic	Benefit
Sex	Mothers with young children and elderly people generally benefit most from controlled parking as the removal of all-day commuters frees up spaces closer to residents' homes. These groups are more likely to desire parking spaces with as short a walk to their destination as possible.
Disability	The retention of double yellow lines at junctions will ensure level crossing points are kept clear.  Parking bays directly outside homes, shops and other local amenities will make access easier, particularly for blue badge holders for long periods of the day.
Age	Fewer cars parked on-street in residential roads will improve the environment for children. Parking controls can help reduce the influx of traffic into an area, and therefore reduce particulates and air pollution, to which children are particularly sensitive.

## Council Priorities

2.91 This report supports 'putting residents first'.

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

### Statutory Officer: Jessie Man

Signed on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

**Date: 29 June 2022**

### Statutory Officer: Kevin Breslin

Signed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

**Date: 4 July 2022**

## **Section 3 - Procurement Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Nimesh Mehta**

Signed by the Head of Procurement

**Date: 30 June 2022**

## **Section 3 – Corporate Director Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Tony Galloway**

Signed on behalf of the Corporate Director - Place

**Date: 7 July 2022**

## **Mandatory Checks**

**Ward Councillors notified:** No, as the report affects all wards.

**EqlA carried out:** YES (Transport Local Implementation Plan)

## **Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

### **Contact:**

Nicolina Cooper, Interim Head of Traffic, Highways and Asset Management

[Nicolina.Cooper@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:Nicolina.Cooper@harrow.gov.uk)

Akin Akinrujomu, Interim Team Manager, Transportation

Tel:07708835467; E-mail: [Akin.Akinrujomu@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:Akin.Akinrujomu@harrow.gov.uk)

Sajjad Farid, Infrastructure Engineer, Parking

Tel:07761406031; E-mail: [Sajjad.Farid@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:Sajjad.Farid@harrow.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers:**

Transport Local Implementation Plan

Parking Management and Enforcement Strategy 2019

<https://www.harrow.gov.uk/road-maintenance-travel/harrow-transport-policy-documents>