## Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel AGENDA

## DATE: Thursday 29 November 2012

## TIME: $\quad 7.30$ pm

## VENUE: Committee Rooms 1 \& 2,

Harrow Civic Centre

## MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor Mrinal Choudhury
Councillors:

Ajay Maru
Jerry Miles (VC)
David Perry

Advisers:

Susan Hall
Mrs Vina Mithani
John Nickolay

Mr A Blann
Mr A Wood

## Reserve Members:

1. Mano Dharmarajah
2. Kairul Kareema Marikar
3. Sachin Shah
4. Krishna Suresh
5. Manji Kara
6. Yogesh Teli
7. Simon Williams

Contact: Manize Talukdar, Democratic \& Electoral Services Officer Tel: 02084241323 E-mail: manize.talukdar@harrow.gov.uk

## AGENDA - PART I

## 1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.
Reserve Members may attend meetings:-
(i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
(ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
(iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
(iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:
(a) all Members of the Panel;
(b) all other Members present.
3. MINUTES (Pages 1-16)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## 4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 51 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

## 5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 49 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

## 6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution).
7. INFORMATION REPORT: PETITIONS RELATING TO 1. WEALD SCHOOL OBJECTION TO 20 MPH ZONE 2. PARKING IN SOUTHBOURNE CLOSE RAYNERS LANE 3. OBJECTION TO PARKING PROPOSALS CHURCH STREET, PINNER (Pages 17-30)

Report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise.
8. PINNER ROAD/COUNTY ROADS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - PROPOSED PHASE 2 EXTENSION (Pages 31-74)

Report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise.
9. CANONS PARK AREA PARKING REVIEW STATUTORY CONSULTATION (Pages 75-168)

Report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise.
10. TRANSPORT PROGRAMME ENTRY PROCEDURE (Pages 169-210)

Report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise.
11. INFORMATION REPORT: TRAFFIC AND PARKING SCHEMES PROGRAMME UPDATE (Pages 211-240)

Report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise.
12. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Which cannot otherwise be dealt with.

## AGENDA - PART II - NIL

This page is intentionally left blank

## TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 3 OCTOBER 2012

| Chairman: | Councillor Mrinal C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Councillors: | * Susan Hall <br> * Ajay Maru <br> * Jerry Miles | * Mrs Vina Mithani <br> * John Nickolay <br> * David Perry |
| Advisers: | $\dagger$ Mr A Blann <br> * Mr L Gray | * Mr A Wood |
| In attendance: (Councillors) | Stephen Greek Joyce Nickolay Christopher Noyce Bill Phillips | Minute 142 <br> Minute 139 <br> Minute 139 <br> Minute 140 |

## 132. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance.
In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 40.1-part 4D of the Constitution, the Panel agreed that the following Members could speak at the meeting:

Councillor Stephen Greek, Councillor Joyce Nickolay, Councillor Christopher Noyce and Councillor Bill Phillips.

## 133. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:
Agenda Item 7 and 8 - Petitions Report; Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone Review - Results of Statutory Consultation

Councillor Susan Hall declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she sat on the Board of the London Fire Brigade and was Ward Councillor for Hatch End. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 8 - Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone Review Results of Statutory Consultation

Councillor Mrinal Choudhury declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Local Authority appointed governor at Elmgrove Primary and Nursery School and Ward Councillor for Burnt Oak. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was Ward Councillor for Kenton West. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

## Agenda Item 11 - Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme Update

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Local Authority appointed governor at Weald Infant and Junior Schools. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

## 134. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
135. Public Questions

RESOLVED: To note that the following public questions were received:
1.

Questioner: Mr Michael Rosenfeld, Chairman, Gayton Road Management Company

Asked of: Councillor Mrinal Choudhury, Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

Question: 'In preparing a report for this meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel on the petition presented to the June meeting of the Panel asking for parking restrictions to be imposed by Harrow Council on the Knowles Court access road, has any officer of the

Council visited the site and seen the parking problem that now exists in order to prepare the report? The tone of the report seems remarkably complacent.'
Answer
(provided by the
Chairman):

Thank you for your question. I can confirm that the officer has visited the site on several occasions and is aware of the parking problems that exist. The report is designed to bring the facts to this panel so that we are aware of the local concern and therefore the tone may appear business like. I can assure you that the panel does take parking issues very seriously, however, I must point out that unfortunately there are very large number of other roads across the borough with similar problems that also need to be considered. When this panel next considers the priorities for funding in next year's programme of works, officers will take into consideration the very valid concerns that have been raised.

## Supplementary Question:

Answer (provided by the Chairman):

Are the Panel prepared for the embarrassment and the loss of reputation that will be caused to the Council if a death were to occur as a result of emergency vehicles not being able to gain access to the flats due because of displaced parking caused by the parking restrictions imposed in Gayton Road by the Council?

The Council is obliged to follow a set procedure and carry out consultations and ensure funds are available before parking restrictions can be implemented in an area. These streets will be considered for parking controls in early 2013. Please note that further clarification will be provided about this issue by officers under agenda item 7, the petitions report.
2.

Questioner: Ann Freeman
Asked of: Councillor Mrinal Choudhury, Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

Question: 'Concerning Item 2.27 of the Information Report and the decision to allow one side of Devonshire Road to be in the extended Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and not the other although the majority count was against joining the CPZ, is it legal under Harrow Council rules to change the terms of a consultation after it is closed?'

Answer (provided by the Chairman):

Thank you for your question. In September 2011 officers, Ward Councillors, members of this panel and the Portfolio Holder for Community and Environment considered the results of the public consultation on whether residents supported a CPZ in their road.

The results in the Northern section of Devonshire Road showed strong support for a CPZ on the eastern side but not on the western side. The decision also took into account the supplementary question about whether residents might wish to change their mind if an adjoining road decided to support a CPZ and the comments expressed in consultation responses. At the time of drafting the questionnaire, opposing views on opposite sides of the road could not be foreseen.

The Council wishes to support the majority views of residents and this is why the decision to progress free parking bays to statutory consultation was taken, which means effectively that there is no change on the western side of Devonshire Road.

The terms of the consultation have not changed, however, because a statutory consultation has been advertised, it is not now possible to simply implement different arrangements on the western side of Devonshire Road because residents have changed their views. The Council does not have unlimited funds to keep re-consulting in one area. I am mindful that there are many areas of the borough, some reported to the panel at this meeting, who have yet to have any consultation on parking controls.

To make any changes to the western side of Devonshire Road would require a new statutory consultation. As the officers have stated in paragraph 2.32 of the petitions report to this meeting, this will be taken into account at the November meeting of the panel.

Supplementary The consultation document did not specify Eastern and Question:

## Answer (provided by an officer):

All responses to the consultation, the supplementary consultation question and comments were taken into consideration. In drafting the consultation questionnaire, officers could not have foreseen the polarisation of views of residents of Devonshire Road. Detailed results of the consultation could not be presented to the Panel due to data protection issues. The results were collated and meetings held with the local Ward Councillors, who were in agreement with officers' view that the western side of Devonshire Road not be included in the CPZ. This issue
will be reconsidered at the November meeting of the Panel.

## 136. Petitions

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petition which was referred to the Divisional Director of Environmental Services for consideration:

Petition from the residents of Southbourne Close, Pinner, containing 19 signatures, with the following terms of reference:
"We, the residents of Southbourne Close, Pinner, request that the Council provide Parking controls in Southbourne Close to ensure clear access at all times into and to the end of the close. This is required because of inconsiderate parking by non-residents who have often prevented refuse vehicles getting down the close to empty bins and furthermore, potentially more serious, causing an impediment to emergency vehicles when needed."

## 137. Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at this meeting.

## RECOMMENDED ITEMS

## 138. Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone Review - Results of Statutory Consultation

The Panel received a report of the Interim Corporate Director, Environmental Services, which outlined the proposed changes to the existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in the Burnt Oak Broadway area. An officer advised that the report provided results of the statutory consultation and the review of the measures implemented in the area in 2011. The proposed recommendations reflected the majority views of the consultation responses. He stated that the key elements of the proposals were as follows:

- CPZ X would now be extended to the remaining section of The Chase;
- double yellow lines would be extended to junctions to alleviate access problems;
- following surveys to monitor traffic flow on the side roads off Burnt Oak Broadway, double yellow lines (DYLs) on one side, parking restrictions to allow loading at busy times, with pay and display (P\&D) during the rest of the day are being proposed;
- comments from residents in the vicinity of the Krishna Avanti School (KAS) had been taken into consideration and section 106 monies would be available to review parking in the area surrounding the school. Recently granted planning permission would allow the school to increase its pupil intake annually which was likely to impact on the
volume of traffic in the area. A 20 mph scheme largely following the Burnt Oak CPZ area was currently under consideration funded by TfL.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that:

- the potential impact of large sporting events being held at the Hive Football Centre was being evaluated and proposals were being formulated to deal with this. He added that event day parking schemes such as the one in operation at Wembley Stadium had high ongoing maintenance costs. Although these costs were funded by contributions from Wembley stadium, this would not be possible for the Hive as it was unlikely that it would be commercially viable to do so. Officers were considering options that used a conventional CPZ scheme in the area and discussions about this were ongoing;
- the Canons Park area parking schemes should not be delayed while plans relating to the Hive were being finalised as this would disadvantage residents were seeking relief from parking problems currently. The parking schemes proposed could be extended to include the Hive at a later date. Timescales for implementation would depend on whether the parking schemes or the proposals for funding for The Hive were finalised first;
- A reduction in the number of vehicles parked in the Burnt Oak CPZ had lead to the perception that vehicle speeds in surrounding streets had increased, which was partly the reason for the proposed 20 mph zone in the vicinity of the KAS. This would help lower vehicle speeds and improve pedestrian safety in the area. £60k funding from TfL for this project had been agreed at the June panel meeting and the proposed 20 mph zone and it was noted that this was not a departure from current council policy. The Council was working to promote a modal shift in the borough by encouraging more cycling and walking amongst residents. This policy was also in keeping with the Mayor's transport strategy.

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

That parking schemes be implemented as set out below:

1. The Chase - from Columbia Avenue to Oakleigh Avenue be included in the CPZ as advertised;
2. Columbia Avenue - between Burnt Oak Broadway and Vancouver Road - the two existing south westerly Pay and Display (P\&D) parking bays be converted to Shared Use P\&D / Resident Permit parking bays, the other two bays remain only P\&D as advertised;
3. Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands - at their junction with Burnt Oak Broadway - the existing loading bays be removed, double yellow lines
be installed and the existing P\&D bays opposite be converted to allow morning peak time loading while retaining P\&D for shoppers etc as advertised;
4. Axholme Avenue, Broomgrove Gardens, Orchard Grove - the existing double yellow lines be extended by 5 metres on the southwestern side of each road at its junction with Oakleigh Avenue as advertised;
5. Camrose Avenue - the existing double yellow line on southeast side be extended by approximately 10.0 m northeast as advertised;
6. residents within the consultation areas be informed of this decision;
7. the Service Manager - Traffic and Highway Network Management be authorised to make minor amendments where required for technical or practical reasons.

Reason for Recommendation: To control parking in the existing Burnt Oak Broadway CPZ - Zone $X$ as detailed in the report. The measures are in direct response to resident and business requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and in order to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

## 139. Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone review (specified roads) Results of Statutory Consultation

The Panel received a report of the Interim Corporate Director, Environmental Services which set out how parking concerns raised by local residents and traders in the Rayners Lane area were being addressed. An officer advised that:

- the programme for statutory consultation regarding reviewing sections of some roads had been agreed at a previous meeting of the Panel;
- $\quad$ there was now majority support among the residents of Central Avenue in Rayners Lane for inclusion in the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ);
- following a petition submitted to the Panel in 2011, Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook Drive had been re-consulted and traffic flow and parking in these streets had been monitored. Subsequently, Alfriston Avenue was now recommended for inclusion in the scheme but Fernbrook Drive had been omitted;
- officers had met with the residents of High Worple, Newlyn Gardens, Raynton Close, Trescoe Gardens and Waverley Road and carried out a statutory consultation. Although the consultation had a low response rate, the results demonstrated that residents were in agreement with the revised proposals;
- residents of Southbourne Close had raised concerns regarding obstructive parking and this issue was dealt with under the Petitions report in agenda item 7.

A Member stated that following site visits by Members and officers to Southbourne Close, residents had indicated that some of them wanted the existing double yellow lines (DYLs) removed and new DYLs implemented in other areas. Refuse vehicles had experienced difficulty in gaining access to Southbourne Close on four separate occasions this year, and on several other occasions had only managed to gain access on the second or third attempt during the same day. He added that he had concerns about access for emergency vehicles and proposed an amendment to the officer recommendation. This motion was seconded and unanimously agreed by the Panel as set out in paragraphs ( g ) and ( h ) below:
'(g) the officers are instructed to review the yellow lining for Southbourne Close to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to gain access;
(h) the officers reconsider the double yellow lines around the two islands in Waverley Road to allow for some parking to be reinstated without affecting road safety.'

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, stated that he had previously been Ward Councillor for Southbourne Close and knew it to be a very narrow road. He was in agreement with the recommendations in the report and was pleased that DYLs would be implemented in the five Closes in question.

Another Member, who was not a member of the Panel, thanked officers for taking on board comments and feedback from residents. The roads in question were access roads with little through traffic. The Member asked for double yellow lines around an island at the junction of Waverley Road with Yeading Avenue to be considered for modification along the lines applied to another island at the junction of Lynton Road with Newquay Crescent.

A Member of the Panel stated that there was a second island in Waverley Road at the junction with Spinnells Road, and asked for similar action to be taken there as well.

An officer stated that with regard to the proposed amendment in paragraph (h), officers would take into consideration the geometry, width, access, sightlines in Waverley Road when reaching a decision about the double yellow lines around the two islands.

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

That

1. an extension to the existing CPZ - Zone $L$ be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in Appendix E, as set out in the report of the Divisional Director Environmental Services:

- Central Avenue - Junction with Hillcroft Avenue to junction with Church Avenue
- Alfriston Avenue - 55 Alfriston Avenue to the junction with Fernbrook Drive

2. residents and businesses within the new CPZ be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
3. double yellow lines be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in Appendix F, as set out in the report of the Divisional Director Environmental Services:

- Raynton Close
- Trescoe Gardens
- Waverley Road
- Newlyn Gardens
- High Worple

4. the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone in Fernbrook Drive not be included within the extension as detailed in Appendix A, as set out in the report of the Divisional Director Environmental Services;
5. the Service Manager - Traffic \& Highway Network Management be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown in Appendix E and F, as set out in the report of the Divisional Director Environmental Services, subject to all recommendations of the Panel;
6. all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of the final decision;
7. the officers be instructed to review the yellow lining for Southbourne Close to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to gain access;
8. the officers reconsider the double yellow lines around the two islands in Waverley Road to allow for some parking to be reinstated without affecting road safety.

Reason for Recommendation: To control parking on the periphery of the existing Rayners Lane CPZ - Zone L as detailed in the report.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

140. Information Report - Petitions relating to: 1.Cymberline Court, Knowles Court, Line Court, Charville Court Gayton Road Harrow - Request for double yellow lines 2.Westfield Park, Hatch End - Concern about parking 3.Dudley Gardens - Request for road widening and parking review 4.Whitchurch Gardens DYL- Objection (Canons Park Station Parking review) 5.Pinner Road and County Roads - Western side of Devonshire

Road to be included in the CPZ extension. 6.Pinner Road and County Roads - Objection to the

The Panel received a report of the Interim Corporate Director, Environmental Services which set out details of the petitions that had been received since the last meeting of the Panel and provided details of the Council's investigations and findings where these had been undertaken.

Officers made the following points about the petitions listed below:

## Cymbeline Court, Knowles Court, Line Court, Charville Court Gayton Road Harrow

- residents had requested that parking controls be introduced in the above streets, which were adjacent to the existing zone E CPZ;
- officers had carried out a thorough investigation as to why Gayton Road had been omitted from the existing zone E CPZ, but had been unable to identify any reasons for this omission;
- local Ward Councillors had been contacted and discussions had focused on the possibility of funds from the Neighbourhood Investment Scheme (NIS), where $£ 10 \mathrm{k}$ was allocated to each ward. This could be used to fund the extension of the existing CPZ to this road and the feasibility of doing this would be confirmed shortly.

A Member stated that if Gayton Road had been omitted from the CPZ due to an oversight by the Council, then it was the Council's responsibility to rectify the situation and requested that this issue be considered at the November meeting of the Panel. Another Member agreed with this, and added that she was concerned about lack of access for emergency vehicles.

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, made the following points:

- meter parking in the streets adjacent to Gayton Road cost 50 pence for 10 minutes. This led to motorists to park in the access road off Gayton Road, which was currently free of any parking controls;
- Gayton Road, which provided access to 4 blocks of flats, was a narrow access road;
- the residents of the last block of flats were mainly over 60 years of age and there was a higher incidence of emergency vehicles being called to this block. When there was a high volume of cars parked on this road, the only way for emergency vehicles to gain access to this block would be by mounting the pavement;
- if this road had been omitted from the existing CPZ due to an error by the Council, then the Council should take prompt measures to rectify the situation;
- he hoped that it would be possible to allocate NIS funds to deal with this.

An officer stated that this road was not part of the current programme of works, however, it may be possible to fund this with NIS funds. Officers would need to meet residents and other local stakeholders and agree draft proposals and timescales before progressing to the statutory consultation stage.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that NIS funds could only be used for capital expenditure. Streets and highways were considered assets and any improvements to assets were considered capital expenditure. This would include the associated costs of the consultation process. Therefore, the cost of extending the scheme to Gayton Road would be deemed a capital expenditure.

## Westfield Park Hatch End - Petition regarding concerns about parking

- the Panel, in agreement with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Enterprise, had agreed to carry out further consultation on proposals to introduce parking charges in the Grimsdyke Car Park and the service roads along Uxbridge Road;
- traffic officers would meet with the relevant Ward Councillors, residents, traders later in the week and report back at the November meeting of the Panel.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that all parking projects were agreed annually at the February meeting of the Panel, when Members recommended how much money should be allocated to each project.

## Dudley Gardens - Request for road widening and parking review

- the petition stated that the carriageway of Dudley Gardens be widened to allow refuse and emergency vehicles to get through;
- parking restrictions were introduced mainly on one side of the road in a bid to make the road accessible to refuse collection vehicles and to discourage non-resident parking.


## Whitchurch Gardens Canons Park - objection to double yellow lines

- the petition objected to the double yellow lines as this would reduce parking spaces;
- analysis of objections and comments raised by residents and in the public consultation would be presented to the November Panel meeting for consideration.


## Devonshire Road off Pinner Road - Objection to statutory consultation for exclusion from CPZ in western section of road

- the petition from residents of the western side of Devonshire Road requested that their side of the road now be included in the CPZ;
- following receipt of the petition, a public consultation was carried out during the summer of 2012;
- the results of the statutory consultation would be presented to the November meeting of the Panel.


## Devonshire Road off Pinner Road - Objection to statutory consultation for introducing passing places in CPZ

- a second petition from 37 households in Devonshire Road objected to the 5 passing places in Devonshire Road due to the proposed extension of the Pinner Road CPZ and the associated loss of parking spaces;
- the results of the statutory consultation would be presented to the November meeting of the Panel.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

## 141. Information Report: Network Management Duty 2011/12

The Panel received a report of the Interim Corporate Director, Environmental Services which set out the performance of the highway network since the introduction of additional regulatory powers under the Traffic Management Act (TMA), which aimed to control street works and other activities such as Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).

An officer reported that the Council had been successfully managing its Network Management Duty as set out under the TMA. He advised that:

- there had been significant improvement in average journey times, particularly in bus journey times during peak periods, which were a good indicator of congestion and traffic flow;
- there had been a slight drop in the performance of the Council's works in comparison to works carried out by utility companies, but this was not a significant cause for concern as this coincided with the highways contract renewal process, which had resulted in a drop in performance;
- there had been an initial increase in the use of FPNs against contractors who had not complied with their permits and a subsequent decline as compliance improved, showing that the use of FPNs was proving successful;
- the Council operated a systematic inspection regime after utilities works had been completed by contractors to ensure that the quality of reinstatements was satisfactory.

Following feedback from a Member of the Panel regarding the poor condition of Christchurch Avenue after completion of recent works, an officer undertook to look into this.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

## 142. Information Report: Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme update

The Panel received a report of the Interim Corporate Director, Environmental Services which provided an update on the progress with delivering the 2012/13 programme of traffic and parking schemes, including schemes funded by Transport for London (TfL).

An officer made the following points about the schemes listed below:
Stanmore - linking of traffic signals in Stanmore Hill / the Broadway / Elm Park / Marsh Lane / pelican crossing outside Sainsbury's

- the scheme was progressing well and TfL had begun installing new signalling equipment which would enable the linking of signal controllers. Once this was operational, officers would evaluate the feasibility of introducing an all red pedestrian phase without adversely affecting traffic flow in the area.


## 20mph zone programme 2012/13

- the aim of this was to improve walking and cycling and create a safer environment by reducing congestion, accidents and vehicle speeds, particularly around local schools.
- Elmgrove School, Bacon Lane (Krishna Avanti School) \& Weald School - 20mph zone


## Elmgrove School

- consultation results showed that $89 \%$ of respondents were in favour of the scheme and the scheme would move forward to implementation.


## Bacon Lane (Krishna Avanti School)

- consultation results showed that $89 \%$ of respondents were in favour of the scheme and the scheme would move forward to implementation.


## Weald School

- a petition from 72 households in Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise objecting to speed cushions and the proposed one-way section in

Robin Hood Drive had been received. The cushions were deemed to increase traffic noise. Proposals to make the road one-way had not been supported. Officers had discussed the petition with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety and agreed that the 20 mph scheme would advance to statutory consultation;

- a majority of residents of The Avenue had been in favour of being included within the proposed 20 mph zone and officers would be liaising with residents about including the Avenue within the zone during the statutory consultation process.
- $\quad$ there was majority support for the double yellow line proposals in Elms Road, Wilsmere Drive, White Gate Gardens and Wynchgate and these would be taken forward to statutory consultation.

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, made the following points:

- he was pleased that the petition had been considered and hoped that officers and the Panel would take its contents into consideration along with the consultation results for Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise, as these roads were directly affected by the proposals;
- $80 \%$ of the residents in these streets had been in touch with local Ward Councillors and given feedback about local traffic and parking related issues;
- some residents felt that speeding was not currently an issue and therefore residents did not feel speed cushions were necessary. The current arrangements worked well and should be maintained;
- 15 residents of The Avenue were in favour of being included in the proposed 20 mph zone. The statutory consultation should separate out questions regarding the speed limit and the introduction of speed cushions;
- there was a strong feeling amongst residents and the school that there should be targeted enforcement of existing parking restrictions at peak times and residents had requested that officers monitor this;
- he thanked officers for engaging with residents and taking their views on board.

Following questions and comments from Panel Members, an officer stated that:

- officers had raised concerns about enforcement at a recent traffic liaison meeting and parking enforcement officers had been made aware of the issues;
- the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety had been informed that not every signatory to the petition had been opposed to the 20 mph scheme;
- officers hoped to minimise the impact of speed cushions and the consultation documents had clearly set out the advantages and disadvantages of implementing these;
- speed surveys had been carried out in the area by an independent consultant and the value of introducing either speed humps, speed cushions or platforms had been evaluated;
- residents of The Avenue would be consulted about being included within a 20 mph zone and the petition would be reported at the next meeting of the Panel;
- with regard to the proposed Old Redding LSS the possibility of both horizontal and vertical deflections being introduced would be considered within the design;
- officers would not advocate the use of rumble strips in these areas, as these were more effective in rural areas;
- officers would look carefully at the siting of any vertical deflections as part of this scheme.
- a proposed pedestrian and cycle safety campaign would be consulted on shortly and the campaign would target teenagers. The artwork for the poster campaign was being finalised;
- the promotion of adult and child cycle training was being publicised on the council's website and posters had been circulated to schools, libraries and community notice boards;

With regard to the remaining schemes, an officer reported that:

- the St Ann's Road town centre projects is currently at design stage and expected to begin implementation in early 2013. This project would see the continuation of the granite paving from Station Road along the length of St Ann's Road together with new lighting, trees and benches and removal of excess street clutter.
- the Kymberley Road project is also at design stage. The aim was to increase capacity at the bus station by creating additional bus standing spaces on street and better pedestrian and cycle routes between the west of town to St Ann's Road and the stations.;
- car park indicator signs in the town centre, which would give motorists real-time information about parking spaces available in the town centre car parks, was under discussion as was the introduction of Legible London signs.
- these projects were being funded through Harrow's Capital programme, Transport for London's outer London Fund and some Section 106 monies from the Neptune Point development if approved.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

## 143. Any Other Urgent Business

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following items were included late on the agenda due to concerns relating to the health and safety of motorists, pedestrians and public transport users:

An adviser to the Panel stated that:

- the double yellow lines outside the Old Etonian restaurant on the High Street on Harrow on the Hill allowed loading. This meant that there could be no disabled parking during loading times. He had recently witnessed buses having to either try to manoeuvre through a narrow gap or having to reverse due to loading outside the restaurant. This section of DYLs should be designated no loading and be implemented as a matter of urgency to ensure free flow of traffic and access to emergency vehicles;
- many street signs in Harrow were obscured by foliage, which should be trimmed back.

Members of the Panel stated that:

- officers had informed a panel member that some signs had been reduced to reduce street clutter. There was a sign 100 yards along High Worple, off Alexandra Avenue, which referred to parking restrictions between 6.30-8.30 pm. However, the Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone operated between 10.00-11.00 am. This was causing confusion amongst motorists. Additionally, the cycle lanes in this area were clearly visible and the signs referring to these could be removed;
- there were a number of redundant signs on Petts Hill which caused confusion to motorists and should also be removed.

Officers undertook to look into the above issues.
RESOLVED: That the comments be noted.
(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm , closed at 9.37 pm ).
(Signed) COUNCILLOR MRINAL CHOUDHURY Chairman
REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety
Advisory Panel
Date of Meeting: $29^{\text {th }}$ November 2012
Subject: INFORMATION REPORT
Petitions relating to:1. Weald School - objection to 20mph zone
2. Parking in Southbourne Close Rayners Lane
3. Objection to parking proposals Church Street, Pinner
Responsible Officer: Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director, Environment \& Enterprise
Exempt: ..... No
Enclosures: Appendix A - Weald School, plan ofrevised measures
Appendix B - Southbourne Close,existing waiting restrictions
Appendix C - High Street, Pinnerparking proposals

## Section 1 - Summary

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last meeting of TARSAP and provides details of the Council's investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

FOR INFORMATION

## Section 2 - Report

## Weald School - Objection to $\mathbf{2 0} \mathbf{m p h}$ zone

2.1 A petition was sent to the council by a local resident of Chestnut Drive. The petition contained 75 signatures and states:

1. "Whilst overall we are not against a proposed 20 mph zone (sings at the beginning of both streets will remind drivers that they should pay more attention to pedestrians and reduce their speed (if required), we are not in favour of speed humps. Speed humps could cause "weaving", thus creating additional hazards. Also they do not necessarily slow down most of standard cars (saloons and estate cars), and 4x4's and van's speed is not affected by humps at all.

There is no speeding issue on both Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise. During the school-run hours, when the road is merely congested, you can only drive at $10-15 \mathrm{mph}$ speed. These two streets are not "through" roads, they are short and only used by resident's delivery vehicles and parents bringing their kids to school. Excessive speeds in these roads are almost impossible during school-run hours and rarely possible outside school hours because of parked cars.

One resident even mentioned that he has lived here for 70 years now and no traffic incident occurred at all within this period. This confirms that both streets have a very good safety record.

Speed humps will only be an irritant to residents, creating unnecessary noise in these streets which are very quiet outside school-run hours.

The proposed raised table with tactile paving outside the school could create a hazard as children will see it as an extension to the footway.
2. We are not in favour of the proposal for a one-way system in Robin Hood Drive. The situation in all three roads will be made
worse if there is no escape for vehicles that enter Chestnut Drive from the Avenue other than turning round.

The danger to pedestrians will dramatically increase by vehicles backing and doing three points U-turns causing a backup of the traffic existing Robin Hood Drive, which will encourage turnarounds in Weald Rise creating further danger.

The problems will continue outside school times with service vehicles and cars having to perform U-turns to exit a heavily parked Chestnut Drive.

The original road layout was designed to avoid these issues and works well.
3. Applying yellow lines on roads around White Gate Gardens will reduce parking facilities for parents bringing kids to school, thus creating more school traffic via Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive.
4. The voluntary one-way system works well if it is adhered to. Should the school keep educating the parents to leave their cars home or further away from school (on main roads), there would be no heavy traffic on both streets during school-run hours.
5. Could "access for residents only" be implemented on both Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise? Will these affect parent drivers that bring kids to school?
6. Because the funds are already secured from TFL, there are plenty of potholes in these two roads, plus on The Avenue. They do create additional danger for pedestrians as drivers try to avoid them, swerving. Re-doing the tarmac on these roads would be a good investment and an improvement of the road safety.

The pathways need attention in several places on both streets. Broken and raised slab edges create walking hazard and because more than $50 \%$ of the residents are elderly people (including disabled people), greater attention should be paid to this matter."
2.2 This area is currently subject to the development of a 20 mph zone scheme in the current financial year which includes these roads. A public consultation on proposals was undertaken recently. Responses to the various points are provided in order.
2.3 Point 1 - The views expressed by local residents are noted with regard to the speed of traffic in Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive. Independent speed surveys carried out in both these roads over a one week time period ( 24 hours / day) indicated an $85 \%$ ile speed of 24.6 mph northbound and 26.2 mph southbound in Weald Rise and 26.6 mph northbound and 25.9 southbound in Chestnut Drive. These figures are slightly above the threshold when considering whether traffic calming measures are required within a 20 mph zone and therefore speed
cushions were considered necessary in order to make the zone selfenforcing. There will be a further opportunity for residents to express their views about the proposals at the statutory consultation stage.
2.4 Point 2 - The one way proposals have been omitted from the revised scheme following discussion with the Portfolio Holder.
2.5 Point 3 - The yellow lines are being proposed at junctions to reiterate the well established principles in The Highway Code which require that a vehicle should not park within 10 metres of a junction. The effects of parking at undesirable locations can impact on drivers, pedestrians and those with mobility difficulties.
2.6 Point 4-Officers will work with the School to promote the advisory one way scheme which operates at morning and afternoon peaks in the vicinity of the school via the school travel planning process.
2.7 Point 5 - It is not possible to introduce "access for residents only" as Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive are both public highway.
2.8 Point 6 - TfL provide an allocation to London boroughs each year to implement identified schemes within the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment and the boroughs confirm to TfL the actual projects and associated budgets within that allocation. The development of a LIP is a statutory requirement of all boroughs required to show how the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy is delivered at a local level therefore the money has to be used on the implementation of a 20 mph zone and not for highway maintenance.

## Parking in Southbourne Close

2.9 At the panel meeting on 3rd October 2012 a petition was presented by the lead petitioner. The petition, containing 20 signatures representing 20 households in the Close and states:
"We the residents of Southbourne Close, Pinner, request that the Council provide Parking Controls in Southbourne Close to ensure clear access at all times into and to the end of the close. This is required because of inconsiderate parking by nonresidents who have often prevented refuse vehicles getting down the close to empty bins and furthermore, potentially more serious, causing an impediment to emergency vehicles when needed."
2.10 The background is that in June 2010 the Council consulted residents of Southbourne Close to establish if there was support for:

- the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)
- for the introduction of double yellow lines in the turning head and also for the extension of double yellow lines on one side close to the junction with Village Way
2.11 The consultation results were reported to the September 2010 panel meeting. There was no majority support at this time for inclusion in a

CPZ and a number of negative comments were received about the extent of the yellow lines in the turning head. These proposals were subsequently amended with reduced lengths of yellow lining in the statutory consultation.
2.12 The results of statutory consultation were reported to the June 2011 panel meeting. This included a petition with 6 signatures from 6 households objecting to the double yellow lines outside 22-28 and 2329. Some residents raised concerns about the reduction in parking capacity in the turning head and displacement to the narrow section of the road. These proposals were subsequently amended with reduced lengths of yellow lining. The scheme shown in Appendix B was implemented in December 2011.
2.13 During consideration of the statutory consultation results at the October 2012 panel meeting regarding some re-consultations agreed by the panel it was agreed that officers be instructed to review the yellow lining for Southbourne Close in order to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to gain access.
2.14 Subsequently a site meeting was held with the lead petitioner and a member of the Panel on 25th October. A number of options were discussed and residents are now considering the best way forward. Once a decision has been made by residents then the necessary formal processes will be put in place to implement the measures which will include statutory consultation. To avoid any delays it is intended to report any formal objections directly to the Portfolio Holder for Environment \& Community Safety for a decision.
2.15 Any significant progress made after the preparation of this report will be verbally reported at the meeting.

## Church Lane, Pinner - objection to parking proposals

2.16 A petition has been received containing 35 signatures from people associated with Pinner Parish Pre-School. This is in response to a statutory consultation regarding a scheme to introduce parking controls. The pre-school operates from the church Hall at Pinner Parish Church on Church Lane.
2.17 The background is that ward councillors have made a number of comments about parking problems at the junction of Church Lane, Grange Gardens and the High Street.
2.18 The Panel will be aware that a review of parking at Pinner has been included on the programme of schemes for a number of years but has not been allocated funding for the active part of the programme. Unfortunately when the Panel last considered the programme in February 2012 it was not possible to fund the review at Pinner for a start in 2012/13. With this in mind ward councillors identified the above site as one of two they would like to see double yellow lines progressed using Neighbourhood Investment Scheme (NIS) funding.
2.19 Ward councillors would have preferred to include other adjustments to parking in the area but this would have involved considerable work and was outside the scope of a project that could be tackled using NIS funding. A scheme for at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines), shown on the plan in Appendix C, has now been approved for NIS funding and an informal public consultation subsequently undertaken.
2.20 The public consultation results were discussed with ward councillors and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety who agreed that the scheme should proceed to statutory consultation. No comments were received from the pre-school at the informal consultation stage although there have been discussions between an official of the church and officers to clarify the ability to load and unload goods or passengers on double yellow lines. There was general support for the measures and respondents highlighted the problems with visibility and obstruction that had been indicated to ward councillors.
2.21 The representation from the pre-school has supporting information that states the pre-school has operated at the Church Hall since 1966 and offers vital years care and education to 2-5 year olds. The facility operates from 9.30 to 12.30 Monday to Friday and the church hall has no private parking
2.22 The statutory consultation period finishes on 31st October 2012 and it is intended to discuss all submissions and objections received including the above petition with ward councillors and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
2.23 Due to the timing of receipt of the petition and preparation of this report a verbal update will be given at the meeting.

## Section 3 - Further Information

3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting. No updates on the progress made with dealing with petitions will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

## Section 4 - Financial Implications

4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report that require further investigation would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

## Section 5 - Equalities implications

5.1 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No.
5.2 The petitions raise issues about existing schemes in the transportation works programme as well as new areas for investigation. The officer's
response indicates a suggested way forward in each case. An equality impact assessment (EqIA) will be carried out if members subsequently decide that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions.

## Section 6 - Corporate Priorities

6.1. Any suggested measures in the report accord with our corporate priorities:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
- Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses


## Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance

$\square$

## Section 8 - Contact Details and Background

## Papers

## Contact:

Barry Philips, Team Leader - Traffic and Road Safety
Tel: 0208424 1437, Fax: 0208424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk
Paul Newman - Team Leader - Parking and Sustainable Transport
Tel: 0208424 1065, Fax: 0208424 7622,
E -mail:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

## Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports
LIP programme of investment 2012/13
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| REPORT FOR: | TRAFFIC \& ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL |
| :---: | :---: |
| Date of Meeting: | 29 November 2012 |
| Subject: Key: | Pinner Road / County Roads Controlled Parking Zone - Proposed Phase 2 Extension No |
| Responsible Officer: | Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director for Environment and Enterprise |
| Portfolio Holder: | Councillor Phillip O'Dell - Portfolio Holder of Environment and Community Safety |
| Exempt: | No |
| Decision subject to Call-in: | Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder |
| Enclosures: | Appendix A - Proposed CPZ Phase 2 <br> Extension on the county roads <br> Appendix B - Proposed Shared Use Bays, Pay \& Display Bays and Waiting Restrictions on Neptune Road Appendix C - Summary of responses \& Engineers response Appendix D - Pinner Road_ County Roads CPZ zone U, Proposed Extension, Statutory Consultation Documents Appendix E-Consultation Area |

## Section 1 - Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the results of the Statutory Consultation carried out in JulyAugust 2012 on Pinner Road - County roads, proposed Controlled Parking Zone U extension, and the proposals to regulate parking along Neptune Road with a variety of parking controls. The report seeks the Panel to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to proceed with implementation of the proposals as outlined in this report.

## Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment \& Community Safety that the parking scheme (see Appendices A \& B) be implemented as set out below:

1. That the Controlled Parking Zone U permit parking for residents operating Monday to Friday, 11am - 12 noon be extended to incorporate the following roads:

- Oxford Road (up to and including property numbers 28 \& 33)
- Dorset Road

2. That the Controlled Parking Zone U permit parking for residents operating Monday to Friday, 11am - 12 noon be extended to Devonshire Road subject to a separate statutory consultation in this road being undertaken and consideration of the results of consultation by the Portfolio Holder for Environment \& Community Safety.
3. That shared use resident / pay \& display bays operating Monday to Friday, 9.30am to 5.30 pm and Saturday 9.30am to 1.30 pm , be introduced at the western end of Neptune Road,
4. That pay \& display bays operating Monday to Friday, 9.30am to 5.30pm and Saturday 9.30am to 1.30 pm , be introduced at the eastern end of Neptune Road,
5. That free parking bays be introduced at 6 locations on Neptune Road,
6. That waiting restrictions be introduced on Neptune Road operating Monday to Saturday, 8.30am to 6.30pm and Sunday 10am to 6pm,
7. That 'No waiting at any time' restrictions be introduced at strategic locations along Neptune Road to aid through movement/access,
8. That 3 loading bays be introduced on Neptune Road operating Monday to Friday, 7 am to 7 pm and Saturday 7 am to 2 pm ,
9. That the Service Manager - Traffic \& Highway Network Management is authorised to take the necessary steps to implement the above recommendations
10. That residents within the consultation area are informed of this decision.

## Reason: (For recommendation)

To recommend for implementation an amended scheme for Controlled Parking Zone $U$ having considered the results of statutory consultation. To introduce measures to regulate parking on Neptune Road with a variety of parking controls designed to accommodate residents and businesses requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and also maintain road safety and accessibility for all traffic.

## Section 2 - Report

## Introduction

2.1 Parking has a significant impact on the quality of life of Harrow's residents and a significant impact on the viability of Harrow's businesses and is one of the main concerns reported to the Council regarding transport issues. This report sets out how parking issues raised in the Pinner Road, county roads and Neptune Road area are to be addressed in order to support local residents and businesses.

## Options considered

2.2 The Statutory Consultation proposals were developed from previous public consultations and took into account as many of the comments from residents and businesses as possible. The options available to local people were to support or object to the proposed scheme advertised.
2.3 It should be noted that there is a wide range of opinion in area scheme consultations and whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view was reflected in the recommendations made.

## Background

2.4 Since introduction of the original scheme in May 2010 the council received complaints from traders on Pinner Road that the new restrictions were affecting their business. Residents in the neighbouring side streets outside the CPZ, in particular Cornwall Road, Devonshire Road, Dorset Road and Oxford Road (known locally as the county roads) complained that parking places were hard to find due to commuters leaving their vehicles parked at these locations for long periods at a time.
2.5 This situation will be further exacerbated by the new development taking place at Trident Point adding to the demand for on-street parking spaces. Neptune Road was not included in the original proposals because at the time of making the decision, insufficient details were available about the proposed redevelopment of the former Travis Perkins site (now called Trident Point) which includes 147 residential units and a supermarket $6,425 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (gross floor area). It is clear that parking controls will be required in Neptune Road itself to mitigate the impact of that development, control parking and loading in the area and enable the free flow of traffic.
2.6 The existing extents of the CPZ are shown in (Appendix A) operating with Monday to Friday, 11am to 12 noon restrictions. A CPZ review was initiated approximately 6 months after the original scheme was introduced.
2.7 Phase 1 of the CPZ review which focussed on Pinner Road was previously reported to TARSAP on $21^{\text {st }}$ June 2012 when the statutory consultation results and the proposed changes were recommended and subsequently agreed by the Portfolio Holder. The proposals which are to be implemented in December 2012 consist of pay and display and disabled bays along Pinner Road, loading restrictions on the northern side of Pinner Road and at any time waiting restrictions at its junctions with Bedford Road, Rutland Road, and Oxford Road as well as relaxations of loading restrictions on the southern side of Pinner Road between its junction with Gardens and its western junction with Neptune Road.
2.8 Phase 2 of the CPZ review (dealt with in this report) focuses on the surrounding area of the County Roads and Neptune Road. A public consultation on these proposals was carried out between February and July 2011 which sought the views of residents and businesses in the county roads area about whether they would like the CPZ to be extended into their road and for introducing controlled parking proposals and waiting / loading restrictions in Neptune Road. The results were reported to the TARSAP meeting held on $20^{\text {th }}$ September 2011 and members recommended that the amended proposals proceed to statutory consultation. This was subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.

## Statutory Consultation

2.9 A statutory Consultation on the phase 2 review proposals was undertaken between $19^{\text {th }}$ July 2012 and $8^{\text {th }}$ August 2012 (see Appendix D). This consultation took into account, where practicable, all the comments received during the previous consultation stages.
2.10 As part of the statutory consultation process, leaflets were delivered to residents and businesses which are directly affected by the proposals. The extent of the area where leaflets were distributed is shown in Appendix E. Notices were displayed on lamp columns along Pinner Road, County roads and Neptune Road and traffic orders were advertised in local newspapers. All relevant stakeholders including Transport for London (TfL) and ward councillors were also consulted. Leaflets were delivered to 869 properties along Pinner Road, the County roads, Neptune Road and The Gardens as part of the Phase 2 proposals.
2.11 A total of 115 responses were received by questionnaire, letter and email, representing an overall $13 \%$ response rate. Although this is relatively low response it is worth noting that a large amount of consultation in this area has already been undertaken on this issue probably leading to reduced response rate and so the consultation is still considered to be representative. Two petitions were also received from residents of Devonshire Road objecting to the exclusions of the western side of Devonshire Road from the proposed CPZ and the proposed double yellow lines. These petitions were reported as information items to the Panel on $3^{\text {rd }}$ October 2012.
2.12 The ward councillors were invited to a meeting held on 29th October 2012, where they were briefed on the results of the statutory consultation as well as the revised parking proposals. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the revised proposal as set out in Appendix A \& B.
2.13 Details of all the statutory objections received along with officer's responses can be found in Appendix C.

## Analysis of results

## Bedford Road

2.14 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines and an extension of the CPZ up to its junction with Sussex Road in Bedford Road. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 2 | 11 | 0 | 85 | 13 | 15 |

2.15 A significant number of the respondents oppose the proposed extension of the CPZ and officers in discussion with the ward councillors have agreed not to extend the existing CPZ in Bedford Road.

## Cornwall Road

2.16 The residents were included in the statutory consultation but were not included in the proposed CPZ extension proposal. Those that responded felt the proposals would have a detrimental impact on their street by displacing parking into Cornwall Road.

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 0 | 5 | 0 | 59 | 5 | 9 |

2.17 No changes are proposed on the roads immediately adjacent to Cornwall Road and the risk of displacement parking is minimal.

## Devonshire Road

2.18 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines and extend the CPZ on the western side between number 27 and Sussex Road and on the eastern side between number 44 and Sussex Road. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Total No. } \\ \text { Consulted }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Total No. } \\ \text { Responded }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { \% } \\ \text { response }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | $\begin{array}{l}\text { No } \\ \text { Opinion }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 7 | 14 | 0 | 78 | 21 | 27 |
| $(4$ within |  |  |  |  |  |
| existing |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPZ and |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 within |  |  |  |  |  |
| propose |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPZ and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| C CPZ |  |  |  |  |  |
| within proposed |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPZ extension) |  |  |  |  |  |$)$

2.19 A total of 28 responses were received 7 for and 14 against the proposals. Of the 14 that were against the proposals 6 were opposed to the double yellow lines and the CPZ, 4 were opposed to the proposed double yellow lines only, 3 were opposed to being excluded from being in the proposed CPZ and 1 was opposed to the hours of operation.
2.20 Two petitions were also submitted by the residents of Devonshire Road which were reported to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) on 3rd October 2012 and a public question was asked of the Chair of TARSAP. The petitions received were as follows:

- Petition 1 - against the proposed CPZ extension excluding residents on the western side.
- Petition 2 - against the proposed double yellow lines to facilitate passing places.
2.21 The majority of the residents of Devonshire Road (western side) responded to an earlier public consultation confirming they did not want
to be included in the CPZ whilst those on the eastern side did want to be included. The proposals were therefore revised for the statutory consultation excluding the western side of Devonshire Road. They have subsequently changed their opinion and have submitted the above petitions objecting to why they have been excluded from the proposals to extend the CPZ. It is too late to include these proposals within the draft traffic order as proposals cannot be added in after publication. A further localised mini statutory consultation with the residents of Devonshire Road would need to be undertaken in order to do this.
2.22 Officers have agreed in discussion with the ward councillors to carry out a localised mini statutory consultation with the residents of Devonshire Road in this area. The results of consultation will be considered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment \& Community Safety before proceeding with implementation.


## Dorset Road

2.23 It is proposed to extend the CPZ between Oxford Road and Devonshire Road. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 5 | 19 |

2.24 Officers have agreed in discussion with the ward councillors to include Dorset Road in the proposed CPZ extension.

## Neptune Road

2.25 It is proposed to implement shared permit holder / pay and display bays, free parking bays, loading bays and single and double yellow lines. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 2 | 4 |

2.26 Neptune Road provides access to deliveries to the proposed supermarket as well as residents parking (less than 1 space per dwelling) and also serves as an emergency access.
2.27 Officers have agreed in discussion with the ward councillors that the proposed measures are in direct response to the residents and businesses requests for changes to the parking arrangements and should therefore proceed to implementation.

## Oxford Road

2.28 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines and extend the CPZ up to its junction with Sussex Road. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 10 | 8 | - | 73 | 18 | 25 |

2.29 The results show a clear difference of opinion between the residents at the southern end in favour of the CPZ extension and those at the northern end opposed to the CPZ extension.
2.30 Officers in discussion with the ward councillors have agreed therefore to recommend only extending the existing CPZ to include an area where there is a clear majority of residents in favour. This area is between numbers $1 \& 2$ up to and including numbers 28 \& 33 Oxford Road.

## Pinner Road

2.31 Residents and businesses are currently included within the CPZ area and were consulted as part of the statutory consultation. The phase 2 proposals do not include any changes along the Pinner Road itself. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | $\%$ <br> response | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 14 | 0 | 303 | 17 | 6 | 1 No. <br> responded <br> from new <br> development |

2.32 This part of the scheme was the subject of the phase 1 review and amendments to the parking controls along Pinner Road have already been considered and recommended by TARSAP in June 2012, subsequently approved by the Portfolio holder, and are now due to be implemented in December 2012. These will be monitored once they have been introduced.

## Pinner View

2.33 Residents were consulted as part of the statutory consultation but were not included in the proposed CPZ extension area. The following response was received:

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | - | 23 | 2 | 9 |

2.34 No changes are proposed on the roads immediately adjacent to Pinner View and the risk of displacement parking is minimal.

## Rutland Road

2.35 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines and extend the CPZ up to its junction with Sussex Road.

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 5 | 11 | 1 | 70 | 17 | 24 |

2.36 There was a significant response to the consultation from resident's objecting to the proposed extension of the CPZ. There was no particular pattern or bias shown in the results. Officers have therefore recommended in discussion with the ward councillors not to extend the existing CPZ.

## Sussex Road

2.37 Residents were consulted as part of the statutory consultation but were not included in the proposed CPZ extension area.

| Support Revised Proposals. |  |  | Total No. <br> Consulted | Total No. <br> Responded | \% response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes | No | No Opinion |  |  |  |
| 1 | 13 | 1 | 105 | 15 | 14 |

2.38 Sussex Road has junctions with many of the other county roads and a review of the consultation outcomes in all the other roads was considered in order to take account of the potential impact. Proposals to extend the CPZ in Bedford Road and Rutland Road were opposed and only a small extension is recoemnded along Oxford Road (between numbers 1 and 33). Dorset Road would be included in the CPZ extension and Devonshire Road would be extended subject to another statutory consultation. On balance it was considered that the changes proposed on the roads immediately adjacent to Sussex Road were not very significant and the risk of displacement parking is minimal.

## Financial Implications

2.39 This scheme is part of the Parking Management programme. There is a Harrow Capital allocation for this programme of $£ 300 \mathrm{k}$ in the 2012/13. A sub allocation of $£ 40 \mathrm{k}$ for the implementation of Pinner Road area CPZ was recommended by TARSAP in February 2012 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder. It is expected that implementation can be achieved from within the programme.

## Risk Management Implications

2.40 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
2.41 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects, which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway and this would include all aspects of the proposals included in this report.

## Equalities implications

2.42 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
2.43 A review of equality issues has indicated no adverse impact on any of the specified equality groups. There are positive impacts of the scheme on some equalities groups, particularly, women, children and people with mobility difficulties. Benefits are likely to be as follows:

| Equalities Group | Benefit |
| :--- | :--- |
| Disability | Improved availability of parking on residential <br> streets, local shops, businesses and amenities. <br> This will help disabled people with mobility <br> impairment, wheelchair users and those that are <br> visually impaired by organising parking and <br> improving sightlines. |
| Age | Improved availability of parking on residential <br> streets, local shops, businesses and amenities. <br> This will help disabled people with mobility <br> impairment, wheelchair users and those that are <br> visually impaired by organising parking and <br> improving sightlines. |
| Pregnancy \& | Mothers with young children or pregnant women <br> are more likely to benefit from parking spaces <br> closer to their destination. |

2.44 Data on respondents' age, ethnicity, disability, religion, gender and sexuality was collected anonymously to monitor the equality of access to the consultation. These responses are broadly comparable alongside the data taken from the most recent census.

## Corporate Priorities

2.45 The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with our wider corporate priorities as follows:

| Corporate priority | Impact <br> Keeping neighbourhoods clean, <br> green and safe |
| :--- | :--- |
| Parking controls make streets easier <br> to clean by reducing the number of <br> vehicles on-street during the day, <br> giving better access to the kerb for <br> cleaning crews. <br> Regular patrols by Civil <br> Enforcement Officers deter criminal <br> activity and can help gather <br> evidence in the event of any <br> incidents. |  |
| United and involved communities: |  |
| Council that listens and leads. | The recommendation seeks to keep <br> whole streets together in forming an <br> extension to the existing CPZ, where <br> the results support this. |
| Supporting and protecting people <br> who are most in need | The council has listened to the <br> community in recommending a <br> scheme that meets the needs of the <br> majority of respondents who favour <br> parking controls, whilst retaining the <br> status quo where the majority do not <br> support parking controls. |
| Controlled parking zones generally <br> help vulnerable people by freeing up <br> spaces for carers, friends and <br> relatives to park during the day. <br> Without parking controls, these <br> spaces would be occupied all day <br> by commuters. |  |
| Supporting our town centre, our local <br> shopping centres and businesses. <br> Neptune Road will assist viability and <br> vitality of the shops/businesses by <br> removing long term commuter <br> parking, enabling better access for <br> customers. |  |

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

| Name: : Kanta Hirani | $\boxed{ }$ | on behalf of the <br> Chief Financial Officer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date: $13 / 11 / 12$ |  |  |
| Name: Matthew Adams | $\boxed{ }$ | on behalf of the <br> Monitoring Officer |
| Date: $14 / 11 / 12$ |  |  |

## Section 4 - Contact Details \& Background Papers

Contact: Sajjad Farid, Traffic Engineer
Tel: 02084241484 Email: sajjad.farid@harrow.gov.uk

## Background Papers:

TARSAP report on Pinner Road \& County Roads Controlled Parking Zone Review (Stage1) - Results of Statutory Consultation 21 June 2012.

TARSAP report on Pinner Road \& County Roads Controlled Parking Zone Review - Results of Public Consultation 20 September 2011.
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## APPENDIX-C

## Pinner Road-County Roads - CPZ Proposed Extension

Analysis of Comments

| Correspondence No. | Comments | Engineers Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cornwall Road |  |  |
| (1509) | 1. Leave thing as they are | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the parking problems |
| (1439) | 2. Proposals would have adverse effect on my road | As will all CPZ proposals there will be those that do not wish to pay for parking permits\& park on adjacent road. |
|  | 3. Proposals would push parking to Cornwall Rd | Agreed there will be some displaced parking if the proposals were to be implemented. |
| (1478) | 4. Purely a means of charging residents to park outside their properties | As 1 (1509) above |
| Pinner View |  |  |
| (1464) | 5. Taking away the right to park, and is a money making step for the Council | As (1) (1509) above it is necessary to charge residents to be able to control / enforce the parking within the zone. |
|  | 6. I will convert my front garden so I Can park off Road | The council has no objection to off road parking subject to meeting the criteria. |
| Bedford Rd |  |  |
| (1514) | 7. Opposed to double yellow lines as this will take up vital parking spaces. | Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 should there be an emergency. |
|  | 8. As (1464) | As (1464) |
| (1499) | 9. A further parking restriction between 5-6pm is required | The proposed consultation is to extend the existing CPZ and currently there are no proposals to include additional restriction outside the existing control periods. This would require a further consultation. |
| (1447) | 10. No parking problems experienced during the day Problems arise in the evening | Noted. The 1 hr restriction only deals with long term commuter parking. |
| (1554) | 11. No Problems experienced with parking | Noted |
|  | 12. As (1). above | As (1). above |
|  | 13. A (5) (1464) above | A (5) (1464) above |
|  | 14. The Borough has not taken into account the residents views but imposed restriction for revenue. We object to further restrictions. | Noted. The Proposals to extend the CPZ have not been agreed. the results/comments together with officers comments will be reported to TARSAP on $29^{\text {th }}$ Nov. 2012 and the decision will be made by the PH soon after |


| (1445) | 15. Costs for permits would be additional burden | Noted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1452) | 16. Never been a problem end of our road | Noted |
| (1508) | 17. As (16) (1452) and hence do not agree to paying to park on my road | Noted. The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking |
| (1541) | 18. Object to double yellow lines. No problems with passing traffic. motorist give way at the top and bottom of road | Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 should there be an emergency. |
|  | 19. As (10) (1447) above | Noted |
| (1542) | 20. As (18) (1541) above | As (18) (1541) above |
|  | 21, As (10) (1447) above | As (10) (1447) above |
|  | 22. As (7) (1514) above | As (7) (1514) above |
| (1544) | 23. As (7) (1514) above | As (7) (1514) above |
|  | 24 As (10 (1447) above | As (10 (1447) above |
|  | 25. Can businesses get permits for their vehicles | Businesses can apply for business parking permits as long as the vehicles is registered to the business address and is intrinsic to the business and not used for travelling to and from work. |
| (1517) | 25. As (5) (1464) above | As (5) (1464) above |
|  | 26. As (10) (1447) Above | As (10) (1447) Above |
|  | 27. Visitors and residents are force to pay dependant on of cars owned $£ 60-£ 420$ | Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking. |
|  | 28. Residents did not express a desire to have a CPZ who was consulted | Residents and businesses were consulted within the consultation area. |
|  | 29. By what means was the extents of the proposed extension judged | CPZ's are proposed encompassing a large area of roads which may be affected by proposed changes to control parking issues where there is a problem of all day commuter parking. |
|  | 30. How many residents requested this extension what no of were consulted | Local residents and business had been asking the council to help address parking issues in their area over a number of years. A total of approximated 869 properties were consulted. |
| Rutland Road |  |  |
| (1451) | 31. Opposed to paying to park on my road | Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking. |
|  | 321 hr restriction is not applicable to deter all day commuter parking near stations. This is not the case in County Roads | 1 hr is normally adequate for preventing long term commuter parking. This was a problem highlighted by many of the residents that responded. |


|  | 33. This is a money making exercise. | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the parking problems in the county roads |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 34. Due to car ownership the roads are already saturated | The proposed CPZ would help to address the car ownership issue. Residents would be forced to reduce the no. of cars they own as they would need to pay more for the permits. Hence they would have to down size. |
|  | 36. As (7) 1514 above | As (7) 1514 above |
|  | 37. Leave things as they are | Noted |
| (1483) | 38. Objection to CPZ | Noted |
|  | 39. No Problem with Parking Before the zone | The existing CPZ was introduced because the local resident/businesses were in favour of parking controls in the area. |
|  | 40. CPZ effects businesses | Measures have been proposed for businesses in the area and they can purchase business parking permits as long as they meet the criteria. |
|  | 41. The council agreed to large developments in the area and should insist on large increase in parking for the developments | The planning department do take into account parking issues both off and on road before granting approval to a development and if required set out conditions to regulate parking within the development. |
|  | 42. As (33) (1451) above | As (33) (1451) above |
| (1423) | 44. As (7) (1514) above | As (7) (1514) above |
|  | 45. As (10) (1447) above | As (10) (1447) above |
|  | 46. Object to paying for a parking permit when its in force for 1 hr | Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking. The 1 hr restriction would help prevent long term commuter parking. |
| (1441) | 47. As (10) (1447) above | As (10) (1447) above |
|  | 48. As (7) (1514) above | As (7) (1514) above |
|  | 49. Large vans, pick-us and trucks should be prevented parking on residential streets | As long as the vehicles are taxed the vehicles can park on the residential streets. However vehicles are not allowed to park on residential street which exceed a maximum a 5 tonne maximum gross weight. |
| (1481) | 50. Would like to see consistent enforcement on Pinner Road where vehicles restrict safe entry/exit from side roads | Noted |
| (1557) | 51. I object to the proposed CPZ | Noted. <br> Extending the CPZ would enable better access to residents on their street. |
|  | 52. As (7) (1514) above | As (7) (1514) above |
|  | 53. Council should increase number of parking spaces | Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 |


|  |  | should there be an emergency/access issues |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 54. Create short stay parking spaces along Pinned Rd utilising the wide footway | Pay \& Display bays are proposed on pinner Road. The council is unable to utilise the footway as part of the footway is privately owned. |
| (1477) | 55. As (51) (1557) above | Noted |
|  | 56. I object to paying to park on a residential street | Noted. The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking |
|  | 57. Businesses need to have a car park to cater for their needs | Businesses can apply for business parking permits as long as their vehicles are registered to the business address and are intrinsic to the business and not used for travelling to and from work. |
| (1437) | 58. As (56) (1477) | As (56) (1477) |
|  | 59. Proposed CPZ not necessary | Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking. |
| (1432) | 60 . The CPZ will create a cost burden | Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. |
|  | 61. As (18) (1541) | As (18) (1541) |
| (1443) | 62. Introduce full time Permit Parking to prevent commuter parking and passing trade to shops | Not considered as part of the consultation |
| Oxford |  |  |
| (1467) | 63. Currently due to CPZ in area residents cannot park anywhere else | Extending the CPZ would enable better access to residents on their street. |
|  | 64. Parking charges can be increased to any level and I do not want wish to pay for the privilege of parking as I already pay road tax. | Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. |
| (1454) | 65. As (56) (1477) | As (56) (1477) |
|  | 66. Congestion problems on Oxford Rd are due to businesses, shops \& restaurants. | The proposals will only address long term commuter parking issues in the area. |
|  | 67. As (57) (1477) | As (57) (1477) |
| (1470) | 68. objection to initial setting up charges, annual parking charges and subsequent increases | Noted. Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. |
|  | 69. CPZ will not solve parking Issues | The measures will only control long term parking during the day. |
|  | 70. If planning department had not allowed so many | Noted. The planning department do take into account parking issues both off and on |


|  | flats in the county roads we would not have the problems with parking | road before granting approval to a development and if required set out conditions to regulate parking within the development. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 71. As (56) (1477) | As (56) (1477) |
|  | 72. All new build: Neptune Rd, New cash and Carry with flats have a huge impact on parking in these roads. CPZ would improve ability to park | Noted |
| (1471) | 73. Implement asap | Noted |
|  | 74. Increased business around us are a major concern | Noted |
| (1466) | 75. No Problem at the northern end of Oxford but there is a problem at the junction of Pinner Rd due to shops/businesses | Noted. Measures are to be introduced for businesses and Passing trade along Pinner Rd. The proposed CPZ will help prevent long term parking. |
|  | 76. As (7) (1514) | As (7) (1514) |
|  | 77. Why are there no free parking bays on other county roads | As a result of the public consultation that was carried out the residents of Devonshire Road (western) did not wish to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. Hence were not included in the proposed CPZ extension and Free bays were proposed along that section |
|  | 78. My child care arrangements require access for a non resident car to e parked every day during the regulated hours. So "free spaces" would make a difference. | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. |
|  | 79. Fees are too expensive | Noted. Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. The cost of the resident parking permits increase with the no. of vehicles owned. Environmentally friendly vehicles can park free but require a permit. |
|  | 80. You are not proposing any changes along Pinner Rd outside the shops where traffic and visibility issues arise daily and safety if often compromised. | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. <br> However measures are being proposed to introduce Pay \& Display on Pinner Road and double yellow lines at the junctions as part of the Phase 1 proposals this financial year. |
|  | 81. The proposals will make things worse | Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce and regulate parking. |


| (1465) | 82. Disappointed one way was not considered | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 83. First permit per household should be free. | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. The charges are set by Committee |
|  | 84. As (33) (1457) | As (33) (1457) |
| (1503) | 85. As (33) (1457) | As (33) (1457), The charges are set/agreed by Committee. |
| (1516) | 86. Double yellow lines should be replaced by single lines during the CPZ hours. | Double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available $24 / 7$ should there be an emergency. |
|  | 87. Don't want double yellow lines outside my property, and the surrounding roads | Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear $24 / 7$ should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely. |
|  | 88. As (82) (1465) which ensures we don't have issues with passing places | As (82) (1465) |
| (1436) | 89. In favour of proposed CPZ | Noted |
| (1427) | 90. There is no parking problem. Cannot afford to pay every year | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking |
| (1550) | 91. The proposed hrs of CPZ need to be extended with additional evening controlled period added. Non residents and business vehicles are using the county roads for overnight parking. | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. |
| (1551) | 92. Don't want double yellow lines passing is generally not a problem as drivers wait at the junction of Dorset Road | Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely |
|  | 93. 1 hr restrictions will not prevent non permit holders from parking on these roads. They will still be able to park for the majority of the day and overnight without paying. Stopping those with permits from parking there. | Noted. <br> The 1 hr restriction is only aimed at preventing long term commuter parking during the day. To introduce additional restrictions would require the scheme to be re-consulted again. |
|  | 94. Why is Sussex Road left out of the CPX proposals? | The residents of Sussex Road did not wish to be included in the CPZ extension hence they were not included in the statutory consultation. |
|  | 95. County roads are not close to the tube stations so | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something |


|  | the proposals are a money making exercise for the Council. | about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 96. Vehicle would be moved by non residents during the 1 hr restriction and then moved back. | Noted. |
| (1558) | 97. Since the initial introduction of the CPZ things have been working well. However this has resulted in areas with no restriction (CPZ) having difficulties finding a place to park. | The proposed CPZ extension will help solve some of the issues with commuter parking. |
|  | 98. I am in favour of the CPZ | Noted |
|  | 99. There should be additional restriction between 3-4pm Mon-Sat as we are affected by patrons of shops on Pinner Road | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. |
| (1440) | 100. As (98) (1558) | As (98) (1558) |
| Devonshire   <br> Road   |  |  |
| (1490) | 101. I disagree with the proposed double yellow lines outside my garage | The proposed double yellow lines will help to keep the access to the garage clear at all times as well as to provide a convenient passing place (*see note below). |
| (1528) | 102. Objection to free parking bay western side of Devonshire Road. | Free parking bays were proposed because the majority of the residents on the western side did not want to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. <br> Two petitions were received from residents of Devonshire Road. 1 requesting the western side be included in the proposed CPZ extension and 1 objecting to the proposed double yellow lines. (*see note below) |
|  | 102. Unless we can apply for permit the residents would not benefit | Noted. This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. <br> Two petitions were received from residents of Devonshire Road. 1 requesting the western side be included in the proposed CPZ extension and 1 objecting to the proposed double yellow lines. (*see note below) |
| (1538) | 103. Unable to park on Devonshire Road as non residents and business use the road as all day car park. | The proposed CPZ extension would help address the problems of long term commuter parking. (*see note below) |
|  | 104. Splitting the road in two | (*see note below) |


|  | CPZ and non CPZ will concentrate the problem into one small area. Unfair for those residents who were in favour of the CPZ. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 105. I am strongly in favour of the revised parking proposals in my section of road | (*see note below) |
| (1449) | 106. I hope the added revenue from the scheme will enable the council to employ a person to police the new restrictions | (*see note below) |
| (1498) | 107. Do not take away 4 parking places to be used as passing places. Those that use the road wait at the top and bottom of Devonshire Road | (*see note below) |
|  | 108. If east side is included in the CPZ then why not the western side. | (*see note below) |
| (1511) | 109. As (107) 1498 | (*see note below) |
|  | 110. People using the roads as rat runs will not know the passing places are there. This has been dealt with by double yellow lines at the top \& bottom bends of the road. | (*see note below) |
| (1549) | 111. As (107) 1498 the parking situation will be further exacerbated by developments in the area. | (*see note below) |
| (1537) | 112.As (93) (1551) | As (93) (1551) (*see note below) |
|  | 113. Local businesses will reduction in 1 hr restriction. Vehicles are parked up in Devonshire Road \& Dorset Rd during the day and evening. | Measures have been proposed for businesses in the area and they can purchase business parking permits as long as they meet the criteria. <br> Further restrictions cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below) |
|  | 114. Don't want double yellow lines would rather have CPZ 12 to 24 hrs a day. | Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely. Different CPZ times cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below). |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { (1461) } & \text { 115. As (69) (1470) } & \begin{array}{l}\text { As (69) (1470) } \\ \text { (*see note below) }\end{array} \\ \hline & \text { 116. As (97) (1558) } & \begin{array}{l}\text { As (97) (1558) } \\ \text { (*see note below) }\end{array} \\ \hline & \begin{array}{l}\text { 117. How many residents } \\ \text { have asked for a CPZ on } \\ \text { Devonshire Rd }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Refer to statutory consultation responses } \\ \text { for Devonshire Road 2.22 to 2.24. } \\ \text { (*see note below) }\end{array} \\ \hline & \text { 118. As (7) (1514) } & \text { As (7) (1514) (*see note below) }\end{array} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll}\text { 119. As (51) (1557) } & \begin{array}{l}\text { As (51) (1557). (*see note below) } \\ \text { received was a questionnaire } \\ \text { for the review of changes to } \\ \text { existing CPZ. There was no } \\ \text { mention of extending the } \\ \text { CPZ to include other County } \\ \text { Road and no plans were sent }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { A public consultation was undertaken in } \\ \text { Juf the existing CPZ which included plans for } \\ \text { ease of reference. The proposals were } \\ \text { revised following the public consultation \& } \\ \text { a subsequent statutory consultation was } \\ \text { undertaken all the residents \& businesses } \\ \text { were consulted on both occasions. (*see } \\ \text { note below) }\end{array}\right.\right\}$



|  | west side of Devonshire Road are wasted before 10 am and after 4 pm as they have yellow lines no longer used by the business | consultation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1457) | 159. Current restrictions on Neptune Road are satisfactory. No need to complicate matters. | The proposed measures on Neptune Road are designed to accommodate most users. The measures are a direct response to residents and businesses. |
| (1455) | 160. No justification for extending the CPZ | The proposals were put forward by the residents \& businesses to do something about the parking problems |
|  | 161. where would people coming into the area for business park | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation |
|  | 162. This may result in business relocating | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation |
|  | 163. Should have facilities to be able to park close to our business | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation |
|  | 164. The consultation is flawed as not all businesses in the area have been consulted (where there is more than one business in one premises) | If the address is registered as having two businesses operating at the address then they both would have been consulted. |
|  | 165. When residents leave to go to work businesses can use them and when the leave the residents can use them | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking. |
|  | 166. As (140) (1553) | As (140) (1553) |
|  | 167. If scheme goes ahead this will make life difficult for the businesses in the area who rely on cars to getting too and from work. | Noted |
| (1424) | 168. Proposals will make life difficult | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking. |
|  | 169. As (162) (1455) | As (162) (1455) |
|  | 170. Why should we pay to visit our own shop? | The proposals were put forward by the residents \& businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking. |
| (1455) | 171. As (165) (1455) | As (165) (1455) |
|  | 172. As (160) (1455) | As (160) (1455) |
|  | 173. As (161) (1455) | As (161) (1455) |
|  | 174. As (164) (1455) | As (164) (1455) |


|  | 175. As (167) (1455) | As (167) (1455) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1523) | 176. The proposals restrict safe entry and exit from our property | This cannot be considered as part of this consultation |
| (1546) | 177. I do not have parking offered by my development \& will not be able to park near by | Noted. Some free bay will be provided on Neptune Road. However the demand will far exceed the no. of spaces available. |
| (1460) | 178. People will be forced to park further away | The proposals were put forward by the residents \& businesses to do something about the parking problems. Where practicable provisions have been provided for both businesses, residents and passing trade. |
| (1546) | 179. What are the benefits for the residents on the County Roads | The restrictions will prevent long term all day commuter parking. |
|  | 180. How much will it cost? | This will depend on the final agreed scheme once a decision is made by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety. |
|  | 181. Why does the council feel that a revised CPZ should be proposed? | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking |
|  | 182. What are the benefits to social communities whereby they need to entertain friends and families. | The proposed CPZ will remove long term commuter parking and that from residents who live inside an existing CPZ but prefer not to pay by parking on adjacent roads who are not in the CPZ. Resident and visitors will be able to more easily park nearer to their properties due to reduced parking. |
| (1504) | 183. Residing in a shared apartment with one allotted parking space. There are 3 tenants with two cars. I will have nowhere to Park. | Noted. <br> Difficulties would only be experienced during the restricted hours of 11am12noon. |
| Sussex Road |  |  |
| (1555) | 184. There could be an impact on Sussex Road by introducing permit parking on nearby roads. | Noted. |
|  | 185. Why should we pay to be able to park close to our house | By introducing parking permits, only residents in the area qualify for the permits and the costs of the permits are related to the no of cars owned/registered. This removed the problem of long term commuter parking and makes it easier for local residents to be able to park near their properties. |


|  | 186. I do agree with the <br> double yellow lines in terms <br> of safety and access. | Noted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (1547) | 187. I feel that the Council <br> has incorrectly interpreted <br> the resident's wishes. This <br> would not have been the <br> case if the questionnaire had <br> specifically asked if residents <br> wished to be included if a <br> NEIGHBOURING road was. | Noted. <br> The Public Consultation carried out in July <br> 2011 had specifically asked those that were <br> consulted. If you answered "NO" to <br> extending the existing CPZ in your part of <br> the street. If parking controls were <br> introduced in the road near to yours, would <br> you then support residents parking in your <br> part of the street? This was specifically <br> done to prevent this kind of confusion at a <br> later stage. |
|  | 188. The properties located <br> along Sussex Rd either side <br> of the side road junctions <br> would be forced to park on <br> Sussex Rd with the <br> introduction of the CPZ. <br> They are being unfairly <br> discriminated against by the <br> extension. | After considering the responses to the <br> statutory consultation the officers in <br> discussion with the ward councillors will not <br> be recommending that the proposed CPZ's <br> be extended the full length of the following <br> County roads (Bedford Road, Rutland Road <br> and Oxford Road. The section along <br> Devonshire Road outside the existing CPZ <br> will be recommended to the P.H to agree a <br> mini statutory consultation be undertaken <br> again due to the responses received. |
| The |  |  |


| (1429) | 194. CPZ would force parking onto adjacent roads | With the introduction of a CPZ there is always a possibility of some parking being pushed onto adjacent streets. That is why we consulted Sussex Roads in the public consultation and the majority had responded saying they did not wish to be included in the CPZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 195. This will become a source of income for the council | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking. |
| (1430) | 196. This is a money making excuse there is no reason for the CPZ extension. | The proposals were put forward by the resident \& businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking. |
|  | 197. Council Time better spent repairing potholes | Noted |
| (1522) | 198. Over the last 6 months it is becoming increasingly difficult to find parking space. Parking permits in surrounding streets would exacerbate parking problems on Sussex Road | Noted. |
|  | 199. due to poor response to the initial consultation a second questionnaire or extended time frame would have been valid | Sussex road was not considered in the statutory consultation because the majority of those that had responded did not want to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. A statutory 21day consultation period is allowed for all comments/response to be submitted to the Council. |
|  | 200. It was not made clear to the residents the implications to parking. , community and well-being if the CPZ was introduced on adjacent roads what impact this would have on them. | The Public Consultation carried out in July 2011 had specifically asked those that were consulted. If you answered "NO" to extending the existing CPZ in your part of the street. If parking controls were introduced in the road near to yours, would you then support residents parking in your part of the street? This was specifically done to prevent this kind of confusion at a later stage. |
|  | 201. If this cannot be reviewed I would be grateful for your advice and recommendations as to how I can bring this to the attention of the decision makers. | In order for Sussex Road to be included in the CPZ extension a statutory reconsultation would need to be re-done. |
| (1495) | 202. I object to Sussex Road not being included in the | Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the |


|  | proposals hence forcing nonresidents onto our street | public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1515) | 203. As (202) (1495) | (202) (1495) |
|  | 204. The proposal will force non-residents who live within the CPZ area onto our street as they do not wish to pay for a parking permit. This problem is compounded by some properties being converted to flats and some have up to 4 cars. | Noted. |
| (1506) | 205. Parking is a nightmare and we park on Oxford Road, Rutland Road or Bedford Road | Noted |
|  | 206. Parking is worst during the week days. When commuters park on Sussex Rd \& walk to the station. | Noted |
|  | 207 As (204) (1515) | Noted |
|  | 208 As (202) (1495) | As (202) (1495) |
| (1453) | 209. As (194) (1429) | As (194) (1429) |
|  | 210. I would like Sussex Road to be included in the CPZ | Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension. |
| (1479) | 211. This will increase congestion on Sussex Road making parking impossible | Noted |
| (1518) | 212. We support the proposed CPZ extension. But have reservations about the usefulness of the double yellow lines. | Noted |
|  | 213. As (211) (1479) | As (211) (1479) |
|  | 214. Disappointed that the Council did not include Sussex Road | Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension |
|  | 214. The analysis of the resident's survey relating to Sussex Road is flawed. We believe that the eastern and western side of Sussex Road display different characteristics. Hence requiring different treatment. | Noted |
|  | 215. We urge the Council to review their decision about | Noted |


|  | the eastern and western <br> sides of Sussex Road. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Avoiding costly errors, |  |  |
| residents suffering, |  |  |
| additional costs and |  |  |
| addressing the problem in |  |  |
| the near future. |  |  |$\quad$.
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## APPENDIX D

Traffic Scheme Consultation


# Pinner Road - County Roads Controlled Parking Zone U Proposed Extension <br> <br> STATUTORY CONSULTATION 

 <br> <br> STATUTORY CONSULTATION}

IMPORTANT - THIS AFFECTS YOU - PLEASE RESPOND

## APPENDIX D

## What is this about?

A public consultation was carried out between February 2011 and July 2011, asking residents and businesses along county roads whether they would like a CPZ in their road.

The results of this public consultation were presented to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) on 20th September 2011. TARSAP were asked to approve the recommendations made in the report to take the changes forward to Statutory Consultation. The recommendations were based on the responses from the residents and businesses during the consultation.

The report was presented to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety for his final approval. The recommendations and TARSAP report can be viewed on Harrow Council website at - http://tinyurl.com/cnns8fk

The link will need to be entered into your web browser. If you do not have personal access to the internet the council public libraries do have internet access that residents may use. Alternatively hard copies can be provided on request. The recommendations are also summarised below for your convenience.

The Portfolio Holder agreed the recommendations to take the scheme to the next stage, which is Statutory Consultation. Statutory Consultation is the legal process that the council is required to undertake before any changes can be made to any waiting or loading restrictions, or designated parking bays on the public highway.

Summary of recommendations, which can be viewed in association with the enclosed plans, are as below.

## Proposals for County Roads:

1) Extension to the Pinner Road Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) permit parking for residents with the operational hours of 11 am -12 noon Monday to Friday is proposed in the following roads and or sections of roads:
a) Bedford Road
b) Rutland Road
c) Oxford Road
d) Dorset Road and
e) Eastern side of Devonshire Road fronting nos. 44 to 74 , inclusive
2) Double yellow line waiting restrictions - We are taking the opportunity to introduce or extend short sections of existing double yellow lines at all junctions, bends and narrow roads within the area of proposed extension of CPZ. These are designed to improve visibility for drivers, deter obstructive parking that could affect emergency services throughout the area of proposed extension of CPZ. Double yellow lines are also proposed along county roads to facilitate passing space for vehicles.

## APPENDIX D

## Proposals for Neptune Road:

It is proposed to regulate Neptune Road with a variety of parking controls designed to accommodate most users. A combination of loading bays, free parking places, pay and display and shared use permit/pay and display parking is proposed. Please refer to enclosed plan for more details.

## What happens next?

As mentioned earlier this is the Statutory Consultation stage, which is the legal requirement that the council needs to complete. The plans have been developed taking into account, where practical, all the comments we received during the previous consultation stages.
This is your opportunity to review the plans in private and make any further comments. It will not be possible to add any further amendments now, as the scheme has been developed using previous resident and business comments. However, small changes that do not impact on the safety for the wider community may still be possible or the changes could be abandoned.

We shall advertise the Traffic Management Order by placing notices on street lamp columns and in a local paper on or about 19th July 2012 which will also explain where the plans can be seen, this would give anyone a chance to comment or place a formal objection if they wish to do so by 8th August 2012.

The results and any formal objections will be presented to TARSAP for consideration to proceed to implementation on the agreed measures. It is anticipated that the results will be reported to TARSAP on 29th November 2012. If there are any formal objections then TARSAP will determine what action needs to be taken for the elements of the scheme to be progressed. Once approval to proceed has been obtained the scheme will be given to our contractors to implement and all residents will be informed of the outcome.

## Parking permit charges

The current annual resident parking charges in Harrow are:

| 1st Vehicle in household | $£ 60$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2nd Vehicle | $£ 90$ |
| 3rd Vehicle | $£ 120$ |
| 4th and subsequent Vehicle | $£ 150$ |

Environmentally friendly vehicles are not subject to charging, but a permit still needs to be displayed. Motorcycles do not need a permit and can also park free-of-charge in any pay and display bay or permit bay in Harrow.

Visitor permits are $£ 15$ per book of 10 , which is reduced to $£ 7.50$ for senior citizens or those receiving mobility benefits if the discount is claimed.

There is no charge for environmentally friendly vehicles, but a permit is still required.
$\qquad$
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## Making a formal statutory objection

Under the legislation which controls the statutory consultation process anyone, local resident/business or not, can make a formal objection to the proposals. However the objection needs to be made in writing (email is acceptable) including the word object or objection (to distinguish it clearly from comments) and the reason for the basis of the objection with your name and address. The law sets out strict timetable for considering formal objections.

We have provided a questionnaire with space for your comments. Please return the questionnaire using the pre-paid envelope provide or alternatively complete the online form available at www.harrow. gov. uk/trafficconsultations Objections to the scheme proposals can also sent to:

Traffic and Highway Network Management
Harrow Council
PO Box 39
Civic Centre
Harrow
HA1 2XA
Or by email to transportation@harrow.gov.uk
Quoting Ref: DP 2012-10 ensuring it is received by 8th August 2012.

## More information

If you have any further questions, or wish to comment, please contact the project engineer:

Tushar Patel
Tel: 02084247534
Email: transportation@harrow.gov.uk
or write to:
Tushar Patel
Parking and Sustainable Transport
Harrow Council
P.O. Box 39

Civic Centre,
Harrow
HA1 2 XA
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## PINNER ROAD - COUNTY ROADS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE PROPOSED EXTENSION - QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete this questionnaire.
Please return your comments by 8th August 2012. In a effort for the council to be more energy and cost effective, you can submit your questionnaire on-line by visiting www.harrow.gov.uk/trafficconsultations and then clicking to visit live consultations. This will direct you to a page containing the Pinner Road County Roads CPZ Extension -Phase 2. ". You may be asked to register your details before completing the survey.

Alternatively you may still complete this hard copy and return it using the enclosed prepaid reply envelope (no stamp required), to arrive by 8th August 2012.

Questionnaires returned without a name and address will not be officially recorded in the results. We count your household / business as one response.

REMEMBER - Responses will not be counted as a statutory objection unless the word "object" or "objection" is mentioned along with the reason for the basis of the objection with your name and address.

Due to the large number of responses anticipated, we cannot reply to you individually.
First Name
Family Name
Business Name (if applicable)


Please tick the most appropriate answer to each of the questions below, and use the space for comments on the back of this sheet if you need to.

If you are not sure about any of the questions, please contact the project engineer whose details are given in the accompanying leaflet and at the above website address.

Q1 Are you a resident or business?


Q2
Do you support the revised parking proposals in your part of the road?

$$
\text { Yes } \square \text { No } \square \quad \text { No opinion } \square
$$

Please use the space on the back of this sheet to clarify your response.
If you have any comments, please use the space provided on the back of this sheet.
If you do NOT want your response to be available for public inspection please tick here.

$\qquad$
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## Please call the number below for a large print version of this document, or a summary of this document in your language.

| Albanian | Nëqoftëse gjuha Angleze nuk është ghuha juaj e parë, dhe keni nevojë për përkthimin e informatave të përmbajtura në këtë dokumentê, ju lutemi kontaktoni numërin dhënës. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Arabic |  <br>  |






Farsi .
屏



Hindi यदि आपको अंगेज़ी यमझ नहीं आती और आपका इस डग्तावंज में दो गई जानकार्ग का अनुवाद हिन्दी में चाहिए तो कृपया दिए गए नंवर पर फोन करें।



$\qquad$
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REPORT FOR: Traffic And Road Satety Advisory Panel
Date of Meeting:

29 November 2012
Subject:Key Decision:Responsible Officer:
Portfolio Holder:
Exempt:
Decision subject to Call-in:
Enclosures:

Canons Park Area Parking Review Statutory Consultation

No
Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise
Phillip O'Dell - Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety No

Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety

## Appendix A

Consultation documents primarily related to safety related proposals

## Appendix B

Consultation documents primarily related to amenity related proposals

## Appendix C

Consultation Plans

## Appendix D

Response summary on a road by road or part road basis

## Appendix E

Statutory objections received

## Appendix F

Recommended changes to consultation plans for implementation

## Section 1 - Summary and Recommendations

This report gives details of the results of the statutory consultation regarding parking proposals (see Appendix C and F) for the Canons Park area undertaken in August 2012 and seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for the proposals to be implemented.

## Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that the following measures be implemented in:

1. Donnefield Avenue - "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) along the full extent of the eastern kerb line and in the northern turning area. A Permit zone, including 1 disabled bay at the entrance to the park, operational Monday to Saturday, 8am - 6:30pm,
2. Torbridge Close - Permit zone operational Monday to Friday, 2pm 3pm,
3. Station Parade, Whitchurch Lane -
i) 1disabled bay and 19 shared permit holder / pay and display bays operational Monday to Saturday, 8am -6:30pm on the northern side of the front service road,
ii) Waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Saturday, 10am - 11am and 2pm - 3pm on the southern side of the front service road,
iii) "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and through narrow sections and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) through the remainder operational Monday to Friday, 12 noon - 1 pm on the rear and eastern service road,
iv) No loading controls operational Monday to Saturday, 8am - 6:30pm on the eastern service road,
4. Cheyneys Avenue between the southern property boundaries of 52 and 106 - waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, $2 \mathrm{pm}-3 \mathrm{pm}$,
5. Du Cros Drive - waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday between 3pm - 4pm,
6. Buckingham Road between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens - various sections of "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm,
7. Buckingham Gardens - "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and in the turning head,
8. Parr Road between the junction of Garland Road and the eastern turning head - "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on the southern side of the carriageway,
9. Bromefield / Bush Grove / Maychurch Close - "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends, junctions, roundabouts and through narrow sections and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm,
10. Bramble Close - "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) extended along narrow access and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm,
(a) Honeypot Lane Shopping parade -
i) waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, $2 p m-3 p m$ in the front service road,
ii) "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on junctions, bends and through narrow sections at the rear of the parade on Brick Lane,
iii) waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 12:00 to 13:00 at the rear of the parade on Brick Lane,
(b) "At any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in various locations as detailed in appendices C and F at junctions, in turning heads, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code,
(c) That the Service Manager - Traffic \& Highway Network Management is authorised to take the necessary steps to implement the above recommendations,
(d) Residents and businesses throughout the consultation area are informed of the outcome of the statutory consultation and Portfolio Holder decision,
(e) Any significant issues arising from the final agreed scheme a minimum 6 months after implementation be reported to the panel for consideration of a review.

## Reason:

To control parking in the area surrounding Canons Park Station as well as the surrounding roads as detailed in the report. The measures are in direct response to resident requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and in order to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

## Section 2 - Report

## Introduction

2.1 Parking has a significant impact on the quality of life of Harrow's residents and a significant impact on the viability of Harrow's businesses and is one of the main concerns reported to the Council regarding transport issues. This report sets out how parking issues raised in the Canons Park area are being addressed in order to support local residents and businesses concerns about parking.

## Options considered

2.2 The Statutory Consultation proposals were developed from previous public consultations and took into account as many of the comments from residents and businesses as possible. The options available to local people were to support or object to the proposed scheme advertised.
2.3 It should be noted that there is a wide range of opinion in area scheme consultations and whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view was reflected in the recommendations made.

## Background

2.4 The parking review was commenced because of numerous requests from both residents and businesses raising concerns about increased parking pressures and access issues in the area surrounding Canons Park Station. Many comments received indicated that the problems were associated with an increase in commuter parking and vehicles displaced from local residential developments.
2.5 The last review took place over 10 years ago and resulted in various measures to resolve issues at the time, however, comments received suggest parking problems have now spread to adjacent areas.
2.6 In July 2011 a stakeholders meeting was held at St Lawrence Parish Church in order to listen to the concerns raised and to define an agreed consultation boundary for any proposals developed.

## Public consultation

> 2.7 In December 2011 consultation documents were distributed to 4,863 properties within the agreed consultation area asking residents and businesses if they experience parking problems.
> 2.8 All the responses received were reported to the panel on $8^{\text {th }}$ February 2012 along with a detailed analysis. In locations where the majority of responses indicated support for additional controls the report contained officer recommendations about proposals which could be taken forward to the statutory consultation phase. After careful consideration
the Panel recommended proposals to the Portfolio Holder who agreed that they should progress to the statutory consultation phase.

## Buckingham Road Re-consultation

2.9 Part of the agreed recommendations by the Panel was to re-consult Buckingham Road properties 1-57. This was due to the residents submitting a petition in the initial public consultation stating that they suffered from parking problems but did not indicate what measures they would support.
2.10 In July 2012 a second public consultation was undertaken to clarify the views of these residents to determine whether any measures would be supported and could be progressed to the statutory consultation phase.
2.11 A total of 21 responses were received from 63 properties equating to a response rate of $33 \%$. Of the 21 responses received only 9 felt there was a parking problem and would support the introduction of additional measures. This equated to a support level of $43 \%$ which does not indicate majority support so no additional proposals are proposed in Buckingham Road.

## Statutory consultation

2.12 A statutory consultation was undertaken to establish the views of residents on the detailed measures developed by officers and agreed by the Panel and the Portfolio Holder.
2.13 Consultation documents were distributed to a total of 1,458 properties on the $25^{\text {th }}$ and $26^{\text {th }}$ July 2012 and formally commenced on the $26^{\text {th }}$ July. The consultation ended on the $16^{\text {th }}$ August 2012. Two different types of consultation documents were delivered depending on the measures proposed in the area.
2.14 Safety related measures primarily consist of "at any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on junctions, bends and narrow sections of carriageway to ensure access for emergency services and improve traffic flow and visibility. They support the well established rules set out in the Highway Code and underline a consistent approach taken throughout the borough. Officers aim progress these measures unless there is a substantial justification to the contrary. A total of 848 of these documents were delivered. A plan showing the extent of the proposals was provided along with a letter explaining the rationale for the proposals. A copy of the consultation document and plans can be found in Appendix A and C respectively.
2.15 The other type of consultation document relates to amenity related measures where controls are introduced to manage parking pressures in high demand areas. These are focussed on areas where residents and businesses highlighted parking problems in the initial public consultation. These consist of waiting restrictions (both single and double yellow lines), resident permit zones and pay and display bays. In these locations officers seek a majority support for the proposals to be demonstrated in order for a recommendation to be made to
progress any measures to implementation. A total of 610 documents were delivered to these locations. The document consisted of an outline explanation of why the consultation was taking place, a plan, a questionnaire asking if they supported the proposals in their street, a freepost return envelope and equality monitoring form. In addition to this adverts were placed in the Harrow Times, notices were erected on site and details were placed on the Harrow website in order to publicise the consultation. A copy of the consultation document and plans can be found in Appendix B and C respectively.
2.16 Officers received a steady number of questionnaire responses from throughout the consultation area both online and via the postal service. This provides a good indication that all roads within the consultation area received the documents. Where multiple responses were received from a particular property only one was taken into consideration in the consultation results table, however all comments received were considered.
2.17 As a significant proportion of the responses were unexpectedly received in the form of a letter or e-mail, many respondents made multiple comments on different proposals without clearly stating whether they support or object to the measures. In these instances officers have considered the content of the comments and assessed whether they support or object to the measures.

## Responses

2.18 From the 1,458 properties consulted 256 responses were received by questionnaire, letter or email. In addition, two petitions were received containing a total of 40 qualifying signatures. This represented an overall response rate of $20 \%$ and is slightly lower than would normally be expected from a statutory consultation.
2.19 In areas where amenity related controls were proposed, 610 consultation documents containing questionnaires were delivered and 195 responses were received which equated to a response rate of 32\%.
2.20 In areas where safety related measures were proposed 848 documents were delivered and 61 responses including the two petitions were received. This equates to a $12 \%$ response rate. As officers look to progress safety measures unless a justifiable reason is provided, the consultation documents asked only for comments.
2.21 A tabulated summary of responses for amenity or safety related measures are provided on a road by road basis in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$.
2.22 Details of all statutory objections along with officer's responses can be found in Appendix E.
2.23 Councillors from each of the four wards were invited to attend a meeting to discuss the detailed results and the officers recommendations prior to the panel meeting.
2.24 Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses received and a complete copy is available for members to review in the member's library.

## Analysis of Amenity Related Proposals

## Bramble Close

2.25 The proposals include the extension of existing double yellow lines at the junction with Honeypot Lane and single yellow lines throughout the remainder of the Close operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections |  |  | | Rannnn |
| :---: |
| 0 |

2.26 As problems have continued to be reported since the consultation and there is likely to be an increase in parking pressures if proposals are approved in adjacent streets, officers recommend that the measures be implemented in Bramble Close.

Brick Lane (rear service road behind Honeypot Lane shopping parade)
2.27 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions, bends and narrow sections of the carriageway. In the remaining areas single yellow lines operating Monday to Friday, $2 \mathrm{pm}-3 \mathrm{pm}$ will be introduced.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 33\% | 33\% |

2.28 The comments received indicated support for the double yellow lines however businesses felt that the single yellow lines would be detrimental to their business operations by removing parking in the area for one hour during the day. Having considered all the comments submitted, officers feel that by amending the operational hours for the single yellow line to Monday to Friday, 1 pm $-2 p m$ this will allow more flexibility for the businesses and residents to park whilst ensuring long term commuter parking does not take place throughout the day. The revised proposals for Brick Lane are detailed in Appendix F.

## Bromefield (between the junction of Wemborough Road and Home Mead)

2.29 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions, bends, narrow sections and the roundabout. In the remaining areas single yellow lines operating Monday to Friday, $2 \mathrm{pm}-3 \mathrm{pm}$ will be introduced.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections |  |  | |  | 7 | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 7 |

2.30 Multiple objections were received from residents to the double yellow lines around the roundabout because this would reduce available parking space. Although many accepted parked vehicles obstructed larger vehicles, it was felt that it is primarily commuter parking that causes the problems and residents should not be penalised by having this parking removed. Alternative suggestions were put forward to introduce single yellow lines because they would be more suitable for removing long term parking whilst allowing visitors, weekend and evening parking for those living in the area.
2.31 Objections to the single yellow line proposals were also received predominantly from residents living on the south-western boundary of the proposals. The objections were due to either residents feeling the controls were not necessary (as they did not suffer from external parking) or through concerns that vehicles would be displaced to locations outside the controlled area. Other comments received raised concerns over parents parking in dangerous locations when dropping off and collecting their children.
2.32 Having considered the objections and comments submitted from residents regarding double yellow lines on the roundabout officers are of the view that serious obstruction is caused to larger vehicles irrespective of the vehicle ownership. The evidence on site shows that vehicles frequently mount the kerbs and grassed area to pass obstructive parking resulting in additional highway maintenance work required to repair the roundabout at the Council's expense.
2.33 Officers contacted the local Fire Station Manager for his views on the proposals around the roundabout and received the following response.
> "Proposals will enhance our access as there is heavy parking throughout the area which significantly restricts access for Fire Appliances particularly around the roundabout itself."
2.34 Given the clear requirement for the carriageway to be kept clear of all vehicles in this location officers recommend that all double yellow lines are implemented as proposed.
2.35 Objections relating to the single yellow lines were predominantly received from properties between Bush Grove and Home Mead. Given these proposals are for the amenity of the residents and there was no majority support in this area officers recommend that the single yellow line proposals are cut back to the junction of Bush Grove as detailed in Appendix F.

## Buckingham Gardens

2.36 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions, bends and the turning head. In the remaining areas single yellow lines operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm will be introduced.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Ren |  |
| 0 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 20 | $64 \%$ | $26 \%$ |

2.37 The initial questionnaire responses received indicated support for the proposals however after a letter was distributed to all residents by an unknown source opinions appear to have subsequently changed. Many of these letters were signed by the residents and sent in formally objecting to the single yellow line proposals. It should be noted a number received came from properties who had already returned the questionnaire supporting the measures. The objections stated
"In an effort to discourage commuter parking we, as residents, are also denied the opportunity to use our road space. The proposed scheme will detract from the enjoyment of our property, taking away our current right to all-day parking in the vicinity"
2.38 The comments received also highlighted concerns about vehicles parking opposite each other blocking access. A suggestion put forward was to introduce double yellow lines down one side of the carriageway preventing parking at any time.
2.39 Due to the lack of support for the amenity related single yellow lines restrictions officers recommend that these are not implemented and that only the proposed double yellow lines on junctions, bends and in the turning head progress to implementation as detailed in Appendix F.

## Buckingham Road between junctions with Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens

2.40 It is proposed to introduce a combination of double yellow lines on the bend and single yellow lines operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Rennnnn <br> 0 | 5 |
| 6 | 0 | 5 | $41 \%$ | $55 \%$ |  |  |

2.41 Objections were received from residents due to the reduction in parking space resulting from the restrictions. It was stated that without off-street parking residents would not be able to park throughout the day and this would cause displaced parking into adjacent streets.
2.42 Comments from respondents supporting the double yellow lines also highlighted the problems experienced with vehicles in some instances having to mount the footway to pass each other.
2.43 A request was received for resident permit bays or the right to purchase permits for Torbridge Close. However, it should be noted that single yellow lines were proposed by officers as an alternative to resident permit bays because the responses from the previous public consultation indicated less than $15 \%$ support for this option.
2.44 Considering the majority support for the proposals and requirement to prevent vehicles from obstructing traffic flows it is recommended that measures be implemented

## Bush Grove

2.45 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions and single yellow lines between the junction with Wemborough Road and 26 Bush Grove operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | 0 | $33 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  |  |

2.46 Objections were received from properties on the periphery of the single yellow lines restrictions raising concerns that they will displace vehicles to park outside their properties. The majority of these responses requested that the proposals be extended to protect the carriageway outside their properties rather than opposing them. Additional comments highlighted concerns over school parents parking on junctions obstructing traffic flow and visibility. One response supported a change in control times to incorporate school collection times.
2.47 Given the majority support and comments received regarding dangerous parking at junctions officers recommend that the proposals are implemented. It should be noted that the extent of the single yellow line proposals are based on responses received from the initial public consultation and measures cannot be significantly extended without a further statutory consultation. This can be considered as part of any future review.

## Cheyneys Avenue

2.48 It is proposed to introduce single yellow lines between the southern property boundaries of 52 and 120 Cheyneys Avenue operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Ren |  |
| 1 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 4 | $37 \%$ | $56 \%$ |

2.49 The objections received stated that they did not feel that commuter parking was severe enough to warrant the restrictions. Others raised concerns that the restrictions would displace parking to just outside the extent of the proposals.
2.50 When analysing the responses received the majority of the objections received originated from the northern section of the proposed extension. Officers therefore recommend that the proposed single yellow line extension is reduced to the southern boundary of 106 Cheyneys Avenue as detailed in Appendix F.

## Donnefield Avenue

2.51 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines along the full extent of the eastern kerb line and in the turning area. A Permit zone, including 1 disabled bay, will be introduced at the entrance to the park, operating Monday to Saturday, 8am-6:30pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Onnnnyy |  |
| 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 4 | $25 \%$ | $77 \%$ |

2.52 The proposed measures received strong support from residents living on Donnefield Avenue, predominantly due to the high level of commuter parking both during the week and at the weekend restricting their ability to park.
2.53 Objections were received from residents in the Canons Park area in relation to the extent of the control times of the permit zone. This is due to the controls restricting parking for visitors to the park during the week and on Saturdays. Other comments received also raised concerns that by introducing the controls in Donnefield Avenue vehicles will be displaced onto Whitchurch Lane obstructing traffic flow.
2.54 Unanimous support was received for the double yellow lines on the eastern side of the carriageway, preventing vehicles obstructing traffic flow and private accesses.
2.55 Given the significant majority support from residents officers recommend that the proposed resident permit zone, associated double yellow lines and disabled bay are implemented.
2.56 In respect of the concerns about vehicles being displaced onto Whitchurch Avenue it is expected that this area will be reviewed in the very near future. If Barnet Football Club take forward proposals to play their home games at The Hive a subsequent review of the impact on parking in the area would be undertaken and include Whitchurch Avenue.
2.57 Consideration was given to reducing the permit zone operating hours so that it did not include Saturday, however, taking account of the recommended measures for Station Parade and surrounding areas it was considered that Donnefield Avenue residents would be adversely affected by this change. This would include problems with local residents from nearby developments parking from Friday evening throughout the weekend as well as weekend commuters using the station. This would leave a very limited number of spaces for either visitors to the park or residents.

## Du Cros Drive

2.58 It is proposed to introduce single yellow lines from the junction with Marsh Lane and the railway bridge, operating Monday to Friday, 3pm 4pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 1 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 29\% | 66\% |

2.59 The main concern of objections raised was the removal of parking for properties with insufficient or no off street parking. Given that Du Cros Drive is currently located on the periphery of the existing Stanmore

CPZ it was explained that there is limited parking opportunities in side streets for both residents and visitors. In addition to this, concerns were raised over vehicle speeds increasing and front gardens being concreted over to provide off street parking having a negative impact on the environment.
2.60 Given the majority support for the proposals and the minimal impact on visitors (1 hour restriction) officers recommend that the measures are implemented. If the measures are approved and implemented road safety officers will assess and monitor any speeding concerns raised.

## Honeypot Lane Shopping Parade

2.61 It is proposed to introduce single yellow lines in the service road fronting Honeypot Lane operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | ( 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | $29 \%$ | $67 \%$ |  |

2.62 The objections received stated that there is not currently a problem with parking in the parade and the single yellow lines would have a negative impact on both residents and businesses by removing all parking in the area during the 1 hour of operation.
2.63 Other comments received supported the proposals stating commuters parking in the parade from early in the morning prevented customers from parking during the day and had a negative impact on their businesses.
2.64 Due to the majority support for the proposals and problems highlighted by the businesses officers recommend that the measures are implemented.
2.65 It should be noted that due to the objections received changes to the control times on the rear service road, Brick Lane, are recommended to be changed to 12 noon -1 pm . This will provide an alternative location for temporary parking should residents or businesses need to park in the area from $2 \mathrm{pm}-3 \mathrm{pm}$. These changes can be seen in Appendix F.

## Maychurch Close

2.66 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at the junction and in the turning head. Single yellow lines introduced in remain areas operating Monday to Friday, 2pm - 3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Ran |  |
| 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | $47 \%$ | $71 \%$ |

2.67 The proposal for double yellow lines at the junction with the roundabout received strong support from residents.
2.68 Objections were received in relation to both the single yellow lines and the double yellow lines in the turning head. Objectors stated that although the single yellow lines will remove commuters it will also prevent friends and family visiting during the operational hours making the current situation worse. Furthermore, it was stated that double yellow lines are not required in the turning head as emergency service can gain entry to the close.
2.69 Due to the majority support demonstrated and improvements in safety officers recommend that the measures are implemented.
2.70 The justification for restrictions in the turning head is to allow for vehicles to turn around without having to reverse out of the close on to the roundabout which puts drivers at greater risk of a collision.

## Station Parade, Whitchurch Lane

2.71 It is proposed to introduce a disabled bay and 19 shared permit holder / pay and display bays operating Monday to Saturday, 8am - 6:30pm on the northern side of the front service road. Single yellow lines are proposed operating Monday to Saturday, 10am - 11am and 2pm 3 pm on the southern side of the service road fronting Whitchurch Lane.
2.72 Double yellow lines are proposed on the rear and eastern service road on bends and through narrow sections and a single yellow line through the remainder of the road operating Monday to Friday, 12 noon -1 pm .
2.73 No loading restrictions are proposed on the eastern service road operating Monday to Saturday, 8am - 6:30pm.

$\left.$| Support Proposals? |  |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Support |
| :---: |
| Level | \right\rvert\, | No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | $24 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | $20 \%$ |

2.74 The objections received opposed the introduction of the shared permit holder / pay and display bays. It is believed either residents with permits will occupy the spaces for prolonged periods or that motorists will not stop to pay taking their custom to other areas where parking is free. Many of the objections received from the shops were due to the single yellow line being operational Monday to Friday and not including Saturday.
2.75 Businesses in support of the proposals stated that frequently their customers cannot park and that recent housing developments in the area have increased the problem resulting in reduced turnover and difficulties with receiving deliveries.
2.76 Residents highlighted that commuter parking often prevents them parking nearby forcing them to park in adjacent streets both in the evenings and at weekends.
2.77 Several responses received from properties opposite the parade on Whitchurch Lane objected due to misunderstanding about the proposals. It was believed that the existing double yellow lines on the northern side of the carriageway opposite the junction with Hitchin

Lane would be downgraded to single yellow lines. This is not the case and no parking "at any time" restrictions will remain in this location.
2.78 A number of objections were also received because they desired additional controls to be in place on Saturday.
2.79 Having considered all the responses from both businesses and residents it is clear they are experiencing significant problems additional controls are required. As the majority of responses supported the proposals officers recommend that the measures are implemented.

## Torbridge Close

2.80 It is proposed to introduce a permit zone operating Monday to Friday, 2pm-3pm.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7\% | 50\% |

2.81 The comments received requested a change in the hours of operation from the afternoon to the morning to allow for visitors later in the day. It was also suggested the existing double yellow lines are extended a short distance to cover the full length of the narrow entrance, ensuring improved emergency service access.
2.82 Although a low response rate was received officers believe given the proposed measures recommended in adjacent roads there is likely to be an increase in external parking pressures if no measures were introduced in Torbridge Close. Taking account of surrounding measures it would not be possible to change the operational hours because this would result in vehicles migrating from surrounding roads that remain operational in the afternoon.
2.83 Officers therefore recommend that the resident permit zone is implemented as advertised with the addition of an extension of the existing double yellow line restrictions at the junction with Buckingham Road. Details of the revised recommended proposals can be seen in Appendix F.

## Analysis of Safety Related Proposals

## Broadcroft Avenue junctions with Ladycroft Walk, Anmersh Grove, Pearswood Gardens, Honeypot Lane and the bend leading onto Lamorna Grove

2.84 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines extending 10 meters into junctions and at bends.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 2\% | 100\% |

2.85 One response was received supporting the proposals at the bend on Broadcroft Avenue and Lamorna Grove. However, the resident objects to the fact that double yellow lines are not being introduced on the
outside of the bend as well because parked vehicles obstruct both traffic flow and private accesses on the outside of the bend. It was also raised that school traffic frequently sound their horns in the morning to warn vehicles on the bend.
2.86 Consideration will be given in the future to introducing double yellow lines on the outside of the bend, however, as they were not advertised in the traffic order they cannot be added at this stage. The proposed measures on the inside of the bend will improve vehicle visibility and help reduce the need for vehicles to sound their horn to warn other motorists. It is recommended that the proposals are implemented.

## Cloyster Wood junctions with Longcroft Road, Cornbury Road and Howberry Road

2.87 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | $12 \%$ | $33 \%$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $12 \%$ |  |

2.88 One objection was received which referred to the loss of parking space and the fact that they had not experienced any problems in the past.
2.89 It is considered that as vehicles parked in these locations are doing so in contravention of the highway code there is not a true reduction in parking capacity. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

Crowshott Avenue junctions with Culver Grove, St Andrews Drive, Bush Grove, Ladycroft Walk, Anmersh Grove and Pearswood Gardens
2.90 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 2\% | 0\% |

2.91 The one objection received appealed against the extent of the measures as they extended across a private access located directly adjacent to a junction.
2.92 The measures are proposed on safety grounds. The objector's access falls within the standard 10 metres distance for the restrictions and it is recommended that the proposals are implemented.

## Dalston Gardens including junction with Wigton Gardens

2.93 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on the bend and at junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |

2.94 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.
2.95 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on bends and at junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Rennnnyyyyyyy |  |
| 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | $7 \%$ |  |

2.96 Objections to the proposals were received as it was felt that the measures are not required and will reduce parking space in the area. In addition to this one objection whose premises is located on a junction stated friends and family would not be able to park outside their house.
2.97 The measures are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. Officers therefore recommended that the measures are implemented.

Buckingham Road junctions with Chandos Crescent, Whitchurch Avenue and Merlin Crescent
2.98 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines around roundabouts and through narrow sections of the roads.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13\% | 0\% |

2.99 The objections received highlighted that the restrictions outside the local businesses, fronting the roundabouts, were unnecessary and would have a negative impact on them by reducing the availability of close customer parking.
2.100 Having reviewed the restrictions directly fronting the businesses officers believe that the double yellow lines can be reduced to provide additional parking whilst maintaining sufficient space to allow access and visibility to oncoming traffic.
2.101 Officers therefore recommend that the restrictions in front of 138 Merlin Crescent are reduced as detailed in Appendix F and that all other restrictions are implemented.

## Homemead

2.102 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines around the island and at the junction with Bromefield.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Ren |  |
| 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | $41 \%$ | $67 \%$ |

2.103 The majority of responses received supported the measures, however, the objections received indicated that the restrictions around the island were unnecessary and the reduced parking space will create problems for residents.
2.104 Due to the majority support for the measures and the need for these measures to ensure emergency services access officers recommend that the measures are implemented.

Honeypot Lane junctions with Wigton Gardens and Dalston Gardens
2.105 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines around the island and at the junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |  |

2.106 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Howberry Road including junctions with Watersfield Way, Cloyster Wood and Howberry Close

2.107 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines between the junctions with Du Cros Drive and Peters Close and double yellow lines at junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | - | 13\% | 83\% |

2.108 The majority of responses received supported the proposed double yellow lines on the junctions, however, one objection was received that opposed the double yellow lines approaching the junction with Du Cros Drive because it will remove parking space and create problems for the elderly and visitors.
2.109 The measures at the junctions are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. The measures on the narrow section of carriageway approaching Du Cros Drive are proposed to prevent vehicles from obstructing traffic and causing congestion at the junction. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Cheyneys Avenue

2.110 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on inside of the bend adjacent to 117 Cheyneys Avenue.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8\% | 0\% |

2.111 The one response received did not support the proposals stating the proposals were unnecessary and a fund raising exercise for the council.
2.112 The measures at the junctions are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Merlin Crescent including junctions with St Brides Avenue, St Davids Drive and Newgale Gardens

2.113 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions and bends.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4\% | 0\% |

2.114 The objections received raised concerns over displaced parking opposite the junctions that could obstruct traffic flow. One ojection indicated that they would like friends and family to be able to park outside their property and feel the proposals will devalue their property.
2.115 The measures at the junctions are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Milford Gardens

2.116 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on the bend adjacent to 36 Milford Gardens.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | 0 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

2.117 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Newgale Gardens

2.118 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines through the narrow access and in the turning head.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objo | - | $90 \%$ |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | $0 \%$ |  |

2.119 One statutory objection was received along with a petition objecting to the proposals. The objectors believe that they are not required, that there has never been a problem, it is inconceivable that anyone would park obstructing the access and that road markings will negatively impact on the character of the close and the value of properties.
2.120 The measures are proposed to ensure that vehicles, particularly emergency services vehicles, can access the close and have enough space to turn around thereby avoiding the need to reverse out of the close on to Merlin Crescent. Officers contacted the local Fire Station Manager for his views on the proposals in Newgale Gardens and received the following response.
"I would agree with the proposals but would suggest relaxing the need for yellow lines in the turnaround area as there is ample off road parking for the residents."
2.121 Taking account of the comments from the Fire Service officers recommend measures for the access to the close are implemented as advertised but that the proposed double yellow lines in the turning head are removed as detailed in Appendix F.

## Parr Road

2.122 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on the southern side of the carriageway outside 1-8 Honeypot Business Centre.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |

2.123 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers recommend that the measures are implemented.

## St Andrews Drive including junctions with Coledale Drive and

 Crowshott Avenue2.124 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on bends and junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |

2.125 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Stratton Close

2.126 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on bends and junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Onnnnyy |  |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

2.127 A number of objections were submitted by the Stratton Close Property Residents Association who felt that the measures are unnecessary. It was stated that Stratton Close is a quiet residential cul-de-sac which regularly receives large HGV deliveries without access issues. Furthermore, it is believed there is no safety benefit and the measures would contribute to additional parking pressure in the area.
2.128 Having reviewed the measures officers suggest that the double yellow lines on the southern side of Stratton Close at the junction with Whitchurch Gardens are reduced to allow for an additional parking space. The proposed amendments can be seen in Appendix F. All other measures are recommended to progress to implementation as advertised.

## Talman Grove

2.129 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on bend and junction.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | Response Rate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 79\% | 45\% |

2.130 The objections received raised concerns over the reduced parking space and the impact on friends and family visiting them. It was also claimed that it may affect community spirit locally.
2.131 The measures are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Watersfield Way including junctions with Longcroft Road, Cornbury Road, Howberry Road

2.132 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions and roundabout.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | (1) |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

2.133 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers recommend that the measures are implemented.

## Whitchurch Avenue

2.134 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | 0 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |

2.135 No consultation responses were received in relation to the proposals. Officers recommend that the measures are implemented.

## Whitchurch Gardens including Whitchurch Close and Woodstead Close

2.136 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions, bends and on narrow sections of carriageway.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { ( }\end{array}\right)$ |  |
| 0 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 4 | $58 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

2.137 The objections received oppose the measures because they are unnecessary and there is no history of any problems regarding access or visibility. The proposals would reduce parking space in the area creating problems for mobility impaired residents and visiting friends and family.
2.138 Having reviewed all the measures again officers recommend that the proposed double yellow lines at the bends adjacent to properties 85 and 98 on Whitchurch Gardens are not introduced because of the unusual kerb alignment which allows vehicles to park in these locations
without significantly affecting visibility or access. The proposed amendments can be seen in Appendix F. All other measures are recommended to progress to implementation as advertised.

Whitchurch Lane including junctions with St Lawrence Close, Whitchurch Avenue, Whitchurch Gardens, Winton Gardens and Buckingham Road
2.139 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on junctions and to protect the pedestrian island outside 168 Whitchurch Lane.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| 2 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | $7 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

2.140 The objections received oppose the measures protecting the island outside 168 Whitchurch Lane because they are considered unnecessary and excessive in length. Objections were also received in relation to the double yellow lines at the junction with Buckingham Road with local businesses also believing that they are excessive and unnecessary.
2.141 It should also be noted that comments were received from properties on Whitchurch Lane raising concerns over the potential for displaced parking as a consequence of the proposed measures for Station Parade and Donnefield Avenue if these are taken forward (see the sections in the report for these roads).
2.142 Having reviewed the proposed measures officers recommend that the double yellow lines protecting the island outside 168 Whitchurch Lane and at the junction with Buckingham Road are reduced. The proposed amendments can be seen in Appendix F. All other measures are recommended to progress to implementation as advertised.

## Wychwood Avenue including junction with Wildcroft Gardens

2.143 It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on the junction, bends and in narrow carriageway locations around islands.

| Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory | Response <br> Rate | Support <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners | Objections | Ren |  |
| 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | $22 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

2.144 The objections received oppose the double yellow lines because they are considered unnecessary and there is minimal impact from commuters or parking for Wembley events. Concerns were also raised over displaced parking should further yellow lines on the Howberry Estate be implemented and the impact of pay and display bays on Station Parade businesses.
2.145 Two requests were received from the southern arm of Wychwood Avenue for the single yellow lines to be extended to protect them. Officers note the concerns in this area over displaced parking from the proposed single yellow line extension however responses from the initial public consultation indicated this view is not supported by the
majority of residents and was therefore not taken forward to the statutory consultation.
2.146 The measures are proposed on safety grounds and current parking occurs in contravention of the Highway Code. Officers therefore recommend that the proposals are implemented.

## Post implementation review

2.147 As agreed at the February 2012 panel meeting automatic reviews on any new measures implemented are now no longer undertaken due to the limited resources available. Once the scheme is introduced and a period of time has elapsed to allow an operational assessment officers will report to the panel any areas where problems or concerns have resulted from the implementation of the agreed measures. The panel can then consider whether they support a review or remedial action.

## Financial Implications

2.148 This scheme is part of the Parking Management programme and there is a Harrow Capital allocation of $£ 300 \mathrm{k}$ for this programme in 2012/13. A sub allocation of $£ 40 \mathrm{k}$ for the implementation of the Canons Park area CPZ was recommended by TARSAP in February 2012 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
2.149 There is also $£ 40,000$ from developer contributions (s106 agreement) funding being provided from the development of the old government offices off Honeypot Lane (known as Fountain Park). This will be available on the completion of the 250th unit on the site. The monies have not been received yet and the planning department are currently liaising with the developer and anticipate the funds will be received shortly.
2.150 The original intention was that both sources of funding would support the implementation of the scheme, however, the final recommended scheme is now smaller and more localised than initially anticipated and the costs can be fully accommodated within the Harrow capital funding allocation.
2.151 When the s106 funding is received it will be used on parking measures within 400 metres of the development site. Therefore should any reviews of the scheme be requested following implementation then these funds could support that work.

## Risk Management Implications

2.152 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
2.153 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects, which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway and this would include all aspects of the proposals included in this report.

## Equalities implications

2.154 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes
2.155 A review of equality issues was undertaken and has indicated no adverse impact on any of the specified equality groups. There are positive impacts of the scheme on some equalities groups, particularly, women, children and people with mobility difficulties. Benefits are likely to be as follows:

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

2.156 Data on respondents' age, ethnicity, disability, religion, gender and sexuality was collected anonymously to monitor the equality of access to the consultation. These responses are broadly comparable alongside the data taken from the most recent census.

## Corporate Priorities

2.157 The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with our wider corporate priorities as follows:

| Corporate priority | Impact |
| :--- | :--- |
| Keeping <br> neighbourhoods <br> clean, green and <br> safe | Parking controls make streets easier to <br> clean by reducing the number of vehicles <br> on-street during the day, giving better <br> access to the kerb for cleaning crews. <br> Regular patrols by Civil Enforcement <br> Officers deter criminal activity and can help <br> gather evidence in the event of any <br> incidents. Resident permit zones remove <br> street clutter signing improving the <br> environment and access on footways. |
| United and <br> involved <br> communities: A <br> Council that listens <br> and leads. | The council has listened to the community in <br> recommending a scheme that meets the <br> needs of the majority of respondents who <br> favour parking controls, whilst retaining the <br> status quo where the majority do not support <br> parking controls. |
| Supporting and <br> protecting people <br> who are most in <br> need | Controlled parking generally helps <br> vulnerable people by freeing up spaces for <br> carers, friends and relatives to park during <br> the day. Without parking controls, these |
| spaces would be occupied all day by |  |
| commuters and other forms of long stay |  |
| parking. |  |

2.158 The principle of enforcing parking controls is integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's adopted Transport LIP.

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

|  |  | on behalf of the <br> Name: Kanta Hirani |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date: $13 / 11 / 12$ | $\checkmark$ | Chief Financial Officer |$|$|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name: Matthew Adams | $\checkmark$ | Monitoring Officer |

## Section 4 - Contact Details and Background

## Papers

Contact: Elliott Hill - Project Engineer Parking and Sustainable Transport 02084241535 Email: elliott.hill@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:
Previous TARSAP reports
Consultation responses
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## Public Consultation - Proposed Double Yellow Lines

## IMPORTANT - THIS AFFECTS YOU - PLEASE READ

## What is this about?

Further to the Canons Park Station Parking Review consultation undertaken in December 2011 the attached proposals have proceeded to the Statutory Consultation phase and may directly impact you. Although additional measures are being consulted throughout the Canons Park area these are the only measure in your immediate area that have progressed. Should you wish to review the results of the public consultation undertaken in December and other proposals progressing in the area these are available in the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting report pack which was held on the $8^{\text {th }}$ February 2012. This is available to view online at: http://tinyurl.com/CP-PublicCon-Report

The measures detailed on the attached plan are being consulted upon to prevent vehicles parking inconsiderately causing access issues, in particular for emergency service vehicles, refuse vehicles and impairing sightlines for motorists and pedestrians. We are proposing double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions where it is unsafe to park. Vehicles should not park in a way which obstructs access or impair visibility as outlined in the Highway Code.
The well established guidelines given in the Highway Code states that motorists: DO NOT stop or park:-

- "anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services;
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space;
- in front of an entrance to a property;
- on a bend" --- Highway Code, 2007 edition, rule 243

The Council as a Highway Authority can only enforce restrictions if there are visible double yellow lines and corresponding traffic orders which relate to each restriction.

## Our Proposals

Although everybody is welcome to comment, we are actively seeking the views of directly affected frontages on the following proposal:

- To implement double yellow lines in the vicinity of your property at the locations shown on the customised plan which is attached with this document.

Please see attached plan. Detailed plans will also be available on the Harrow Council web site under Traffic Orders on the Transport and Streets page and are available for inspection in the reception area at the Council Civic Centre on Station Road, Harrow. Officers will be available during office hours should you wish to discuss the scheme proposals. If you prefer, or are unable to view the plans by either of the previous highlighted methods then please contact the project engineer on the number below and he will send you the documents in the post.

## What happens next?

We wish to make sure that everyone who may be affected by these proposals knows what is happening and has the opportunity to let us know what they think. Although our aim is to proceed it may be possible to make small modifications.

We shall advertise the Traffic Management Order by placing notices on street lamp columns and in a local paper (Harrow Times) on or about $26^{\text {th }}$ July 2012 which will also explain where the plans can be seen, this would give anyone a chance to place a formal objection if they wish to do so by $16^{\text {th }}$ August 2012.

## Making a formal statutory objection

Under the legislation which controls the statutory consultation process anyone, local resident/business or not, can make a formal objection to the proposals. However the objection needs to be made in writing (email is acceptable) including the word object or objection (to distinguish it clearly from comments) and the reason for the basis of the objection with your name and address. The law sets out a strict timetable for considering formal objections. Objections to the scheme proposals should be sent to:

## David Eaglesham

Service Manager, Traffic and Highway Network Management
Harrow Council, PO Box 39, Civic Centre, Harrow, HA1 2XA
Or by email to transportation@harrow.gov.uk quoting DP 2012-05 and making sure it's received by 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ August 2012.

## More information

If you have any further questions, or wish to comment, please contact the project engineer:
Elliott Hill - Tel: 02084241535
Email: elliott.hill@harrow.gov.uk

Or write to: Parking and Sustainable Transport
Harrow Council, P.O. Box 39
Civic Centre
Harrow, HA1 2XA
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## APPENDIX B

Traffic Scheme Consultation


## Canons Park Station Parking Review

Statutory Consultation

## IMPORTANT - THIS AFFECTS YOU

## What is this about?

This leaflet is about the council's proposals to help local people who have told us about parking problems in the roads surrounding Canons Park Station.

Residents have said that there are parking problems due to:

1. Commuters parking for Canons Park Station.
2. Problems with parked vehicles obstructing traffic flow at junctions, bends and narrowings.
3. Inconsiderate parking causing access issues for residents entering and exiting off street parking provisions.
4. Dangerous parking near to and at junctions blocking visibility.
5. Long term parking at shops on Station Parade and Honeypot Lane restricting access to businesses.
6. Lack of disabled parking facilities at Station Parade shops and access to Canons Park.

After listening to residents we have developed parking proposals to address these problems by managing the on-street parking using various controls, including double and single yellow lines, restricted permit zones and 'No Loading' controls.

We are also proposing double yellow lines at junctions, bends and narrow points for safety reasons. This is to promote compliance with the rules laid down in the Highway Code section 243 about not parking in locations which would cause an obstruction.

You may recall that we carried out an initial public consultation in your area in December 2011. The purpose of this consultation was to find out if and where residents and businesses feel there are problems and what proposals would be supported. By carrying out this consultation we were able to listen to residents and develop the proposals. The proposals are now being taken forward to formal statutory public consultation. This is explained in more detail below.

This leaflet is designed to help you make your views known or make a formal objection to any part of the detailed measures proposed.

The final decision on the measures proposed will be solely based on your submitted views to the revised proposals. We will not make any assumptions for those people who do not respond to the enclosed questionnaire.

## Consultation results

We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who responded to the initial consultation document.
We asked residents and businesses a number of questions about whether they would like controls in their road. This information was used to plot a map of residents' and businesses' responses to identify where there was support for controls and where there was not. The results from the consultation were collated and analysed.

A total of 924 responses were received from 4,863 properties consulted. This represents an overall response rate of $19 \%$. Unfortunately it is not possible to reproduce all the results in detail in this leaflet; however more details are available in the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel report presented to the panel on the $8^{\text {th }}$ February 2012.

This is available to view online at: http://tinyurl.com/CP-PublicCon-Report If you do not have web access and are unable to get to a Public Library to use the internet there, please contact Elliott Hill on 02084241535 and we will provide a copy.

The Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel consists of elected councillors from around the borough. The recommended proposals were agreed to go forward to statutory consultation.

## Current stage of the consultation process

We are seeking the view of residents and businesses directly fronting the proposals. There are two different parts to the consultation: Informal and Statutory. The Informal is where we invite your comments and ask you to complete a questionnaire. The other is Statutory Consultation when you can make a formal objection.

Please consider carefully what you wish to do; you can complete both the questionnaire and make a formal objection if you wish. However, completing the questionnaire on its own will not be treated as a formal objection, whatever comments are made.

The reason why we have these two processes is that the legislation only makes provision for people to object, whereas the informal consultation allows people to comment and make their views known. This enables us to try and amend the proposals to best meet the needs of local residents and businesses.

## Details of how and when to object are given later in this leaflet.

We distributed an A5 booklet entitled "Parking - Can we help you?" with the last consultation material which gave some of the advantages and limitations of a CPZ along with a number of frequently asked questions. These included the fact that vehicles could be displaced into uncontrolled areas. If you did not retain your copy and wish to see the document then it can be viewed on the council's web site - www.harrow.gov.uk

A limited number of hard copies are available on request.

## Detailed proposals

The enclosed plan to this leaflet shows the proposed measures in the vicinity of your property. Should you require further explanation of proposals in the area please contact the project engineer listed under further information:-

1) Introduction of controls to manage problems raised:-

- Du Cros Drive - Introduction of single yellow line controls. Monday to Friday 3-4pm
- Cheyneys Avenue - Extension of single yellow line controls up to No.120. Monday to Friday 2-3pm
- Station Parade Shops - Combination of single yellow line controls, pay and display and permit bays.
- Donnerfield Avenue - Introduction of resident permit zone. Monday to Saturday 8am-6:30pm
- Torbridge Close - Introduction of resident permit zone. Monday to Friday 2-3pm
- Buckingham Road - Introduction of single yellow line controls from Whitchurch Lane to Buckingham Gardens. Monday to Friday 2-3pm
- Introduction of single yellow line controls at the following locations. Monday to Friday 2-3pm
- Bush Grove
- Bromefield
- Maychurch Close
- Brick Lane
- Honeypot Lane Service Road
- Buckingham Gardens

2) Double yellow lines - We are also taking the opportunity to introduce double yellow lines at all junctions, bends and narrow roads to improve safety. These are designed to improve visibility for drivers and pedestrians and deter obstructive parking that could affect emergency services throughout the initial consultation area.

## Parking permit charges

For proposed permit zones the current annual resident parking charges in Harrow are:
$1^{\text {st }}$ Vehicle in household $£ 60$
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Vehicle $£ 90$
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Vehicle $£ 120$
$4^{\text {th }}$ and subsequent Vehicle $£ 150$
Environmentally friendly vehicles are not subject to charging, but a permit still needs to be displayed. Motorcycles do not need a permit and can also park free-of-charge in any pay and display bay or permit bay in Harrow. Visitor permits are $£ 15.00$ per book of 10 , which is reduced to $£ 7.50$ for senior citizens or those receiving mobility benefits if the discount is claimed.

The charge for business permits is $£ 300$ per annum. There is no charge for environmentally friendly vehicles, but a permit is still required.

## Making your views/informal comments

We have provided a questionnaire with space for your comments. Please use a separate sheet if necessary. Please return the questionnaire using the envelope provided or alternatively complete the on line form available at www.harrow.gov.uk/trafficconsultations Responses should be received no later than $16^{\text {th }}$ August 2012.

## Making comments on the double yellow lines

It is intended to go ahead with the double yellow lines at junctions, bends and narrow points for reasons of safety irrespective of whether amenity related controls progress. Although there is not a "vote" on these proposals we will look at all comments made. Please use the space in the questionnaire.

## Making a formal statutory objection

Under the legislation which controls the statutory consultation process anyone, local resident/business or not, can make a formal objection to the proposals. However the objection needs to be made in writing (email is acceptable) including the word object or objection (to distinguish it clearly from comments) and the reason for the objection with your name and address. The law sets out a strict timetable for considering formal objections. Objections to the scheme proposals should be sent to:

Service Manager
Traffic and Highway Network Management
Harrow Council
PO Box 39
Civic Centre
Harrow HA1 2XA
Or by email to transportation@harrow.gov.uk
Quoting ref DP 2012-05 and making sure it is received by 16th August 2012.
During the statutory consultation period detailed plans will be displayed at the Civic Centre and officers will be available to discus any issues during office hours. If you require any clarification or answers to questions please contact the project engineer whose details are in the "More Information" section.

## What happens next?

We will analyse all the responses we receive and will look to modify the proposals in line with local views, where possible. All formal objections received will be looked at individually and assessed on their merit by the Service Manager, Traffic and Highway Network Management to determine if they are valid to the proposals.

It is anticipated you will be able to see the results of the statutory consultation from around October 2012 by going to the council's web site. The recommendations based on this consultation will be submitted to the Portfolio Holder who will make the final decision on the proposals.

The portfolio holder is the senior councillor responsible for roads and parking. When final proposals are decided we will send out a leaflet to all properties within the consultation area. If any proposals are agreed, they will be implemented at the earliest by December 2012.

## More information

We have provided links to web pages to view certain information as this is an economic and effective way of providing information to you at a time to suit yourself. If you do not have web access and are unable to get to a Public Library to use the internet there, then please contact the project engineer, Elliott Hill, whose contact details are below:

## Elliott Hill

Tel: 02084241535
Email: elliott.hill@harrow.gov.uk

Or write to Elliott Hill<br>Parking and Sustainable Transport<br>Harrow Council<br>P.O. Box 39<br>Civic Centre<br>Harrow<br>HA1 2XA

## If you require a larger text version of this document please call Elliott Hill on 02084241535

## CANONS PARK - PROPOSED PARKING CONTROLS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete this questionnaire and return it using the enclosed prepaid envelope, to arrive by 16th August 2012. Alternatively you may answer these questions online from $26^{\text {th }}$ July 2012 at www.harrow.gov.uk/consultations and then click to visit live and closed consultations. It is recommended that you read the leaflet and enclosed documents (or the website) before completing the questionnaire, as it may contain information that you are not aware of.

REMEMBER - questionnaires will not be counted as a statutory objection.
Due to the large number of responses anticipated, we cannot reply to you individually.
Questionnaires returned without a name and address will not be officially recorded in the results of this consultation. We count your household/business as one response, rather than number of responses from individual residents/employees from the same address.

First Name
Family Name
Business Name (if applicable)
Property Number/Name
Street Name
Postcode
Date

Please tick the most appropriate answer to each of the questions below, and use the space for comments on the back of this sheet if you need to.

If you are not sure about any of the questions, please contact the project engineer whose details are given in the accompanying leaflet and at the above website address.

Q1 Are you a resident or business?
Resident $\square$ Business $\square \quad$ Both $\square$

Q2 Do you support the revised parking proposals in your part of the road?


No $\square$ No opinion $\square$

Please use the space on the back of this sheet to clarify your response.
If you have any comments, please use the space provided on the back of this sheet.
$\square$ If you do NOT want your response to be available for public inspection please tick here.

COMMENTS - Please use additional sheets if you need to

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire



































## APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

| Location | Resident/Business |  |  | Support Proposals? |  |  |  | Statutory Objections | ResponseRate | Support Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both | Business | Resident | No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| Bramble Close | - | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 3\% | 100\% |
| Brick Lane | - | 3 | - | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 33\% | 33\% |
| Bromefield | 1 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 54\% | 46\% |
| Buckingham Gardens | - | - | 27 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 20 | 64\% | 26\% |
| Buckingham Road - Between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens | - | - | 11 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 41\% | 55\% |
| Buckingham Road/Chandos Crescent | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13\% | 0\% |
| Bush Grove | 1 | - | 14 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | - | 33\% | 53\% |
| Cheyneys Avenue | 2 | - | 26 | 1 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 37\% | 56\% |
| Donnefield Avenue | - | - | 13 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 25\% | 77\% |
| Du Cros Drive | - | - | 30 | 1 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 29\% | 66\% |
| Honeypot Lane - Shopping parade | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 29\% | 67\% |
| Maychurch Close | - | - | 7 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 47\% | 71\% |
| Station Parade - Canons Park | 1 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 24\% | 60\% |
| Torbridge Close | - | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7\% | 50\% |

APPENDIX D
Safety Related Proposals

| Location | Resident/Business |  |  | Support Proposals? |  |  |  | No. of Statutory <br> Objections | Response <br> Rate | SupportLevel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both | Business | Resident | No opinion | No | Yes | Petitioners |  |  |  |
| Broadcroft Avenue - Including all junctions | - | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 2\% | 100\% |
| Cloyster Wood - Junctions with Longcroft Rd/Cornbury Rd/Howberry Rd | - | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12\% | 33\% |
| Crowshott Avenue - Including all junctions | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 2\% | 0\% |
| Dalston Gardens | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Gyles Park - Including all junctions | - | - | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Homemead | - | - | 9 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | - | 41\% | 67\% |
| Honeypot Lane - Junctions with Wigton Gardens and Dalston Gardens | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Howberry Road | - | - | 6 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | - | 13\% | 83\% |
| Cheyneys Avenue |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8\% | 0\% |
| Merlin Crescent - Junctions with St Brides Ave/St Davids Dr/Newgale Grdn | - | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Milford Gardens | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Newgale Gardens | - | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 90\% | 0\% |
| Parr Road | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| St Andrews Drive | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Stratton Close | - | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1\% | 100\% |
| Talman Grove | - | - | 11 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 79\% | 45\% |
| Watersfield Way - Junctions with Longcroft Rd/Cornbury Rd/Howberry Rd | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Whitchurch Avenue | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0\% | 0\% |
| Whitchurch Gardens - Including Whitchurch Close and Woodstead Close | - | - | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 4 | 58\% | 0\% |
| Whitchurch Lane - Including Hitchin Lane and all junctions. Excl Station Pr | - | 10 | - | 2 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7\% | 25\% |
| Wychwood Avenue - Including Wildcroft gardens | - | - | 7 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 22\% | 14\% |

## APPENDIX E

| Ref | Road | Comments | Officers Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 001572 \\ & 001575 \end{aligned}$ | BROMEFIELD | Objections to the proposed double yellow lines on the roundabout: <br> - It penalises the residents and not the road users. <br> - Prevents genuine users from parking <br> Suggestions: <br> - Single yellow line in the morning restricting parents and commuters parking. <br> - Restrictions 8am to 8pm allowing residents to park in the evening. <br> - Reduce the roundabout size to allow for access | Any vehicle that parks around the roundabout will obstruct larger vehicles. It does not matter whether this is a resident, visitor or commuter with the current lane width vehicles should not be parked at any time. <br> Single yellow lines will only resolve the problems during the hours of operation and not outside those times. <br> The suggestion to reduce the size of the island and increase the lane width would resolve the obstruction issue; however this would be a costly exercise both in funding and resources. This is not considered viable within the scope of the current project and will need to be considered in the future by the panel. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 001588 \\ 002020 \end{array}$ | BROMEFIELD | Objections to the single yellow lines received include: <br> - It will have a negative effect on the area. <br> - It will create unwanted parking stress. <br> - The area does not have a parking problem and there is no need for the restrictions. <br> - It devalues the area and will make it a rat race for other residents. <br> - The people who park are not all commuters; they are office workers working nearby and they will park further within the estate. <br> - The proposal does not take into consideration the school mums who park between 3 to 4 for 10 to 15 minutes. <br> - It is only a few people at the beginning of Bromefield without driveways who have a cause for complaint. I cannot see why the whole of Bromefield and the surrounding areas should be affected with your proposals. <br> - Harrow Council eager to implement in order for the traffic wardens to generate extra revenue. <br> - The Council should be charging less at the underground car parks to stop a handful of commuters parking. <br> - The proposal has been thought of within the offices of Harrow Council with an opinion of a few residents. | The proposals originate from the responses received from the public consultation. The majority of residents in the area where the measures are proposed stated that they felt there is a problem with parking and would support the introduction of measures. The majority of these responses supported single yellow lines as opposed to resident permit bays. <br> As the measures are amenity related they are only proposed and progress if over $50 \%$ support them. The single yellow lines do not generate any funds and the council will not look to progress them without resident support. <br> The issue with parents parking is likely to be improved as commuters would not be parking in the controlled area. This will leave safer places for parents to park for short periods whilst dropping off and collecting their children. <br> The station car parks are not owned by the council. We cannot control the prices they charge. <br> The proposals are based on resident's responses. |


| 001604 | BUCKINGHAM ROAD | Why should we pay for parking permits to park outside our own house when we pay for our road taxes? | The proposals are an amenity for the residents of a particular street. The charges for the permits pay towards the enforcement of the zone. Any additional funds help to pay for the 'Freedom Pass' for the elderly. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001638 | CHEYNEYS AVENUE | There is absolutely no need for the yellow lines. <br> I object to the pay and display in Station Parade - what will it do to the shops there? | Amenity measures are only proposed where the majority of responses received from residents in the public consultation stated they did have a parking problem. In this instance there was a majority and the preferred measures were single yellow lines. <br> The pay and display measures are proposed to increase turnover of vehicles so that customers can find parking. The measures are supported by the businesses and residents. |
| 001643 | CHEYNEYS AVENUE | If you keep extending the parking restrictions, all that happens is the parking then becomes a problem for someone else. <br> I agree with the changes proposed for Station Parade shops and Honeypot Lane service road as this may make it easier to use our local shops and support the small businesses to stay and serve our community. | It is possible there will be an element of displaced parking. All residents had the opportunity to consider the introduction of controls. For some people the one hour restriction Monday to Friday is preferable than not being able to park near their house due to commuters at any time. For others their current parking situation is preferred. |
| 001659 | DONNEFIELD AVENUE | The restrictions in Donnefield Avenue need to be more stringent. I suggest a Monday-Sunday 8am-7.30 to cope with parking for the park and the large amount of cars parking in the evening and weekends for events at Wembley Stadium and Arena. <br> The disabled bay at the north end of Donnefield Avenue is a good idea, but I think the pavement there should be narrowed further to provide for two or three disabled cars. | The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home. <br> At other entrances around the park there are safe unrestricted locations to park. <br> Disabled badge holders can park on restrictions for up to 3 hours as long as they do not obstruct the carriageway. |
| 001674 | DU CROS DRIVE | I would not object if resident parking bays with effect between 3 pm and 4 pm Monday to Friday were introduced rather than single yellow lines. Single yellow lines are too prohibitive. Restrictions. | Single yellow lines were the preferred option supported by residents in their responses to the public consultation. This is why these measures opposed to permit bays have progressed. |
| 001694 | HONEYPOT LANE | I strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions for the Canons Park area based on a requirement for parking during the proposed restriction time. I would not be able to park outside my own residence and I object to having to pay additional costs. | Due to the responses received changes to the single yellow lines on Brick Lane at the rear of the service road now allow vehicles that require to park in the area from 14:00 to 15:00 to park. |


| 001705 | MAYCHURCH CLOSE | We object to the proposal of double yellow lines at the circle end of our close as this is unnecessary as the road is wide enough for emergency vehicles and cars do not cause an obstruction. <br> As it is very wide we will not be able to park outside part of our house. Also we would prefer "resident permit zone" Mon-Fri $2-3 \mathrm{pm}$ as in Torbridge Close because we may want to park outside our house during the week or if we may have visitors. | If vehicles park in locations where double yellow lines are proposed they may obstruct emergency service access. The proposals are in line with the well established rules of the Highway Code. <br> The majority of responses received from the public consultation supported single yellow lines opposed to resident permits therefore these measures progressed to statutory consultation. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001732 | WHITCHURCH LANE | I object to the 10.5 hour CPZ in Donnefield Avenue. Whilst a one hour CPZ Mon-Fri would be reasonable, the all day restrictions would create the following problems: <br> - Saturday restrictions will inhibit access to the Park and the Children's Playground near by. <br> - It will encourage parking on Whitchurch Lane already congested and narrowed 2 lane highway with 3 bus routes. <br> - It will create finally (excluding the shops) a 1-2 sq. km zone where no day time parking can take place for non-residents, encouraging the hard surfacing of frontages causing flooding and ecological problems. | The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home. <br> Concerns raised over displaced vehicles on Whitchurch Lane have only recently come to light and will be considered as part of a review relating to Barnet FC moving to The Hive. <br> Residents wishing to transform their gardens for off street parking have to adhere to certain requirements which include appropriate drainage. |
| 001738 | WYCHWOOD AVENUE | We support all plans but want the "single yellow line 3-4 or 2-3 pm" controls extended to include the part of Wychwood Avenue to cover the area between the new "double yellow" lines. <br> This is due to the current situation of car/van parking making the road dangerously narrow, and blocking visibility for cars trying to leave/enter residential driveways. <br> In the area between these new controls, I feel that this new plan will create and compound problems. Currently, existing restrictions displace parking into the space from the corner of Wychwood Avenue to the roundabout (as designed). Overnight parking of commercial vans cause a serious continuous issue with road narrowing and nil visibility for residents leaving driveways, and also for pedestrians crossing the street. <br> Further restrictions in Cheyneys Avenue/Du Cros Drive/Station Parade Shops will increase the above issue, and that the area of Wychwood Avenue should also be included in the above scheme to have a "single yellow line" between 3-4 pm or 2-3 pm. | The extent of the proposed single yellow lines was determined by the responses to the initial public consultation. Measures only progressed where there was a majority response, in areas where there are no single yellow lines the majority of residents did not support their introduction. <br> For the proposed measures to be extended significantly a further statutory consultation would be required. This would need to be considered under a review. If the concerns raised persist after 3 months of any controls being implemented it is advisable that a review is requested. <br> Furthermore all vehicles should adhere to the Highway Code and not block traffic flow, if they do it is possible the Police may issue a ticket for obstructing the highway. The proposed measures are designed to encourage compliance. |


| 001914 | BUCKINGHAM ROAD | When I return at $1: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ I am unable to find a parking space and park in neighboring roads. Therefore if the parking restrictions are introduced in Bucking Road/Gardens then commuters will be displaced to neighboring streets meaning that I will have to park even further away. | The majority of responses received back from the public consultation was that there is a problem and that they would support single yellow lines. <br> The hours of control for the measures cannot be changed as this would result in migration of cars from one area to another. It is important the controls are consistent throughout an area. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001916 <br> 001922 <br> 001923 <br> 001924 <br> 001929 <br> 001930 <br> 001933 <br> 001934 <br> 001935 <br> 001936 <br> 001938 <br> 001939 <br> 001940 <br> 001941 <br> 001942 <br> 001943 <br> 001944 <br> 002022 <br> 002023 <br> 002024 <br> 002035 <br> 002121 <br> 002234 | BUCKINGHAM GARDENS | The proposed (single yellow lines) to discourage commuter parking is unnecessary, and penalises residents and their visitors as they are also denied the opportunity to park in our road space. <br> The proposed scheme will detract from the enjoyment of our property, taking away our current right to all-day parking in the vicinity. | The objections have been considered and as there was no longer a majority support for the measures officer's recommend that the proposed single yellow lines do not progress to implementation. <br> The proposed double yellow lines are recommended to proceed to implementation. |
| 002036 | MERLIN CRESCENT | My objection to your proposal for parking restrictions is that inconsiderate and irresponsible parking will be transferred to the opposite side of the road which will also obstruct the view of traffic and pedestrians traveling South up Merlin Crescent towards St. Brides Avenue. <br> This proposal would allow vehicles to park across driveways in Merlin Crescent, as already happens particularly at school times. | Should any measures be approved for introduction this location will be reviewed for the safety concerns raised. Officers feel at this time it is unlikely to cause a safety concern due to the highway layout. <br> Should vehicles park across residents driveways without their permission enforcement action can be taken. Parking enforcement should be contacted in this instance. |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline 002037 & \text { TALMAN GROVE } & \begin{array}{l}\text { We would like to strongly object because: } \\
\text { 1. the proposed restrictions will cause more difficulties in this } \\
\text { estate, both to residents and visitors; } \\
\text { 2. Talman Grove is not a through road, so everyone takes } \\
\text { extra care, especially areas where there is restricted vision. } \\
\text { 3. If parking is prevented in areas, cars will drive faster } \\
\text { through the estate. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { The proposals are designed to maintain access and good } \\
\text { visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the } \\
\text { well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 } \\
\text { which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 } \\
\text { m of a junction or on a bend. }\end{array} \\
\hline 002117 & \text { WHITCHURCH LANE } & \begin{array}{l}\text { I have run a business for } 25 \text { years and from experience feel } \\
\text { the rad is not that busy for traffic to justify the restrictions and } \\
\text { would also be adverse effect on businesses in the area. } \\
\text { A single yellow line on one side of Buckingham Road with the } \\
\text { time restricted for a few hours of the day would be more } \\
\text { appropriate. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { These comments have been taken into consideration and } \\
\text { the proposed double yellow line restrictions have now been } \\
\text { reduced. }\end{array} \\
\hline 002149 & \text { WHITCHURCH LANE } & \begin{array}{l}\text { No car owner or driver should have the right to monopolize the } \\
\text { service road for the shops in Station Parade - at any time. } \\
\text { On the south side of the Canon's Park Station Parade "island". } \\
\text { The double yellow lines must remain. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { It is not perceived the bays will be fully occupied by } \\
\text { residents, other motorists will have the right to pay and } \\
\text { display or park on the single yellow lines outside the hours } \\
\text { of control. }\end{array}
$$ <br>

There must be ban on overnight parking in the service road so\end{array}\right\}\)| The double yellow lines will remain as existing on |
| :--- |
| Whitchurch Lane. |


| 002151 | BRICK LANE | We do not believe that the proposals are necessary. <br> Insufficient information about Bromefield Road's restricted parking arrangements available. <br> The proposals will have an adverse affect upon local businesses and trading units, especially in Station Parade and Brick Lane. <br> Business Permit Fees are prohibitive and unreasonable. <br> There are insufficient offices currently and the proposals do not give us sole use of the area outside our office to enable us to trade satisfactorily. | Due to a large area surrounding Brick Lane supporting the introduction of controls there is likely to be a significant increase in parking pressure should measures not be introduced. <br> All proposals in the surrounding area are available online or plans can be sent out. Notices on site and in the local paper also provided information on the extent of the proposals. <br> The proposals have been supported by local businesses due to the problems they currently experience from external long term parking. <br> The hours of control for the single yellow line on Brick Lane have been changed so they differ from the area wide control times. This allows for parking should businesses or residents need it temporarily during the operational hours. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002153 | GYLES PARK | We have never had a problem with unwanted parking. <br> We are both elderly and critically ill and require healthcare professionals. <br> Friends and family visit regularly. It will seriously reduce the value of our house if double yellow lines were outside. | The proposals are in line with the Highway Code to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. <br> Vehicles should not be parked in this location. |
| 002154 | STRATTON CLOSE | Stratton Close is a quiet residential cul-de-sac and regularly receives large HGV's (eg. Rubbish collection trucks, recycling collection trucks, etc) without any access issues at all. <br> We believe there is no real safety justification for the proposed yellow lines. By implementing the councils proposals the amount of available parking spaces are being reduced, which will result in additional parking pressures. <br> There is sufficient room to get a large vehicle around the roundabout with a car parked on the straight approach to the roundabout. Pedestrians do not cross the road here, so loss of visibility is not an issue and in our opinion there is no valid safety case. <br> In other locations there is adequate space and visibility is not impaired. | The proposals are in line with the Highway Code to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. <br> Further to the comments received and officers reviewing the measures, the double yellow lines have been shortened on the approach to the roundabout at the junction of Stratton Close with Whitchurch Gardens due to the highway layout. |


| 002155 | BROOMGROVE GARDENS | Statutory Objection to double yellow lines around the junction between Chandos Crescent and Buckingham Road. <br> Although I agree that it would be sensible to prevent parking immediately outside the newsagent /Islamic centre because of the proximity to the traffic island, I don't agree with introducing double yellow lines everywhere else. <br> Visibility is not affected, the roads are quite wide and there aren't normally that many cars. This will create a lot of inconvenience for no obvious gain. | Officers have reviewed the proposals and amended the measures on Merlin Crescent where the double yellow line proposals have been shortened. <br> It is felt the remaining are necessary to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002156 | GYLES PARK | I have never seen anyone park in front of my house. There is an entrance to my drive, and there has always been access available to the refuse vehicles. I therefore do not consider it necessary to have double yellow lines. | The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. |
| 002157 | MERLIN CRESCENT | Object to the proposed yellow line. We have guests who often park outside our house. It would be inconvenient to park elsewhere away from the house. <br> Our grandparents, who are elderly and have difficulty walking will be unable to park outside our house. We have moved to Edgware recently and one of the reasons we purchased the house was because it had free on-street parking. | The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 002158 \\ & 002185 \end{aligned}$ | CHEYNEYS AVENUE | I formally object to the extension of the single yellow line controls on Cheyneys Ave and the introduction of single yellow line controls across the various areas specified in the consultation. <br> There has been no noticeable increase in traffic flow in the last 20 years on Cheyneys Ave. <br> There is no accurate evidence of 'dangerous' parking, let alone a parking issue that would be resolved through the introduction of parking controls. Furthermore, inconsiderate parking which is unlawful under the Highway Code can be addressed under exisisting laws, outside of the unfounded proposed parking enforcements. <br> The initial consultation results saw a poor response of $19 \%$ of the properties consulted. A poor response indicates little or no problems with parking points, as is the case here. <br> In addition, if there was a parking issue in the Canons Park area, the Stanmore Place complex should not have been given planning permission. | The proposed single yellow lines are not related to road safety. They are proposed as an amenity for residents who suffer from external parking pressures. <br> In the areas where the measures are proposed the majority of responses received indicated they did experience parking problems and would support single yellow lines. <br> Harrow Council rejected the planning application for the development on the old government site however this decision was overturned by the government on appeal. |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l}\hline 002168 \\
002209 & \begin{array}{l}\text { WHITCHURCH CLOSE \& } \\
\text { WHITCHURCH GARDENS }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { I wish to object as the parking spaces in the close is already } \\
\text { very limited and it will further reduce if you are to extend cover } \\
\text { to the front area of house no.74. } \\
\text { This area will not obstruct any incoming or outgoing vehicles } \\
\text { and I agree with your proposal if you limit the double lines to }\end{array}
$$ <br>
obse proposed to prevent vehicles <br>
ensure there is sufficient space to turnaround preventing <br>

vehicles from having to reverse out of the close.\end{array}\right]\)| the end of wooden fencing opposite the entrance of no. 74. |
| :--- |


| 002198 | WHITCHURCH LANE | I object to the proposals on the basis that the documentation is incomplete and ambiguous and therefore is not fit for purpose. <br> With regard to Station Parade your documentation only refers to a combination of controls so one is left to assume that the drawing is the definitive document. <br> On Drawing No T-DWG-00005-A-10 a yellow line is drawn on the South side of the service road adjacent to Whitchurch Lane but there is no indication of what is proposed. I have searched your documentation and the Borough web site and cannot find written down anywhere just who is eligible for a permit for any given zone. Are permits only going to be issued to residents of the flats or will residents of adjacent roads be eligible? <br> The number of flats exceeds the number of permit bays shown on the drawing by $30 \%$. Is there going to be a limit to the number of permits issued? The introduction of Pay \& Display will sound the death knell for any passing trade for the shops. <br> Assuming that all the parking bays were not already filled with permit holders, if you have already got in your car to drive to the shops why would you want to stop at Station Parade where you would have to get out of your car, pay, return to your car to display and only then contemplate going to the shop of your choice? <br> For only a few more minutes in the car you can drive to Edgware Broadwalk where you can park for free and have a much wider selection of shops to choose from In my capacity as Chairman of the Friends of Canons Park I also object to the restrictions on Donnefield Avenue being implemented on Saturdays. <br> To single out Donnefield Avenue as the only road with restrictions on a Saturday seems not only perverse but also contrary to the idea of giving as many people as possible easy access to it. | The documents provide all required details for the proposals. The measures on the parade are controlled within the zone which is shown with a dashed line and note stating the proposed operation hours. The key indicates where proposed double yellow lines are recommended. <br> All other measures have their own note detailing the measures. <br> Permits will only be available to those properties within the proposed zone (dashed boundary on plan) <br> As with all controlled parking zones there will be no limit to the number of permits issued. Spaces will be available on a first come first serve basis. Either pay and display or residents. <br> Parking is free on the single yellow line in the service parade outside the 2 operational hours. <br> The majority of the shops support the proposed measures that were progressed in response to the suggestions from the public consultation. <br> The proposals in Donnefield Avenue are a result of the responses received from the public consultation. Residents suffer from extensive parking problems due to commuters, local facilities and visitors to the park. They therefore find it very difficult to park within close proximity to their home both during the week and at weekends. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 002200 | KYNANCE GARDENS | I object is the restricted parking zones on the Bromefield/Wemborough Avenue area leading up to the roundabout. <br> Parking in Canons Park station at $£ 4-$ per day is absurdly expensive and $I$ do not think it is entirely unreasonable for commuters or visitors to London have the ability to park in public roads which are not in the immediate vicinity of the station and where the houses effected have drives to park in. <br> You are effectively pushing commuters to park further-up simply shifting them a few streets up. The final point relates to pay and display parking outside Station Parade at Canons Park Monday to Saturday 8:00am to 6:30pm. This is simply a tax by another name and in my opinion completely unnecessary. <br> Current restrictions work perfectly well. | All residents in the area had the opportunity to support proposals to prevent long term parking from commuters. In areas where there was a majority support these locations progressed to the statutory consultation phase. <br> In relation to the parking charges at the station car park, this is not owned by the council and we cannot dictate what price is charged. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002201 | WHITCHURCH LANE | Formally object to no Saturday parking eastern side Donnefield Ave, as parking will be pushed onto our section of Whitchurch Lane, which currently only has Monday - Friday restrictions. Also will prevent parking for access to Canons Park and Sports lubs in Donnefield Ave. <br> Would also like to suggest rather than all day CPZ in Donnefield Ave to have 2 single hour restrictions Monady to Friday. <br> Station Parade - would suggest minimal Saturday restriction on single yellow line. | Parking on the eastern side of the carriageway has resulted in numerous complaints of obstructive parking due to the insufficient carriageway width. These measures are recommended for progression to ensure emergency service access. <br> Any issues that may arise on Whitchurch Lane will be considered under a separate review relating to Barnet FC using the facilities at the Hive. <br> Saturday controls were not initially supported in the responses received back during the public consultation. Therefore they were not included in the Statutory Consultation. |
| 002206 | WHITCHURCH CLOSE | I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines as this area provides as a parking space. | The proposed restrictions are to ensure sufficient access is maintained for the emergency services and for vehicles to be able to turn. They support the well established rule of the Highway Code. |
| 002207 | WYCHWOOD AVENUE | Objection to put double yellow lines on the bend and junction. <br> (1) Quiet part of Wychwood Avenue and not many vehicles come round the area. <br> (2) Vehicles parked in this area do not cause any obstructions. <br> (3) Residents and visitors will be forced to park further up the road where the road is narrower. <br> (4) This part of Canons Park does not get congested when there are football matches or other major events at Wembley. Commuting from Canons Park or Stanmore stations. | The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. |


| 002208 | CORNBURY ROAD | We strongly object to the double yellow lines around the corners of Cornbury Road and Cloyster Wood. We have never had any problem causing obstruction or impaired visibility. Double yellow lines will cause severe inconvenience to us. | The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002210 | GYLES PARK | I am delighted to see that double yellow lines are to be put around the island but very unhappy that they appear not to extend all the way around. I would still have cars parked opposite. <br> Unless they extend all the way around, emergency vehicles \& council refuse vehicles will still be blocked. Reversing out is currently dangerous and hugely frustrating. | The extent of the double yellow lines supports the highway code and are proposed on grounds of safety. For amenity related measures to be considered the majority of responses received need to be in support of introducing measures. <br> Officers understand that this is in relation to access however with the existing carriageway width it is felt there is appropriate space for parking on one side. |
| 002213 | WHITCHURCH LANE | Strongly object to the double yellow lines extending, they seem to be much longer than any of the other double yellow lines which are mainly around bends and junctions why is this? <br> I can understand it being around the bend and especially near St. Lawrence Close since it is a small road but to have it extend so far up seems excessive at best. | The extent of the double yellow lines have been reviewed by officers and have been shortened, however they cannot be removed completely as they are proposed to protect the island and prevent obstructive parking. |
| 002215 | WHITCHURCH LANE | We would like to formally object to the proposal of no Saturday parking in Donnefield Avenue between 8am and 6.30pm. <br> There should be NO Saturday restrictions as it will <br> a) transfer parking onto Whitchurch Lane which currently has Mon. to Fri. limits only, so potentially causing major traffic congestions and <br> b) it will prevent visitors to the area using park and sports clubs. If Saturday restrictions are required then they should be limited to 1 or 2 separate hours. | The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home. <br> Concerns raised over displaced vehicles on Whitchurch Lane have only recently come to light and will be considered as part of a review relating to Barnet FC moving to The Hive. <br> There are other locations around the various park entrances where visitors can still park should they wish to drive to the park. |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline 002216 & \text { DU CROS DRIVE } & \begin{array}{l}\text { I object to the introduction of a single yellow line parking } \\ \text { restrictions on Du Cros Drive. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Amenity related controls are only progressed where there } \\ \text { is a majority support. In this instance the majority of } \\ \text { responses received did feel there was a parking problem } \\ \text { Ren Du Cros Drive with vehicles significantly obstructing } \\ \text { Recently there was a theft from one of my vehicles while it was } \\ \text { parked in my driveway and therefore I feel it is essential that } \\ \text { our vehicles are parked in our sight. This incident was very } \\ \text { expensive to repair and so it is even more essential for us to } \\ \text { single yellow lines. } \\ \text { have parking access outside our house without restrictions and } \\ \text { having to pay for permits. }\end{array} \\ \text { Permits will not be available for residents as what is } \\ \text { proposed is a single yellow line not resident permit bays. } \\ \text { Therefore there will be no financial burden to residents. } \\ \text { As a current full rate payer, I feel the Council is already getting } \\ \text { enough funding without having to charge us extra for parking } \\ \text { permits. }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Note: The objector will be informed of the TARSAP } \\ \text { meeting date and location. }\end{array}\right\}$

| 002236 | BROMEFIELD | I object to the proposed Parking controls. Having examined the plan of the proposed measures in the vicinity I notice that the proposed Single Yellow Line control ( $2-3 \mathrm{pm}$ ) does not include the part of my Road (Bromefield) in which my house is situated. <br> I feel that the result of the proposed parking controls will cause the displacement of commuter traffic and other residential traffic into the non-controlled areas. <br> This will result in an increase in parked vehicles and an increase in the incidences of illegal, inconsiderate and irresponsible parking such as the partial or complete blocking of driveways, which I already experience from time to time. <br> I feel that the parking controls should be extended and/or residents' parking bays introduced to Bromefield to prevent the above mentioned parking infringements of the Single Yellow Line control (2-3pm) restriction be removed completely in Bromefield. | Displaced parking is possible. Restrictions were only proposed in locations where there was majority support from residents directly fronting the measures; all residents in the area had the option to support such controls. <br> Having considered the comments received from the statutory consultation and lack of support for the proposed single yellow line measure between Bush Grove and Maychurch Close they are not recommended for progression to implementation. In all other areas there was a majority support. <br> Should the parking displace to other, adjacent areas and cause future problems residents are advised to request a review after a period of 3-6 months to allow parking patterns to settle. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002240 | WHITCHURCH GARDENS | There is no historic precedent and circumstances have not changed. I have medical condition and need transport close to my front door. If introduced I will have to walk a long distance. By introducing the DYL's parking capacity will be removed by 20\%. <br> The council is wasting money as there have been no accidents. The road is wide enough for vehicles to park and although I have a garage it is dilapidated and too far to walk. | The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243. <br> It should however be noted that in reviewing the area officers did feel that due to the unusual bend alignment at the northern end of Whitchurch Gardens the double yellow lines on the bend are not recommended for progression to implementation due to the limited vehicles usage and reasonable visibility maintained. |
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REPORT FOR: Traffic And Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date of Meeting: 29 November 2012
Subject: Transport Programme Entry Procedure
Key Decision: ..... No
Responsible Officer: Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director, Environment \& Enterprise
Portfolio Holder: Phillip O'Dell - Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
Exempt: ..... No
Decision subject to Call-in:
Enclosures:
Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder
Appendix A: Harrow LIP transport objectives Appendix B: Harrow Transport Programme Entry Procedure

## Section 1 - summary and recommendations

This report sets out a comprehensive way of assessing and prioritising works in order to ensure that the borough develops work programmes that meet its statutory duties as well as targeting the areas of greatest need.

## Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to agree to the following:

1. programme entry procedure be introduced for prioritising all works programmes;
2. programme entry guidance be made a publicly available document on Harrow's website; and
3. any changes to the programme entry procedure be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

## Reason: (For recommendation)

The Council receives many requests for works to be undertaken and difficult decisions need to be made to determine which schemes provide the greatest benefits to the borough due to the limited funding available. The programme entry procedure will enable the council to be consistent and transparent about how decisions are made and to demonstrate that the schemes of maximum benefit for the borough are always prioritised.

## Section 2 - report

## Introduction

2.1 Every year the Council receives hundreds of requests for schemes and works, and for every request there is a cost to consider. Funding is limited and often conditional (e.g. funding provided to deliver local implementation plan) therefore it is not always possible, or appropriate to provide the service requested. In order to ensure that the Council meets its objectives and the significant challenges in delivering local services all transport schemes and projects should demonstrate that they target the areas of priority and provide value for money.
2.2 The introduction of a Transport Programme Entry procedure will provide improved and more transparent prioritisation of work programmes and enable the borough to provide a better service to residents and businesses in the borough. It will also enable schemes of maximum benefit to be prioritised where funding restrictions prohibit the implementation of all the work requests received from stakeholders. The use of an objective and transparent prioritisation process will help to increase public understanding about how decisions are made and in particular broaden an understanding of the difficult issues faced by the borough in an increasingly difficult economic climate.
2.3 Introducing the procedure will also ensure that the programme of works implemented meets statutory obligations and targets the delivery of required outcomes, particularly those in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP), Local Development Framework and Corporate Plan.

## Options considered

2.4 Two options were considered which involved either setting out guidance or doing nothing.
2.5 By not adopting a programme entry system the Council is open to accusations of favouritism or bias and a lack of both consistency and transparency in the development of work programmes which may be difficult to defend. Alternatively, providing a programme entry system provides open, transparent and consistent guidance for the public, members and officers which is objective and clearly focussed on achieving key outcomes. Therefore developing guidance is the preferred option.

## Background

2.6 Funding for transport schemes in the borough has steadily reduced over recent years whilst requests for service changes and improvements continue to be received at a high level. The following table shows the drop in key transport funding in Harrow since 2008/09. Total funding over the last 5 years has dropped by $61 \%$.

| Funding source | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 / 0 9}$ <br> $\mathbf{( \mathbf { 0 0 0 } )}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 / 1 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{( £ 0 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ <br> $\mathbf{( £ 0 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 / 1 2}$ <br> $\mathbf{( £ 0 0 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 / 1 3}$ <br> $(\mathbf{£ 0 0 0})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TfL LIP funds | 5,949 | 4,789 | 3,826 | 3,831 | 2,183 |
| Harrow capital | 355 | 355 | 355 | 355 | 300 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 , 3 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 8 3}$ |

2.7 The impact of this reduction in funding is that less transport schemes are introduced and that the Council is often unable to respond favourably to requests for works and recommended changes to the road network. Deciding which schemes to progress is becoming increasingly difficult particularly when all the schemes considered may be beneficial to the public. It is therefore essential to develop a system where comparisons between proposed schemes can be better made.
2.8 The programme entry guidance shown in Appendix A provides an effective way of prioritising the works to be implemented and will allow those decisions to stand up to scrutiny. It also explains the context in which programme entry fits within the development and delivery cycle for the Local Implementation Plan and a range of other Transport Planning functions.

## Programme Entry assessment system

2.9 The programme entry prioritisation system is based on a number of key categories, each with its own set of operational criteria, which are then used to develop ranking lists. When service requests or work requests are received each case is assessed against these criteria and then ranked. The cases with a higher ranking are more likely to be included in a future work programme.

These categories have been developed around common areas within the LIP or focussed on areas where a large number of service requests are routinely received by the Council. The categories are assigned within the following general themes:

- Parking
- Road safety
- Accessibility
- Public transport
- Congestion
- Environment and air quality
2.10 The individual programme categories are either reactive or planned. Reactive programmes cater for short term urgent minor works which are limited by the available funding in year. Planned programmes are medium/long term works which would involve larger budgets and more complex schemes with a longer period of development and implementation.
2.11 The ranking lists for planned works will inform the development of forward work programmes based on undertaking a further strategic assessment which considers the schemes suitability to meet the Harrow LIP objectives and the Council's corporate priorities. Any planned schemes that are prioritised would then need to be scheduled within a larger programme of works, like the LIP programme of investment for example, and assigned against a future financial year and funding allocation.


## Performance monitoring

2.12 The Harrow LIP objectives are statutory objectives which were agreed with the Mayor of London and with Harrow's Cabinet. These objectives were developed as part of developing the Transport LIP and are shown in Appendix B. The objectives are long term and take account of a period up to 2031.
2.13 The use of a programme entry system will be invaluable in ensuring that works taken forward contribute effectively towards meeting the performance targets set out in the LIP. The criteria are weighted towards supporting these targets. The borough's LIP performance is monitored against TfL mandatory and statutory indicators and also against some locally set targets. These are as follows:

Mandatory / statutory targets

- \% trips walking
- \% trips cycling
- Bus excess waiting time
- Length of principal road in need of repair
- Total numbers killed and seriously injured
- Total number of casualties
- $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions
- Number of schools within 20 mph zone
- School pupils per cycle parking space
- Number of motorcycle casualties
- Weekday bus run times on selected routes in the borough
- Proportion of school aged children in full time education whose main mode of travel is the car
- Number of environmentally friendly vehicle parking permits in the borough
2.14 Environmental issues are also important and are an important aspect of the Harrow LIP objectives and therefore prioritising works more appropriately will ensure that environmental considerations are taken into account in the prioritisation process. In terms of Harrow's climate change strategy programme entry will help to achieve the following:
- Changing the public's behaviour by encouraging walking and cycling or the use of public transport
- Supporting bus priority measures and promoting cycling and walking initiatives
- Encouraging school and workplace travel planning
- Encouraging free vehicle parking permits for environmentally friendly vehicles as controlled parking zones are expanded
- Promoting the provision of electric vehicle charging points


## Access to information

2.15 It is intended that this procedure and the guidance within the document is accessible on the council's website so that the public and members can have easy access to the information and are able to have a common understanding of how work programmes are funded, planned and programmed. This is a key aim of the procedure which aims to be fully open and transparent.
2.16 A key benefit of this will be to indicate what types of works are likely to be priorities so that requests for service made by members of the community can be targeted appropriately and would have a higher possibility of a positive outcome.

## Financial Implications

2.17 No additional funds or resources are required to introduce the programme entry procedure.

## Risk management Implications

2.18 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
2.19 There are no risks associated with implementing this procedure. The main change affecting staff will involve minor changes to operational working practices which will be phased in progressively by managers.

## Equalities Implications

2.20 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
2.21 There will be an improvement in the way that schemes take consideration for equalities groups in respect of transport provision. The main area to benefit will be disabled people with mobility or visual impairment. This is facilitated within the programme entry document by the following measures:

- Disabled people are identified as an area of priority within the various assessment criteria
- Specific programme categories are defined for people with disabilities


## Corporate priorities

2.22 All the corporate priorities are considered within the programme entry procedure and will influence the development of planned work programmes. All schemes assessed will be tested for their strategic fit against the corporate priorities. This means that schemes which contribute towards a greater number of the corporate priorities will receive a higher priority for inclusion within a work programme.

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

|  |  | on behalf of the <br> Name: Kanta Hirani <br> Date: $13 / 11 / 12$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\checkmark$ | Chief Financial Officer |  |

## Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

## Contact:

Ann Fine, 02084241496 (x2496) ann.fine@harrow.gov.uk
David Eaglesham, 02084242500 (x1500) david.eaglesham@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers: Harrow Transport Local Implementation Plan

## Appendix A

## Harrow LIP Transport objectives

1. To enable Harrow's residents to have the best possible access to employment opportunities and to improve the attractiveness of Harrow as a place to live, visit and work, the borough will further develop the transport system to provide access to employment opportunities within and beyond the borough and also support improved access to a wide range of facilities such as retail centres and education and health services as well as access to cultural heritage and outdoor green spaces
2. Support improved orbital transport links across the Borough and between outer London centres thereby providing greater access to a wider catchment area for employment opportunities by enabling journeys currently made by car to be made by sustainable forms of transport and thereby improve the environment
3. Encourage a healthier lifestyle by promoting healthy and safe travel particularly for pedestrians and cyclists
4. Reduce CO2 emissions in Harrow, increase environment sustainability, improve general health and deliver a better quality of life in the borough through the use of travel planning and appropriate traffic engineering measures including providing improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
5. Support the borough's economic growth by regenerating Harrow Town Centre and the new Area of Intensification and ensure that the transport delivery needs of the Area of Intensification are prioritised
6. Reduce the number of motorcycle casualties across the borough
7. Improve social inclusion in the borough by improving the quality, capacity and accessibility of Harrow-on-the-Hill station and Harrow bus Station and improving the accessibility, efficiency and attractiveness of all transport including public transport borough wide and in particular Transport for London stations
8. Support projected population growth within the new Intensification Area by improving transport connectivity between Harrow-on-the-Hill station/Harrow bus station and Harrow \& Wealdstone station
9. Increase the number of people cycling in the borough in order to improve public health, improve air quality, reduce congestion and to reduce the impact of climate change
10. Support Harrow's local economy by reducing congestion, improving the efficiency of servicing and delivery and making essential car journeys easier
11. Improve the quality of life of residents and visitors and improve overall health the borough will improve pedestrian walkways that use and link existing parks and open spaces with town centres and public transport provision
12. Ensure that the vitality of the town centre is supported through good transport
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Harrow Council is the Highway Authority in the London Borough of Harrow and is responsible for the entire highway network with the exception of private roads. In respect of the Strategic Road Network Harrow is required to consult Transport for London on any traffic management because they have a regulatory role over this part of the network.

Every year the Council receives hundreds of requests for schemes and works, and for every request there is a cost to consider. Funding is limited and often conditional (e.g. policy / project delivery / target related) therefore it is not always possible, or appropriate to provide the service requested.

In order to ensure that the Council meets its objectives and the significant challenges in delivering local services using available resources all transport schemes and projects are required to demonstrate that they meet set criteria so that a consistent approach is taken to the planning, programming and delivering of schemes and projects.

The purpose of this document is therefore to clarify how future work programmes and schemes will be developed using a Programme Entry system and to ensure that the system is fully embedded into the decision making process and also into the working environment.

The system will set out the relevant criteria and guidance needed in order to establish a comprehensive way of prioritising works and to ensure that a consistent approach to decisions is introduced so that we can be more transparent about how we make these difficult decisions. This is particularly important as financial pressure becomes increasingly more challenging and difficult decisions need to be made in order to determine which schemes need to be taken forward and provide the greatest benefits.

This document will be useful to a variety of audiences and therefore it is very likely that only parts of the document are useful to all users. It is intended that the document will guide traffic engineers and transport planners in doing their jobs and inform councillors, senior Council officers and the public in understanding how the works programmes are developed.

## 2 TRANSPORT TEAMS IN HARROW COUNCIL

Within the Environmental Services Department there are two main transport teams responsible for traffic and transport schemes in Harrow that are based at the Civic Centre.

The transport planning team undertakes a more strategic role in forward planning future programmes of work as well as liaising with key stakeholders including Transport for London over policy, programmes and funding. The transport projects team has a more operational role and assesses service requests for consideration in future programmes of work and designs and implements currently funded work programmes. Both teams follow the guidance within this document.

The overall coordination of the service is the responsibility of the Traffic Manager, which is a statutory position held within the Council as set out by the Traffic Management Act and
has overall responsibility for ensuring the satisfactory performance of the highway network. The diagram below sets out the organisational structure:

Figure 2.1: Transport teams in Harrow Council


## 3 POLICY FRAMEWORK

### 3.1 Statutory requirements influencing transport provision

Much of the work to improve the highway network carried out by the Council is governed by legislation and statutory requirements. In particular the following legislation all place statutory obligations on Harrow as the highway authority:

- Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999
- Traffic Management Act 2004
- Road Traffic Act 1988
- Equality Act 2010

Each of these Acts and their implications is explained in further detail in the following sections.

### 3.2 Greater London Authority Act (GLA) 1999

The GLA Act requires the London Mayor to develop a number of strategic documents and to ensure consistency between them. The documents listed below have the most significant impact on transport in London.

- London Plan - Spatial Development Strategy
- Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS)

The development of the London Plan sets an overall integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London whilst the Mayor's Transport Strategy takes into account the policies in the London Plan and sets out the planning, management and development of transport in London with policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services while also minimising the impact on climate change.

In particular the GLA Act makes London Boroughs responsible for the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy in their areas and requires them to develop Local implementation Plans (LIP). Section 144 of the GLA Act enables the Mayor to issue statutory guidance on the implementation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy, to which all boroughs must have regard, and he also has reserve powers to issue general or specific directions as to the manner in which a borough is to exercise its functions in preparing and implementing its Local Implementation Plan (LIP), with which they must comply. The LIP is required to demonstrate how local authorities are addressing and implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy at the local level.

### 3.3 Traffic Management Act 2004

The Traffic Management Act (TMA Act) was introduced in 2004 to tackle congestion and disruption on the road network. Section 16 of the TMA introduced a new network management duty for local traffic authorities such as Harrow and requires them to manage their road network with a view to achieving two objectives, which are:

- to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network, and
- to facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

Section 17 of the Act requires traffic authorities to appoint a Traffic Manager to take responsibility for the network management duty and specifically to:

- identify things (current or future) which are causing, or have the potential to cause, road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on the road network, and
- to consider any possible action that could be taken in response

In Harrow the transport teams under the direction of the Traffic Manager undertake this role and identify measures that can be included in the LIP to address road congestion.

### 3.4 Road Traffic Act 1988

Local authorities are required by statute (Road Traffic Act 1988) to:

- Carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety on existing roads and in the construction of new roads,
- Undertake studies of personal injury accidents,
- Take appropriate measures to prevent such accidents,
- Provide road safety advice, information and practical training for road users.

In Harrow the transport teams under the direction of the Traffic Manager undertake this role and identify measures that can be included in the LIP to address road safety.

### 3.5 Equality Act 2010

The Equality Act 2010 replaced the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) with its stated aim being to 'harmonise discrimination law, and to strengthen the law to support progress on equality'. The Act replaced all existing equality legislation, including the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The most significant sections of the Equality Act that directly affect transport relate to the transport sections of the previous Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). This required all new land-based public transport vehicles (trains, buses, coaches and taxis) and transport infrastructure (bus and railway stations) to be accessible to disabled people, including wheelchair users. This covers access to goods, services and facilities.

To support access to all services, Harrow ensures that bus stops in the borough are suitable for low floor buses and provides disabled parking facilities and lowered kerbs as necessary in appropriate locations to meet the demands of those with impaired mobility.

### 3.6 Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) and Sub Regional Transport Plan (SRTP)

The Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) identifies goals, associated challenges and outcomes which the borough has a duty to work towards. The six goals of the MTS are:

- To support economic development and population growth
- Enhance the quality of life for all Londoners
- Improve the safety and security of all Londoners
- Improve transport opportunities for all Londoners
- Reduce transport's contribution to climate change, and improve its resilience
- Support delivery of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and its legacy

The implementation of the MTS is delivered at sub regional level and at borough level. There are 5 regions (North, South, East, West and Central) each developing a SubRegional Transport Plan (SRTP) and 33 boroughs each developing a Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The London sub regional format is intended to develop a more collaborative and integrated approach to transport planning and connect the strategic aims of the MTS to local transport planning within boroughs.

The West London Sub-Regional Transport Plan (SRTP) provides a sub-regional context for Harrow's LIP and sets out key challenges and priorities within the sub-region to help guide the investment priorities of Transport for London and other government, public and private bodies as well as influence the development of regional LIPs. The SRTP goals, challenges and outcomes were used to develop the Harrow Transport LIP.

The SRTP will be regularly updated and developed as regional transport challenges and opportunities change.

### 3.7 London Plan and Local Development Framework (LDF)

The London Mayor has to produce a spatial development strategy (SDS) - which has become known as 'the London Plan'. This is the overall strategic plan for London, setting out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London over the next 20-25 years. Local borough development documents have to be 'in general conformity' with the London Plan, which has to be taken into account when planning decisions are taken in any part of London.

A local development framework is the spatial planning strategy introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which is now relevant to Harrow as the planning authority. In Harrow the Local Development Framework (LDF) sets out how future planning will be carried out in the borough and contains a range of documents of which the core strategy is the most important component. The core strategy sets out the long term vision of how Harrow, and the places within it, should develop by 2026 and sets out the Council's strategy for achieving that vision. In particular, it identifies the broad locations for delivering housing and other strategic development needs such as employment, retail, leisure, community facilities and other uses. It also sets the context for the other policy documents that make up the Harrow LDF. The transport implications of development, population increase and economic growth in the borough significantly influences transport provision and the development of the policies and programme in the LIP are fully integrated with the local development framework.

### 3.8 Local Implementation Plan (LIP)

The Harrow Transport LIP is the main document that set out the borough's transport objectives and the measures that will be undertaken to ensure these objectives are met. It also sets out how the borough will implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, how it links with the West London SRTP as well as with Harrow's planning documents included in the borough Local Development Framework.

The LIP includes longer term transport objectives, policies and a detailed three year programme of investment (currently 2011/12 - 2013/14) and a monitoring regime to ensure that these objectives are met. This programme entry document will significantly influence which projects are included in the programme of investment which is primarily funded by Transport for London.

### 3.9 Corporate influences

The London Borough of Harrow has a number of key strategic documents which influence the provision of services as follows:

- Sustainable Community Strategy
- Corporate Plan

Harrow's adopted Sustainable Community Strategy sets the vision for the borough and provides the overarching strategic framework influencing all of Harrow's major objectives up to 2020. The vision has been produced by the Harrow Partnership which is a collaboration of representatives from agencies that deliver public services, community and voluntary organisations and businesses in Harrow. This vision feeds into Harrow's Corporate Plan which sets out the Council's high level priorities and targets for the coming years. The current priorities are:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
- Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

The corporate priorities are considered in taking forward all work proposals.
Figure 3-1: Policy influences


## 4 HOW FUNDING IS SECURED

Funding for transport improvements in Harrow comes from a range of sources. The vast majority of it comes from Transport for London (TfL) to support the delivery of the LIP; however funding also comes from Council Capital, developer contributions (as planning section 106 agreements) and Council revenue funds. Much of the funding allocated is strictly limited as to where, when and how it can be spent.

### 4.1 Transport for London Grant

Every year Transport for London (TfL) allocate boroughs with a funding allocation which is provided to assist the borough in implementing the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy as set out in Harrow's LIP. This award is made up of a variety of elements which includes key transport initiatives, principal road network maintenance, local transport funds and, where relevant, major scheme bids submitted to TfL.

The formula funded allocation targeted at transport initiatives is structured around a set of need-based indicators relating to public transport, road safety, congestion, the environment, accessibility and residential population weighted by the index of deprivation.

The funding allocation is also weighted in order to reflect the Mayor of London's current priorities and is currently weighted as follows:

- $10 \%$ Public transport
- $26 \%$ Road safety
- $41 \%$ Congestion and environment
- 23\% Accessibility

In addition to the above, TfL provides a small amount of money that the borough can decide how to invest on a year by year basis on local transport schemes to help meet the Mayor's Transport Strategy. These schemes still require TfL approval before proceeding.

TfL also provides the borough with an allocation for principal road maintenance. This award is based on the condition of principal roads in the borough. The condition of the principal roads is determined by road condition surveys conducted across the entire principal road network in London each year and annual borough allocations are made on that basis.

The borough is also entitled to bid for money from TfL for major scheme works which are usually worth in excess of $£ 1$ million. This funding is not guaranteed and is awarded on a competitive basis with other boroughs through the submission of specific project bids that are required to meet TfL's criteria for major schemes.

The LIP includes a programme of investment over a defined period (currently 3 years $2011 / 12$ - 2013/14) detailing the schemes and initiatives necessary to achieve the aims and objectives set out in the LIP. In advance of each individual funding year the borough submits to TfL a detailed programme of schemes for the year and confirms scheme funding allocations in line with the overall annual LIP funding allocation set. In advance of submitting the funding allocation to TfL, the programme is agreed with the Council's Portfolio Holder. The programme is required to be broadly in line with the LIP objectives and is formally agreed by Transport for London. Subsequent changes to this programme are allowed but must be negotiated and agreed with TfL. Schemes can span a number of years, however, awards for funding are agreed for a single year at a time. Funds for remaining years where schemes span a number of years are expected to be included in future allocations and are usually agreed by TfL.

TfL agrees funding with the boroughs through the use of the online TfL borough portal system. During the year any additions or changes in scheme funding allocations are requested via the portal and TfL then approve or decline as appropriate. The borough will allocate all funds in line with the LIP objectives and this ensures compliance with the Mayor's Transport Strategy and is monitored by TfL.

Harrow can allocate the TfL grant allocation within Harrow's finance system as either revenue or capital expenditure as required by the council's financial policies. For capital funds, a capital project proposal and business case for the entire TfL programme is submitted in advance of the funding year and considered by the Council's Capital Forum before it can be included within the Council's Capital programme. The Capital Programme is then considered and approved by the Council's Cabinet. Following Cabinet approval the Capital project then requires a project initiation document to be submitted to the Capital Forum and approved before funds can be spent.

### 4.2 Harrow Capital

Harrow capital funds are made up from usable capital receipts and capital grants. Proposed schemes and projects are subject to a capital bid / business case as described in the section above - section 4.1. Requests for capital funding across the council compete for funds available on the strength of their case against a set of council priorities and criteria and the Council's Capital Forum assesses the bids and agrees the priorities to be taken forward into the council's Capital Programme. This is endorsed by Cabinet before being finalised.

Currently there is an annual allocation for the Parking Management Programme specifically dedicated to funding controlled parking zones (CPZ) and the local safety parking schemes programme (minor localised parking measures).

This programme of works is identified in the LIP and is Harrow's main contribution to supporting the overall programme of investment in addition to the TfL LIP grant.

### 4.3 Developer contributions

Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission for development. The obligation is termed a Section 106 Agreement. The planning department leads on the planning permission process and negotiations with the developer and the Transport Planning team contributes to this by providing information on likely traffic impacts and any necessary interventions required.

These agreements are a way of delivering or addressing matters that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms. During the planning application process any impacts on the public highway are considered and if any negative impacts are identified then there are negotiations with the developer to secure funding to introduce appropriate interventions. The funding is used to support the provision of additional or improved highway infrastructure in order to facilitate the development and benefit the wider community. An example of this would be funds provided by the developer for a junction improvement, like a new roundabout or traffic signals, in order to provide more capacity for an anticipated increase in traffic generated by a new development. The Section 106 money is usually made available for specific negotiated works only and once agreed the money cannot be used for any other purposes. If the money remains unspent, during the agreed timeframe, it usually has to be returned to the developer.

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a new system of securing developer contributions through the planning system which local authorities are empowered to charge on new development in their area under the Planning Act 2008 (Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010). It is a levy that local authorities in England and Wales charge on new developments in their area and the money raised can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods want, for example, new or safer road schemes, park improvements or a new health centre. The system is very simple and applies to most new buildings and it will be levied on the net increase in floor space arising from any new development.

The current system of developer's monetary contributions which are negotiated and agreed on a case by case basis and recorded via Section 106 agreements is likely to be replaced in 2013 by a Harrow CIL. This will provide for the payment of contributions linked to the size of the development and calculated by reference to a published charging schedule.

### 4.4 Harrow Revenue

Harrow Council revenue funding is made up of Government borough formula grant, Council Tax Income and other income streams from fees and charges. A small dedicated annual budget is provided annually for undertaking minor work such as road markings and traffic signing and is also used to undertake traffic surveys and feasibility studies to assist with assessing service requests. The works undertaken are generally reactive in nature.

### 4.5 Other sources of funding

All elected Councillors in Harrow have control over a small amount of capital funding under the neighbourhood investment scheme. This money can be used to implement schemes in their wards that they consider to be of specific concern to their constituents. These funds, at the discretion of councillors, can be used to implement traffic / parking type schemes. Once a use for the funding is agreed, it cannot be used for any other purposes other than that specifically agreed by the Councillor.

## 5 HOW WORKS ARE PLANNED AND PROGRAMMED

### 5.1 Transport Planning and the Local Implementation Plan

The transport planning team is responsible for producing the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) document which contains all of the borough's transport plans, policies and programme of works for future years. The preparation of this document is a lengthy process requiring the development of appropriate policies and work programmes which accord with the mayor's transport strategy, undertaking extensive consultation and seeking the authority of London's Mayor, the council's Cabinet and adoption by full council. The whole process can take over 12 months to complete. The input into the development of a LIP is therefore crucial as it sets out the types of schemes that will be included over a 3-5 year period.

Transport for London (TfL) issue guidance on how London boroughs should produce their LIPs and manage the approval process, on behalf of the Mayor of London. In practice a very detailed guidance document is produced by TfL in consultation with the boroughs which includes very specific requirements for boroughs to follow in order to produce their LIP. Statutorily, the LIP is required to demonstrate how local authorities are addressing and implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy at the local level and it is required to contain a timetable for implementing proposals in the delivery plan. The development of the LIP delivery plan and programme of investment are underpinned by the programme entry guidance outlined in this document which will influence the types of projects and initiatives that will be selected. Programme entry therefore has a significant impact on future work programmes in the LIP.

Legislation requires major policy documents like the LIP to undergo a Strategic Environmental Assessment and an Equalities Impact Assessment. These documents are
both produced in conjunction with the LIP at the development stage so that environmental and equalities impacts can be fully incorporated into the final LIP document.

A number of statutory bodies must be consulted with during the development of the LIP, however, in practice a very wide consultation both internally and externally is required. Effective consultation ensures that the LIP is developed to be compatible with other council policy such as the Local Development Framework and Corporate Plan as well as satisfying key stakeholders such as environmental groups and TfL. Once a draft is prepared a full public consultation is undertaken and the results of consultation considered by cabinet with recommendations on how to finalise the document. Further discussions with TfL are undertaken to shape the document into an approvable format before it is submitted to cabinet again for final approval and adopted by full council. The process is shown as follows in Figure 5-1.

Figure 5-1: LIP development process
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The approved LIP is binding and if the borough wishes to significantly change the content of the LIP this would require a full consultation as well as renewed Mayoral approval. This is a very costly and time consuming process and would in effect require the same process as the original LIP. Smaller changes, however, may be agreed through negotiation with TfL.

Harrow's current LIP was produced following the development of the Mayor's Transport Strategy in May 2010. It was approved by cabinet on 19 May 2011 and adopted by full Council on the 7 July 2011. The TfL guidance for boroughs producing their LIPs required the boroughs to do the following:

- Set borough transport objectives;
- Show links between Harrow's transport objectives and the Mayoral goals as outlined in his transport strategy;
- Show links between Harrow's transport objectives and Harrow's Sustainable Community Strategy;
- Produce a delivery plan for borough activities as well as for the Mayoral high profile outputs including a timetable for their delivery;
- Produce a high-level breakdown of the required programme of investment by year including funding sources required;
- Produce a Performance Monitoring Plan to meet targets set by the Mayor of London;
- Include an Equalities Impact Assessment; and
- Conduct appropriate consultation with statutory bodies and make changes to the LIP where appropriate.

Harrow's LIP contains all of Harrow's transport policies. To improve the integration of these policies into working practices and to provide greater transparency and clarity a number of daughter documents have been produced to show how these policies are put into practice. These daughter documents include:

- Parking Management and Enforcement Plan;
- Road Safety Plan;
- Local Freight Movement Operational Strategy; and
- Transport and Disabilities Procedure.

TfL monitor the implementation of each borough's LIP delivery plan and progress with satisfying the Mayor's high profile outputs. Each year, Harrow reports progress to TfL through providing updates on key outcomes identified in the LIP - see section 7. In addition to this Harrow officers meet quarterly with TfL officers regarding implementation of the programme of works. Independent checks are also undertaken by TfL on works implemented. In 2014, the borough will be required to prepare and publish a three-year impact report setting out the expenditure and implementation of the current LIP programmes and set out achievements and evidence to demonstrate how the LIP has contributed to wider Harrow policy objectives.

The current LIP programme of investment ends in 2013/14 and it is expected that TfL will issue guidance for a subsequent LIP or delivery plan to be produced for the subsequent period. The development process would be similar to that explained earlier in this section.

### 5.2 Programme development

The majority of works implemented in the borough are identified in Harrow's Transport Local Implementation Plan. This was developed by officers in the transport teams prioritising initiatives on the basis of road safety, congestion, environment, accessibility, public transport and air quality issues as well as the Mayor of London's high profile outputs and the Borough's corporate priorities. This also took into account the statutory duties that the borough is required to undertake as outlined in section 3. Programmes are developed over the short, medium and long term periods as necessary to deliver the LIP objectives.

The programme development process uses a wide range of inputs which are coordinated by the transport teams to develop effective and realistic programmes of work. These inputs consist of service requests from numerous stakeholders including the public, councillors, transport organisations, emergency services, etc. as well as a wide range of ongoing transport assessments and studies undertaken by officers in the transport teams as a part of their routine workload. The programme entry system is used to assess these inputs and develop ranking lists for identified work categories which support the development of work programmes. The diagram below demonstrates the process.

Figure 5-2: Programme development process


The Transport Planning team lead on the programme development process and determine which programmes are eventually included within the Transport Local Implementation Plan. The programme entry system helps to prioritise needs by creating specific ranking lists for work categories like for example, safety or congestion, which are used to prioritise the interventions of greatest need. However, the final scheme selections that make up the work programmes also have to have due regard to TfL guidance and a range of other factors such as:

- Testing the strategic fit of proposed interventions
- Balancing the spread of interventions across the borough geographically,
- Focussing interventions along key corridors in the highway network or in neighbourhood areas to maximise the combined impact of the interventions,
- Targeting all objectives of the LIP proportionately,
- Undertaking the network management duty

Programme entry is therefore the initial assessment system that informs the programme development process.

### 5.3 Programme entry

The programme entry assessment system outlined in this document will be used to provide a formal framework for assessing all suggestions for projects, schemes or works and be used to develop ranking lists for each work category. In each case an evaluation will need to be made before any project or initiative may be included in a ranking list or a work programme. Each case will be evaluated by using the relevant work category criteria to assess their relative need and priority and establish a ranking. Those cases that satisfy the criteria and meet a set threshold will then be used to inform the development of future programmes of investment for local implementation plans.

The programme entry categories are split into reactive (short term) and planned work. Reactive works are defined as individual elements of work of a minor nature (generally less than $£ 5,000$ ) that need to be done within the immediate year of consideration. These are usually required to deal with safety or access issues or other unexpected changes to the environment at short notice. Urgent remedial works are taken forward using the available in year funding and are not a part of the LIP.

Requests for works which would involve a significant level of complexity in design, consultation, works coordination and implementation as well as cost are usually considered for a planned work programme over the medium to long term within the LIP.
Before an assessment for planned work is made the following needs to be considered first:

- Check that the issue is not already addressed by a project in the works programme,
- If the issue could be addressed by adapting a project in the programme then the scheme designer needs to consider the viability of making changes. If the issue can be included then an assessment is not required.
- If the issue is in an area where there are no planned works then the programme entry system should be used to assess it using the appropriate work category.
- If the issue is for a major scheme (generally in excess of $£ 1$ million), then the programme entry process does not apply because a specific evaluation for major schemes is undertaken using TfL criteria.

For planned work categories a strategic weighting criteria will be applied to test the strategic fit with LIP policies and Harrow corporate priorities (see section 6.8).

All internal and external stakeholders will be provided with clear and concise advice on the status of service requests including acknowledging receipt of the request, an indication of the timescale to undertake a programme entry assessment and confirmation of the outcome. If policy requirements or programme entry criteria are not met then the reasons why the request is unsuitable will be explained. If the request is already in a programme or can be included then details of the funding year and likely delivery time scales will be provided. Figure 5-3 explains the programme entry system decision making process.

Figure 5-3: Programme Entry process ${ }^{1}$
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### 5.4 Work programmes

The current programme entry work categories, programme types, typical interventions and sources of funding are shown below.

Table 5-4: Types of work categories and typical funding

| Transport area | Programme entry work category | Typical interventions | Type of programme | Typical funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking | Minor localised parking issues | Waiting / loading restrictions | Reactive | Harrow capital |
| Parking | Disabled persons parking places | Residential bays for blue badge holders | Reactive | TfL LIP grant |
| Parking | Area parking management schemes | New Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) and reviews of existing CPZs | Planned | Harrow capital |
| Road Safety | Minor localised traffic safety and speed issues | Vehicle activated message signing, traffic signs, road markings, surfacing changes | Reactive | Harrow revenue |
| Road Safety | Area speed control schemes | 20 mph zones or limits focussed around schools and areas of high pedestrian activity | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Road Safety | Accident remedial schemes | Accident / casualty reduction schemes focussed at accident clusters on the network | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Accessibility | Local pedestrian access issues | Uncontrolled crossing points for pedestrians (lowered kerbs), Stiles / kissing gates on footpaths | Reactive | TfL LIP grant |
| Accessibility | Local vehicular access issues | Vehicle access road markings ( H bar) | Reactive | Harrow revenue |
| Accessibility | Rights of way improvements | Improving rights of way and the green grid and maintaining public footpaths access | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Accessibility | Cycle route schemes | Developing cycle network with cycle lanes, cycle paths, cycle crossings | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Accessibility | Cycle parking schemes | Provision of safe and accessible cycle stands | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Accessibility | Walking schemes | Controlled pedestrian crossings (zebra, pelican), new footway links | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Public transport | Bus priority schemes | Bus lanes, traffic signal changes to improve journey time reliability for bus services | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Public transport | Bus stop accessibility schemes | Improving bus and pedestrian access to bus stops | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Congestion | Traffic congestion schemes | Measures to improve traffic flow and reduce queuing and delay (e.g. SCOOT signals linking) | Planned | TfL LIP grant |
| Environment and air quality | Freight management schemes | Loading bays, freight routing direction signing, weight / width / height limits | Planned | TfL LIP grant |

### 6.1 Ranking lists

A ranking list will be developed for each of the specified work categories set out in section 5.4 and will be regularly updated as and when new assessments are added so that the highest priorities can always be determined. The lists will also provide historical data about previous or similar requests to ensure that consistent assessments can be made and to provide evidence to justify the priorities selected. It is very common for similar or repeat requests to be received on a specific issue and making reference to the list can help to avoid any duplication and inconsistencies.

The assessment of service requests and identified issues is undertaken by selecting the most appropriate work category and applying the relevant assessment criteria. In the event that more than one type of criteria might apply an assessment will be undertaken on each work category and the higher classified assessment used. The request will then be assigned to that work category and ranking list.

The assessment factors for each work category are set out in this section and an indication is given of the typical areas given priority. Each programme entry case will be assessed against all of the factors for the relevant work category and a judgement made by technical staff about the relative priority and position on the work category ranking list.

Planned work categories will also have a strategic weighting criteria applied as well as the operational criteria. This allows the strategic fit for planned works to be tested against the LIP policies and objectives and corporate priorities.

The work categories are based around these transport areas from the MTS and LIP:

- Parking
- Road safety
- Accessibility
- Public transport
- Congestion
- Environment and air quality


### 6.2 Parking

The Council receives many requests for changes to parking controls. Sometimes these are small requests for additional yellow lines or disabled bays or sometimes these are complaints about the lack of parking availability and requests for new controlled parking zones. These issues are generally political in nature and the resulting work programmes are funded from the Council's own funding and so they are not competing directly against other transport schemes over LIP funding. There are three programmes, two to address local access issues and the other for area wide schemes.

### 6.2.1 Minor localised parking issues

These are predominantly localised revisions or additions to parking restrictions to address issues with access or safety caused by inappropriate or obstructive parking. The local safety parking schemes (LSPS) programme addresses the typical issues often raised by
the emergency services or the council's waste collection services over concerns about disruption to essential vehicular access. In general the locations selected are more isolated from area wide parking controls and provide a way for these more minor issues to be dealt with outside of a major area scheme. The key factors influencing priorities are:

Assessment factor
Key stakeholders

Traffic accidents and speed
Vehicle flows
Pedestrian flows
Level of accessibility and visibility
Other local factors with an impact

## Typical areas of priority

Emergency services / Local services / Residents petitions

High numbers of accidents / high vehicle speeds
High vehicular flows
High flow areas like shopping parades, schools
Continuous obstruction of sightlines
Adverse impact on bus services, the disabled

### 6.2.2 Disabled persons parking places

Disabled bays are provided specifically in response to individual requests and also at key locations to increase access for disabled people to all amenities across the borough. This includes provision at shopping centres, key public transport locations, libraries etc. The Council also provides disabled parking bays in all Council run car parks.

There are numerous requests for these facilities, however this is a limited budget and prioritisation for introducing disabled parking bays across the borough is required. There are strict eligibility requirements for anyone applying for a residential disabled parking bay outside their home and these are as follows:

- Applicant must be a current blue badge holder
- The disability must be related to permanent mobility problems that make walking impossible or where the exertion required to walk would constitute a danger to life or a serious deterioration to health.
- Applicant must be the driver of the Blue Badged vehicle, or if the applicant is a passenger of the Blue Badged vehicle it must be shown that;
(a) The applicant requires physical assistance from the driver of the vehicle and the driver is generally the only person available to assist the applicant. The driver must also live at the same address as the applicant.
(b) The applicant is sufficiently disabled to require constant supervision by the driver of the vehicle. The driver of the vehicle should be the only person available to provide this supervision and must also live at the same address as the applicant.
(c) The applicant is between the ages of 2 and 17 years and meets either or both of the criteria stated in sections a and b above.
- The applicant's address must have no off-street parking space or space that could be reasonably made available for parking (eg. a front garden of sufficient depth for conversion and provision of a vehicle crossover).
- Ability to park on-street is a major problem most of the day.

If a person meets these requirements and if there is an appropriate and safe location for a parking bay, then the request is prioritised as follows:

Assessment factor
Severity of disability
Length of time since application

## Typical areas of priority

Based on OT categories
Time elapsed

### 6.2.3 Area parking management schemes

Areas of high parking demand like commercial centres or around stations may attract many requests for changes to parking controls covering a wide range of issues from obstruction to lack of residential or commercial parking access. These projects are predominantly driven by customer demand rather than purely by policy and programme objectives. Controlled Parking Zones are generally introduced to manage kerb-side parking spaces more fairly, effectively and safely. In residential areas, CPZs are created to benefit residents, while in commercial and shopping areas short stay parking and deliveries are better facilitated. In Harrow, CPZs are never introduced without majority local residential support which is determined through local public consultations.

The programme of CPZs is recommended by TARSAP and formally approved by the Portfolio Holder in advance of the relevant funding year. The programme put forward by officers is developed and prioritised with consideration to the following factors:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders

External factors likely to increase demand for parking

How long since the location was last considered for the programme

Position on the current programme
Number of requests in close proximity within the location

## Typical areas of priority

Emergency services / Local services / Residents petitions

Parking displacement, development impact, commercial activity, etc.

Longer duration since last evaluation

Longer duration without implementation
Higher number of requests

### 6.3 Road safety

Harrow has a strong tradition of promoting and prioritising road safety. This is reflected in the Council's personal injury accident record, which consistently shows that the number of casualties in Harrow each year is amongst the lowest of all the London Boroughs.

### 6.3.1 Minor localised traffic safety and speed issues

These types of issues are common place throughout the borough and where accidents result local road safety schemes may be necessary (see section below). However, where
the location does not have a history of accidents and may not justify a significant level of investment to address the problem then other measures may be considered.

Small scale changes may be able to quickly resolve local safety problems. These types of works may include road markings, traffic signing, anti-skid surfacing, etc. In particular speed activated signs are considered for residential streets where no history of personal injury accidents is evident and where traffic speeds are regularly observed above 30 mph . In such cases the borough shares recorded speed survey data with the Police at quarterly traffic liaison meetings so they can decide whether they should target their resources in that area. Speed activated signs are never installed in conservation areas.

The key factors influencing priorities for these minor works are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders

Traffic speed
Local environment

## Typical areas of priority

Emergency services / School / Residents petitions / Cllr / MP

High vehicle speeds
Lack of appropriate signing / road markings, poor road condition

### 6.3.2 Accident remedial schemes

Local Safety schemes are introduced to reduce casualties and the borough considers all killed and serious injury ( KSI ) accidents over the latest 3 year period when looking to identify locations for remedial schemes. In particular clusters of KSIs are a key way of identifying appropriate locations for consideration. High traffic speeds at any location can offer an indication as to how successful any proposed local road safety scheme can be. Because people walking and cycling are at most risk of serious road accident casualties, it is of extreme importance to ensure that any growth in sustainable travel in the borough is not hindered by any concerns over increased casualties. In addition, because reducing motorcycle casualties is a transport objective for the borough locations where these casualties occur are considered as a priority. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Evidence of accident clusters (3 or more)

The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed
Potential to increase modal shift towards walking and cycling in the location

Typical areas of priority
Clusters with a higher number of accidents or vulnerable road users (motorcycles, cycles, pedestrians)

Higher vehicle speeds
Land uses with higher levels of pedestrian activity - hospitals, schools, parks, shops, places of worship

### 6.3.3 Area speed control schemes

Area speed control schemes including 20 mph zones are introduced to encourage modal shift away from the private car and thereby encourage walking and cycling instead by creating a safer environment for all road users. These measures in Harrow never include the main roads in the borough to ensure that the main road network is able to perform efficiently and effectively. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders

Number of schools in the area
Number and type of accidents / casualties over the last 3 years

The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed
Potential to increase modal shift towards walking and cycling in the location

## Typical areas of priority

School / Residents petitions / Cllr / MP / Disabled

Higher numbers of schools
Higher number of accidents

Higher vehicle speeds
Land uses that have higher levels of pedestrian activity - hospitals, schools, parks, shops, places of worship

### 6.4 Accessibility

An estimated $12 \%$ of the population in Harrow currently experience reduced mobility. This includes wheelchair users, people with other disabilities and people with walking difficulties. The number is expected to increase in line with the expected population increases. The types of accessibility improvements required are varied and challenging. Prioritising one type of improvement may not benefit others. Accessibility improvements are needed to services beyond the issue of mobility and include sensory requirements for those with hearing or sight problems or simple travel assistance for those with learning difficulties.

People also suffer from accessibility issues as a result of the existing local infrastructure. It is often not possible to walk or cycle to certain destinations safely because of the lack of safe accessible routes. In these locations the Council can sometimes make changes to the existing infrastructure in order to widen the level of accessibility.

### 6.4.1 Local pedestrian access issues

Pedestrians are the most versatile users of the transport network with access to most areas of the public highway as well as public rights of way. A wide range of access issues on pedestrian desire lines can occur for a variety of reasons, particularly for the disabled.

The provision of lowered kerbs can be provided at controlled / uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points and at other locations to enable mobility and visually impaired pedestrians as well as wheelchair users and those with pushchairs to cross roads more easily. There are many requests and the Council considers locations that form a part of whole routes where the level of need is likely to be greater.

Other small accessibility improvements may include removing barriers to the use of rights of way such as replacing stiles with kissing gates. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Location

Impact on mobility / visually impaired

Length of time since application

Typical areas of priority
Critical pedestrian route with no other safe alternative routes available

Locations with significant barriers restricting use of route

Time elapsed

### 6.4.2 Local vehicular access issues

Vehicle access road markings (H-bar) are advisory markings which are provided to highlight the presence of a vehicular access to a property. They are advisory markings only which cannot be enforced and therefore must be used in specific situations where parking demand is moderate and they may be respected by traffic. Areas with extremely high demand for parking may not be suitable and require enforceable measures. The key factors influencing priorities are:

Assessment factor
Location

Length of time since application

Typical areas of priority
Obstruction of vehicular access serving disabled persons parking space or premises serving more than 10 parking spaces (in areas not suitable for waiting restrictions)

Time elapsed

### 6.4.3 Rights of Way improvements

Rights of way in Harrow include footpaths, bridleways and byways. Most of these run through the borough's countryside, which is comprised of green belt, open spaces and parks. Harrow has an adopted Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) which includes a Statement of Action. Key to the Statement of Action are the following improvements:

- Extending the rights of way network to include new routes
- Improving information and publicity to the public about the rights of way
- Improving the overall accessibility of the network to all but giving particular consideration to those with mobility difficulties

Types of improvements that may need to take place along the rights of way include:

- New way marking signage
- Handrails to improve accessibility
- Appropriate seating along long routes
- Extending the rights of way
- Replacing stiles with kissing gates which are far easier to use for all people and which allow easier access for people with mobility difficulties

To prioritise work, points are awarded for the following:

Assessment factor
Key stakeholders

Link to ROWIP
Routes linking to the location
Condition of route
Length of time since application

Typical areas of priority
Mobility impaired, School, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions

Addresses statement of action
Good connectivity with other routes
Infrastructure is in poor condition
Time elapsed

### 6.4.4 Cycle parking

The provision of safe and secure cycle parking facilities is important to promoting cycling as a sustainable transport mode. In general cycle parking is located in a way that avoids disruption to pedestrians, shoppers carrying goods and people with mobility difficulties and is in a location that is visible to passers to limit the potential for theft and damage of bikes and especially where they are likely to be well used. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders
New locations (no current provision)

Cycle parking using existing street furniture

Usage of existing cycle parking
Links to cycle routes

## Typical areas of priority

Cycle groups, School, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions
Land uses with higher levels of pedestrian activity stations, commercial centres, hospital, places of worship, leisure centres, shopping parades

High usage of street furniture to secure bikes

Higher usage of existing facilities
Higher number of cycle routes in proximity

### 6.4.5 Cycle route schemes

Road conditions, local topology and traffic speeds are all important for determining the cycling safety for any area. For new cycle routes in the borough, it is important that they provide new links both to educational institutions and where appropriate through to other boroughs. It is also important that existing and new routes are improved to minimise cycling accidents. The ratio of cycle speed to general traffic speed is often a cause for cycling casualties. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders
Barriers to cycling
Linking local amenities

Safety

Typical areas of priority
Cycle groups, School, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions Higher number of barriers removed (e.g. crossing main road) Higher number of stations, commercial centres, hospital, places of worship, leisure centres, shopping parades linked by route

Higher number of cycle accidents / casualties, higher difference between vehicle and cycle speeds

### 6.4.6 Walking schemes

Walking improvements include pedestrian crossings, controlled crossings, pedestrian phases as signals, pedestrian route signing as well as the introduction of new pedestrian routes and links. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor Typical areas of priority

Key stakeholders
Safety
Barriers to walking
Pedestrian movement
Vehicular movement

Emergency services, school, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions
Higher number of pedestrian accidents / casualties in proximity Higher number of barriers to walking with greater level of difficulty Higher number of pedestrians

Higher number of vehicles

### 6.5 Public transport

The bus and underground service in Harrow is run by Transport for London and the rail services are run by train operating companies. Officers at Harrow regularly liaise with all transport operators and other stakeholders to identify ways of improving public transport in Harrow and promoting its use. Work programmes focus on improving accessibility to public transport services as well as to improving bus flow and reducing traffic congestion which impacts on buses.

### 6.5.1 Bus priority schemes

Schemes are selected based on information provided from a range of sources where improvements can be made to bus routes and particularly bus journey time reliability. The key factors influencing priorities are:

Assessment factor
Key stakeholders Emergency services, transport operators / TfL (joint inspection meetings), HPTUA

Location On strategic road network, greater traffic delays on network, high

### 6.5.2 Bus stop accessibility schemes

Schemes are selected where there is a prevalence of bus stops not meeting Disability Discrimination Act standards along bus route corridors. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders

Clearway marking
Signing / road markings
Kerb height
Footway hard standing area
Bus frequency

## Typical areas of priority

Emergency services, disability groups, School, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions

Sub standard provision
Sub standard provision
Sub standard provision
Sub standard provision
Higher frequency

### 6.6 Congestion

The Traffic Management Act requires local authorities to identify issues which are causing, or have the potential to cause road congestion and disruption to the movement of traffic on the road network and to consider any possible action that could be taken in response.

### 6.6.1 Traffic congestion relief schemes

Congestion schemes are identified where excessive congestion has been identified on the network through monitoring of TfL network performance data. Areas with worse journey time reliability, average queue lengths and average delay are targeted. In general these studies are aimed at junctions and links on the main road network hierarchy which facilitates longer journeys to destinations that are more distant and which attract significantly higher levels of traffic. The assessments also consider locations where viable changes to local traffic and parking management arrangements have the potential to alleviate the problems. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders

Delay on network
Delay to bus services
Extent of area subject to delay
Strategic network impact

## Typical areas of priority

Emergency services, school, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions

Higher levels of delay (TfL congestion maps)
Higher levels of delay (i-bus data)
Higher number of junctions within area subject to delay Within strategic route network

### 6.7 Environment and air quality

Local freight movement in Harrow is nearly all by road and this has an impact on both the local environment and the local quality of life. The unpleasant impacts of freight movement include noise, vehicle emissions, building vibrations, congestion and accidents. To address these issues a number of measures can be taken. These include addressing land use issues, operating standards for freight distributors, environmental vehicle standards and traffic management.

### 6.7.1 Freight management schemes

Schemes are mainly selected where delivery difficulties have been identified. These are identified, often by local businesses, because of the associated congestion caused by deliveries not parking appropriately and also as a result of delivery vehicles parking inappropriately because of a lack of suitable locations to park. The key factors influencing priorities are:

## Assessment factor

Key stakeholders
Contributes to Freight Movement Operational Strategy objectives

Number of accidents / casualties
Number of complaints

## Typical areas of priority

School, Cllr, MP, Residents petitions
Higher number of objectives satisfied

Higher number of accidents / casualties
Higher number of complaints

### 6.8 Strategic weighting (planned works only)

There are two strategic assessment factors which impact on the priority of planned works. These will be applied by the transport planning team after the main programme entry assessments are undertaken by the transport projects team and demonstrate the impact of the proposed intervention on the borough's corporate priorities and on Harrow's LIP transport objectives. These criteria will test the strategic fit of the planned work.

### 6.8.1 Impact on corporate priorities

Harrow has 4 corporate objectives which are defined in the Corporate Plan. A higher priority is assigned to schemes and initiatives that meet a greater number of these objectives as follows:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
- Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses


### 6.8.2 Impact on Harrow's LIP transport objectives

Harrow has 12 transport objectives which are defined in the Harrow Local Implementation Plan and agreed with the Mayor of London and full Harrow Council. The borough has a statutory duty to work towards achieving these objectives. A higher priority is assigned to schemes and initiatives that meet a greater number of these objectives as follows:

- Improve access borough wide to a wide range of facilities and services
- Improve orbital transport links
- Encourage healthier lifestyles
- Reduce $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$
- Regenerate Harrow town centre and the new area of Intensification
- Reduce borough motorcycle casualties
- Improve accessibility
- Improve transport connectivity between Harrow on the Hill station / Harrow bus station and Harrow \& Wealdstone station.
- Increase cycling borough wide
- Reduce congestion and make essential journeys easier
- Improve pedestrian walkways that use and link existing parks and open spaces with town centres and public transport provision
- Support vitality of town centres through good transport access prioritising sustainable modes


## 7. MONITORING

### 7.1 LIP reporting and engagement with TfL

There are a number of TfL reporting requirements associated with implementing the programme of investment in the LIP and Harrow is required to submit the following to TfL on an annual basis:

- An Annual Spending Submission in October, confirming the detailed programmes for the following financial year (refer to section 4.1),
- A report detailing the delivery of the mayor's high profile outputs,

The annual spending submission allows the programme of investment included in the LIP to be confirmed or adjusted as necessary to deliver the LIP objectives. This programme entry document has been specifically developed to prioritise suitable interventions for the programme of investment on that basis. The interventions must also support the delivery of the mayor's high profile outputs and TfL monitor progress annually.

In addition to this TfL expects to meet each borough formally at least once each year to discuss progress on the delivery of LIP programmes. These meetings, which are often arranged on a quarterly basis focus on any areas of weaker performance to ensure that measures are in place to strengthen them for the future. TfL also discusses any significant changes to the overall Programme of Investment to ensure performance targets are met. Developing an effective programme of investment helps to ensure TfL's expectations are met.

At the end of the LIP period (current LIP programme of investment ends in March 2014) Harrow will be required to prepare and publish a Three-Year Impact Report on the
implementation of LIP programmes, achievement of targets and provide evidence of how the LIP has contributed to wider policy objectives for the local area. A monitoring regime is in place to support the preparation of this report which is set out in section 7.3. The ThreeYear Impact report will provide technical information to assess progress, summarise key achievements and must be prepared in close liaison with stakeholders so that a rounded overview of progress can be presented.

### 7.2 Annual reporting on Mayor's high profile outputs

Each year the borough is required to report to TfL on progress in delivering the Mayor's high profile outputs and in implementing the Mayor's Transport strategy. This requires the borough to report annually the following information for the borough:

- Cycle parking spaces provided
- Cycle training provided
- Interventions to assist cycling
- Pedestrian crossing facilities provided (eg refuges, zebra crossings, pelican crossings etc.)
- Length of guard rail removed
- Interventions to assist pedestrians
- Number of education and training interventions for road safety and personal security provided
- Number of 20 mph zones implemented
- Interventions to improve road safety and personal security
- Length of bus lane implemented
- Number of accessible bus stops implemented
- Interventions to assist buses
- Number of workplace travel plans and travel plans reviewed
- Number of schools with school travel plans
- Number of schools participating in Walk on Wednesdays
- Number of cycle promotion events held during Bike Week
- Number of events supporting smarter travel (eg Eco-driving, greener vehicles, liftshare, car clubs etc.)
- Interventions on smarter travel
- Electric vehicle charging points installed
- Car club bays implemented
- Number of trees planted across the borough
- Interventions on the environment
- Shopmobility schemes introduced
- Interventions on accessibility
- Number of controlled parking zones introduced
- Number of waiting and loading reviews taking place
- Interventions to review parking or freight issues
- Number of European emission standard or fleet for heavy duty diesel-engined vehicles
- Electric vehicles in Council fleet
- Interventions to improve the efficiency of Council vehicle fleet


### 7.3 Performance targets in LIP

The LIP contains a range of performance indicators and targets which will be used to monitor the ongoing delivery plan and support the preparation of the Three-Year Impact Report. The borough reports on progress in reaching these targets and identifies any barriers in doing so. On most of the targets there is both a short term and long term target. Although some of the targets do not seem that ambitious, just maintaining the status quo is often very challenging. The agreed LIP targets are as follows:

| Transport area | Performance targets |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Walking | - Achieve a 30.5\% mode share for walking in 2013/14. <br> $\bullet$ | Achieve a 31.5\% mode share for walking in 2026. |

As an indicator of network performance maintaining the current bus journey time performance in 2013/14 and beyond is specified. Particular bus routes being measured using i-bus data from TfL are as follows:

| Route | Section of route | i-bus weekday <br> run time <br> Base year value <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> (mins) | i-bus weekday <br> run time <br> Target year <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ <br> (mins) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| H12 | W/B between High Rd and Pinner Grn | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| H12 | E/B between High Rd and Pinner Grn | 13.8 | 13.8 |
| H9 | Kings Rd and Harrow View | 9 | 9 |
| H10 | Kings Rd and Harrow View | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| 140 | N/B between College Rd and The Bridge | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| 140 | S/B between College Rd and The Bridge | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 114 | W/B between Turner Rd and Burnt Oak <br> Broadway | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| 114 | E/B between Turner Rd and Burnt Oak <br> Broadway | 4.2 | 4.2 |

Glossary

| CPZ | Controlled Parking Zone |
| :--- | :--- |
| DDA | Disability Discrimination Act |
| DPPS | Disabled Person's Parking Space |
| GLA | Greater London Authority |
| HC | Harrow Capital |
| LDF | Local Development Framework |
| LIP | Local Implementation Plan |
| LSPS | Local Safety Parking Scheme |
| MTS | Mayor's Transport Strategy |
| NIS | Neighbourhood Improvement Scheme |
| ROWIP | Rights of Way Improvement Plan |
| SRTP | Sub-Regional Transport Plan |
| THNM | Traffic and Highway Network Management |
| TfL | Transport for London |
| TMA | Traffic Management Act |
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## Section 1 - Summary

This information report is presented to members to provide an update on progress with delivering the 2012/13 programme of traffic and parking schemes. This includes schemes funded by Transport for London (TfL) and schemes included in Harrow's Capital Programme. The information contained in this report reflects the latest position at the time of writing the report in November 2012.

FOR INFORMATION

## Section 2 - Report

## General

2.1 This information report provides members with an update on the current programme of transport schemes and initiatives funded in 2012/13. This includes schemes funded by TfL grant and the Harrow capital programme. Appendix A provides a summary of progress with all the schemes in the programme.
2.2 More detail on certain schemes is provided below in the body of the report where they have reached the public consultation, statutory consultation or implementation stages.


#### Abstract

2.3 In addition to the programme update specific issues of interest to members may also be included. An update on the Harrow town Centre improvement is included.


TfL schemes - 2012/13 update

## Stanmore Broadway - linking of traffic signals

2.4 The signal controllers were commissioned on $15^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 and will be followed by the SCOOT implementation process that will link all the signals to the Urban Traffic Controller at TfL. This process is likely to be completed within the next four weeks.
> 2.5 Once the signals are linked the traffic flows will be monitored along the Stanmore Broadway corridor and a review of network performance undertaken. In addition the Stanmore Hill junction will be reviewed to ascertain what scope there is to introduce an all red pedestrian phase without adversely affecting traffic flow on this corridor.

## Weald School - 20mph zone

[^1]discussed and it was agreed to include The Avenue within the 20 mph zone because there was majority support from local residents for this road to be included.
2.7 Statutory consultation was subsequently undertaken and ended on the $7^{\text {th }}$ November. Any objections to the proposals will be considered by the Portfolio Holder before proceeding any further.

Elmgrove School - 20mph zone
2.8 Statutory consultation on the proposed scheme was completed in September and no objections were received. The scheme has now been scheduled for implementation in December.

Roxbourne School - 20mph zone
2.9 Speed surveys have been undertaken throughout the area surrounding the school and an outline 20 mph zone design has been completed. Many of the roads in the area surveyed already contain some form of traffic calming and therefore these roads will be incorporated into the proposed zone by using the necessary traffic signing only.
2.10 Informal public consultation on the scheme proposal is scheduled to commence in November.

## Local transport funding

## Bacon Lane, Krishna Avanti School 20mph zone

2.11 Statutory consultation on the proposed scheme was completed in September and no objections were received. The scheme has now been scheduled for implementation in December

## Accident remedial scheme - Old Redding

2.12 There have been 20 personal injury collisions recorded during the last 36 months of available data. These collisions have resulted in 30 casualties ( 27 slight and 3 serious). The plan in Appendix B1 shows where the accident clusters are located.
2.13 Following discussions with representatives of the emergency services at the Traffic Liaison Meeting held on $20^{\text {th }}$ September detailed proposals have been developed to address the large number of personal injury collisions that have occurred along Old Redding.
2.14 The emergency services frequently use Old Redding and as a consequence the proposals developed need to limit the use of traffic calming measures. It is therefore proposed to implement three speed platforms positioned in advance of the accident cluster locations. The platforms will be 50 mm high with a 5 m long plateau to minimize the impact on emergency response times. (This is the minimum height requirement). Further discussions with the Fire Brigade have indicated that their preference is not to have speed platforms, however, they
appreciate the need for some form of speed reduction measure given the quantity of collisions in this area.
2.15 The proposals also include a chicane located east of the series of sharp bends in the road to slow down vehicles in advance of the first bend. A plan of the proposals can be seen at Appendix B. A consultation with key stakeholders and affected residents will be undertaken within the next month.

## Accident remedial scheme - Alexandra Avenue / Rayners Lane / Warden Avenue, junction improvement

2.16 Junction improvements are generally carried out at locations where the number of accidents involving personal injury is higher than expected and where an analysis of the accident patterns indicates changes to the road layout could improve the situation.
2.17 In terms of accidents at this junction, there have been 12 personal injury collisions in the last 36 months of available data. This figure is considered sufficiently high to trigger physical intervention. These collisions have resulted in 14 casualties; 12 being slight and 2 serious.
2.18 In order to address these personal injury accidents we are proposing to introduce a mini roundabout at the junction, a mini roundabout would help reduce vehicle speeds and improve turning manoeuvres at the junction. Appendix D gives details of the proposals.

Junction improvement / bus priority scheme
Eastcote Lane / Rayners Lane / Roxeth Green Avenue
2.19 The existing problems with road safety, congestion and bus journey time reliability are being investigated at this junction. A review of the recorded collision history, recent traffic surveys, bus journey time data and other local issues has been undertaken and a scheme to introduce a significant junction improvement prepared. The attached plan
Appendix C shows the proposal which involves:

- constructing a roundabout at the junction
- constructing upgraded pedestrian refuges on the arms of the junction to assist pedestrian movement
- Introduce 'at any time' double yellow line waiting restrictions to prevent obstructive parking as well as repositioning a bus stop
- Improve street lighting at the junction
- Improve the streetscape at this location
- Provide cyclists with bypass lanes to avoid using the roundabout
2.20 The public consultation period ended on $5^{\text {th }}$ November.

Bus route improvement works - Long Elms
2.21 As part of Bus Priority programme, works were carried out along a section of Long Elmes in 2010/11 to address delays to the buses using
this corridor. Inset parking bays were provided at the eastern end of Long Elmes to set back on-street parking and keep traffic lanes clear for buses which minimized any loss of parking for local residents.
2.22 This project will continue this year to address the congestion issues along the remaining section of Long Elmes. Additional inset parking bays will be provided along the section of Long Elmes between property numbers 26 to 70 . These inset parking bays will help reduce the delay experienced by the buses along this corridor by removing on street parking in the same way as the measures introduced last year.

## Bus Stop Accessibility works

2.23 As part of bus stop accessibility programme, in conjunction with TfL, improvements to bus stops are introduced throughout the borough to improve bus and pedestrian access, especially those with mobility difficulties and those with wheelchairs and pushchairs. Typical works include the introduction of bus stop clearways, improved footways and hard standings at bus stops and improved road markings and signing.
2.24 TfL provides a list of non compliant bus stops for review and these are assessed and a programme of works developed to convert those bus stops to meet statutory requirements for disabled people contained within the Equality Act (previously contained within the disability Discrimination Act). Works are proposed for about half of these bus stops on the list so far and the works are going at approximately 40 sites across the borough. Additional funding of $£ 15 \mathrm{k}$ has been made available by TfL to carry out more work this financial year.

## Pedestrian and cycle safety campaign

2.25 As part of the pedestrian safety campaign targeting teenagers a theatre company specialising in educational productions was engaged to put on performances for ten High Schools in Harrow during October. They delivering a hard hitting teenage pedestrian road safety show to over 2,300 year 7 children. Specially designed posters have been distributed to all schools to reinforce the distraction message to children which can be seen in Appendix E.

## Cycle Training

2.26 TfL funded cycle training is offered free to children and adults, who live, work or are educated in the borough. All courses are promoted via the council website and throughout schools and businesses in the borough.
2.27 Level 2 "Bikeability" training for year 6 students will be offered to every school in the borough and students in years 7 and 8 are also offered "Bikeability" level 3 training to try to increase the number of children cycling to high schools. Adult training continues to be popular especially at beginner level and are still running every other week at Elmgrove School and also take place at The Harrow Leisure Centre during school holidays.

## Harrow town Centre Improvement - 2012/13 update

## St Ann's Road

2.28 The Place Shaping sponsored project to upgrade and improve St Ann's Road is a significant public realm improvement project. Key design features include the repaving of St Ann's Road to match Station Road, review and repaving of Havelock Place, removal of planters and street clutter to create more space for pedestrians, review of existing street stalls and stopped up spaces, new trees, benches and lighting.
2.29 Detailed design is underway and the possible relocation of the disabled bays on Havelock Place is being investigated.
2.30 The funding consists of $£ 735 \mathrm{k}$ from Harrow Capital and $£ 182 \mathrm{k}$ from the Outer London Fund.

## Kymberley Road

2.31 This project aims to create new bus standing space on Kymberley Road, upgrade the pedestrian and cycle routes between the new developments in the west of town and St Ann's Road, review access arrangements for the car parks and generally improve the public realm around Kymberley Rd and College Rd.
2.32 Outline highway design is complete and architects are now considering the public realm improvements.
2.33 Project funding is made up of $£ 1,000$ k of Harrow Capital, $£ 250$ k from S106 contributions and £150k LIP.

## Car Park Indicator Signs

2.34 This project involves the installation of variable message car park indicator signs around Harrow Town Centre. Once installed, the signs will display information about car park locations and available spaces which will be updated electronically.
2.35 The project is expected to cost $£ 150 \mathrm{k}$ and is fully funded by the Outer London Fund. Feasibility and design has commenced with implementation due 2013/14.

## Legible London Signs

2.36 The Legible London pedestrian wayfinding system is to be installed in Harrow Town Centre and Wealdstone Town Centre.
2.37 Funding of $£ 50 \mathrm{k}$ has been made available for $2012 / 13$ by the Outer London Fund and a further $£ 100$ k has been set aside in the LIP for 2013/14.
2.38 Preliminary locations for the signs have been drawn up based on site meeting with Transport for London and Ward Members are being consulted.
2.39 Design for London, who oversee the management and expenditure of the Outer London Fund has requested that a sum of the $£ 50 \mathrm{k}$ be used for 3 or 4 wall painted signs in the town centre. This is being investigated and is subject to approval by Members and consent from property owners.

## Section 3 - Further Information

3.1 A regular update is provided at every meeting on progress with the annual programme of traffic and parking schemes. Future reports will provide information to members about any consultations, statutory consultations, portfolio holder decisions and implementation issues since the previous meeting.

## Section 4 - Financial Implications

4.1 Any schemes and works programmes mentioned in this report are being taken forward using identified resources and funding from TfL Grant and Harrow Capital in 2012/13.

## Section 5 - Equalities implications

5.1 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
5.2 All major schemes included in this report, depending on what stage they are at, have been or will be subject to an equality impact assessment (EqIA).
5.3 Small to medium sized schemes, depending on what stage they are at, have been or will be subject to a review of equality issues as a part of the design risk assessment stage of the scheme.
5.4 In general terms there have been no adverse impacts on any of the specified equality groups from any of the schemes or initiatives mentioned in this report. There are positive impacts on some equalities groups, particularly disability and age.

## Section 6 - Corporate Priorities

6.1 The funds allocated by TfL and Harrow for transport improvements will help achieve the corporate priorities as follows:

## Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe

This will be supported by the following programmes of work:

- 20 mph zones
- Electric vehicle charging points
- Car clubs
- Freight loading bays
- Local safety schemes
- Road safety campaigns

Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
This will be supported by the following programmes of work:

- Shopmobility
- Bus stop accessibility schemes
- Bus priority schemes
- Pedestrian crossings

United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
This will be supported by the following programmes of work:

- School travel plans and associated works
- Cycle training
- Bike Week, Walking Works
- Sustainable travel promotions, road safety educational activities and environmental promotions
- Major Schemes

Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses.

This will be supported by the following programmes of work

- Controlled Parking Zones
- Local safety schemes
- Cycling parking
- Shopmobility
- Major Schemes


## Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Date: 13/11/12

## Section 8 - Contact Details and Background Papers

## Contact:

Barry Philips - Team Leader - Traffic and Road Safety
Tel: 0208424 1649, Fax: 0208424 7662,
E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk
Paul Newman - Team Leader - Parking and Sustainable Transport Tel: 0208424 1065, Fax: 0208424 7622,
E -mail:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk
Hanif Islam - Senior Professional - Transport Planning Tel: 0208424 1548, Fax: 0208424 7662,
E-mail: hanif.islam@harrow.gov.uk

## Background Papers:

Approved 2012/13 TfL Programme and Harrow Capital Programme September TARSAP report

## Appendix A - Traffic \& Transportation programme update - 2012/13

## Harrow Capital - Parking management schemes

This is Harrow's own programme of traffic and parking scheme initiatives which support the delivery of the Local implementation Plan. In $2012 / 13$ this comprises of allocations of $£ 260 \mathrm{~K}$ for controlled parking schemes, $£ 40 \mathrm{~K}$ for the local safety parking schemes programme.

| Scheme | Details | $\mathbf{£ K}$ | Status | Contact <br> officer | Planned <br> finish |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CPZ zone V <br> West Harrow review | Review of CPZ Zone at eastern part <br> of area close to Bessborough Road <br> which was introduced 1 April 2010 | 17.5 | Scheme with contractor for delivery end of <br> Nov 12 | Paul <br> Newman | Nov <br> 2012 |
| CPZ zone W <br> West Harrow review | Review of CPZ Zone around West <br> Harrow Station which was <br> introduced 1 April 2010 | 17.5 | Scheme with contractor for delivery for <br> delivery end of Nov 12 | Paul <br> Newman | Nov <br> 2012 |
| New CPZ <br> Whitmore School <br> area / Honeybun <br> Estate areas | Parking control issues associated <br> with and in close proximity to West <br> Harrow CPZ area | 50 | Scheme with contractor for delivery end of <br> Nov 12 | Paul <br> Newman | Nov <br> 2012 |
| CPZ zone U <br> Pinner Road review | Review of Parking controls along <br> Pinner Road, County Road CPZ and <br> Neptune Road. | 15 | Scheme with contractor for delivery Dec 2012 |  |  |


| Scheme | Details | £ K | Status | Contact officer | Planned finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New zone/controls Canons Park station area | Review of parking in area generally within the vicinity of the station | 40 | Statutory consultation results reported elsewhere to November 2012 Panel meeting | Paul Newman | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mar } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ |
| CPZ zone X <br> Burnt Oak <br> Broadway review | Review of area CPZ and double yellow lines at junctions, bends and narrowing's and one way system in Park Way implemented $1^{1 \text { st }}$ April 2010 | 15 | Portfolio Holder decision effective from $3^{\text {rd }}$ November 2012 <br> Implementation likely January 2013 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Paul } \\ & \text { Newman } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Mar } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ |
| CPZ zone L Rayners Lane review (reconsultation 1) | Re-consultation on parking controls in Central Ave North, Alfriston Ave, Fernbrook Drive, Raynton Close, Trescoe Gds, Newlyn Gds as requested by Panel in 2011 | 10 | Portfolio Holder decision effective from $3^{\text {rd }}$ November 2012 Implementation likely January 2013 | Paul Newman | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mar } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ |
| CPZ zone L Rayners Lane review (reconsultation 2) | Re-consultation on yellow lines in Southbourne Close recommended at October 12 Panel meeting |  | Portfolio Holder decision on re-consultation effective from $3^{\text {rd }}$ November 2012. Discussions with residents over options ongoing | Paul Newman | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Mar } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ |
| CPZ zone P Review Rosslyn Crescent, Frognal Avenue | Review of parking controls required as part of a s106 agreement resulting from local development | 15* | Public Consultation Documents issued November 2012. Results to be reported to TARSAP February 2013 <br> * Funded by s106 agreement | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Paul } \\ & \text { Newman } \end{aligned}$ | 2013 |
| Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme | The introduction of minor localised waiting restrictions (yellow lines) schemes to deal with access problems and road safety issues. | 40 | The traffic orders for Phase 2 of the waiting restrictions have been developed. The proposed waiting restrictions on Harrow on the Hill have been agreed and will be implemented shortly. | Barry Philips | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Mar } \\ & 2013 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

## TfL Capital - Corridors, Neighbourhoods, Supporting Measures and Local Transport Funding

This is the main programme funded by Transport for London to deliver the programme of investment in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The overall allocation related to the LIP is 1778K. This is allocated as either capital or revenue within harrow's financial system depending on the nature of the work undertaken.

| Scheme | Details | £ k | Status | Contact officer | Planned finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petts Hill | The scheme is complete, however, funding is assigned to the repayment of a loan. | 333 | The final annual payment. | Hanif Islam | N/A |
| Weald School - 20 mph zone | A 20 mph zone is proposed in the area surrounding Weald School. | 40 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | Dec 2012 |
| Elmgrove School 20 mph zone | A 20mph zone is proposed in the area surrounding Elmgrove First and Middle School. | 50 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | Dec 2012 |
| Roxbourne School 20 mph zone | A 20mph zone is proposed in the area surrounding Roxbourne School. | 50 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | Jan 2013 |
| Bus stop accessibility schemes | Works to improve access to bus stops | 50 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Disabled parking and dropped kerb programme | Provision of Disabled bays, H bars and dropped kerbs and physical changes to highway due to increasingly mobility impaired population | 65 | Ongoing programme of assessing and implementing requests for disabled parking bays, White H bars and dropped kerbs. All disabled bays have been subject of survey to ascertain if provision meets criteria. Budget increased from $£ 33 \mathrm{~K}$ in 2011/12 | Paul <br> Newman | Mar 2013 |


| Scheme | Details | £ k | Status | Contact officer | Planned finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accident remedial schemes - Mass action - killed and seriously injured ( KSI) casualties reduction | To address accident hotspots in the borough and improve road safety | 80 20 | Alexandra Avenue / Warden Avenue / <br> Rayners Lane - junction redesign to address personal injury accidents <br> Old Redding safety scheme - see main body of the report | Barry Philips <br> Barry Philips | Mar 2013 <br> Mar 2013 |
| Stanmore Hill / The Broadway / Marsh Lane / Elm Park | Scheme to introduce a SCOOT system to improve congestion by linking five sets of traffic signals along the Stanmore Broadway corridor. | 30 | See update in main body of the report. | Barry Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Belmont Trail | Scheme to maximise the use of this important green corridor (former railway line) through the urban environment. | 62 | Design work for DDA complaint new access from Christchurch Avenue completed. Contractor commissioned to carry out works (scheme being progressed in coordination with green grid landscaping works by planning department) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Paul } \\ & \text { Newman } \end{aligned}$ | Dec 2012 |
| Local Transport Fund | Bacon Lane (Krishna Avanti School) 20 mph zone <br> Wood Lane - pedestrian improvements | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ | See main body of report <br> Works scheduled in November | Barry Philips Barry Philips | Mar 2013 <br> Nov 2012 |
| Clamp Hill/Uxbridge Road/The Common | Improvements for cycles to minimise conflict with other traffic where speeds are higher These will enable improved bikeability levels | 166 | Clamp Hill scheme designed, associated waiting restrictions subject to statutory consultation. The Common ongoing discussions with local councillors and design work being finalised | Paul Newman | Mar 2013 |


| Scheme | Details | $\mathbf{£ k}$ | Status | Contact <br> officer | Planned <br> finish |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bus priority schemes | Route studies, bus stop audits, <br> and analysis. <br> Implementation of works to | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | 65 | Route studies and assessments to produce <br> works programme for future years. <br> Implementation of schemes to assist bus <br> manif <br> movements in current year. | Islam <br> Barry <br> Philips |
| Bus Priority <br> Eastcote Lane, <br> South Harrow | Junction redesign to improve <br> bus journey time | 60 | Funds amalgamated with Eastcote Lane / <br> Rayners Lane junction reconfiguration to do one <br> overall scheme. See main body of report. | Barry <br> Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Bus Priority <br> Common Rd / High <br> Rd, Stanmore | Junction redesign to improve <br> bus journey time | 75 | Awaiting cost of statutory undertakers <br> diversionary work | Barry <br> Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Eastcote Lane / <br> Rayners Lane <br> junction <br> reconfiguration | Work is needed to relieve <br> congestion and smoooth traffic <br> flows and to address delays the <br> junctions | 50 | Funds amalgamated with Bus priority, Eastcote <br> Lane scheme to do one overall scheme. See <br> main body of report. | Barry <br> Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Freight strategy <br> schemes <br> investigation and <br> implementation | This will involve rinvestigating <br> and implementing freight <br> facilities and improved signing <br> as set out in the Freight <br> movement operational strategy. | 100 | Advisory route signing being developed | Barry <br> Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Shopmobility | Funding support for increased <br> opening hours of service <br> particularly at weekends and in <br> Christmas sales | 5 | Funds being used to keep Shopmobility open <br> on the first Saturday of every month. Extra <br> services planned for Christmas period. | Hanif <br> Islam | Mar 2013 |
| Rights of Way | This will enable the borough to <br> update the definitive map and <br> further investigate rights of way <br> in the borough | 10 | To undertake a review of the definitive map and <br> update and consolidate all known rights of way, <br> including public footpaths | Ann Fine | Mar 2013 |


| Scheme | Details | £ k | Status | Contact officer | Planned finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School support | Various initiatives: <br> - Walk to School promotions <br> - Schools quarterly newsletter <br> - Small grant funding to support travel plans <br> - Theatre in education <br> - School Travel Maps <br> - Cycle repair workshops | 70 | Ongoing support for schools to support modal shift and promote sustainable travel and discourage use of private car to travel to school. <br> Development and updating of school travel plans including requests for grant funding to implement measures to support school travel plans <br> Promotional work to support sustainable transport message including Theatre in Education shows and Dr Bike sessions | Hanif Islam | Mar 2013 |
| Promoting sustainability | Various initiatives: <br> - Campaigns <br> - Car Clubs <br> - Bike Week and Cycling promotions <br> - Walking and walking works promotions <br> - Promotion of electric vehicle technology and charging points <br> - Awareness campaign and integration with smarter travel | 45 | Ongoing support to planning application process for businesses and residential developments in order to encourage travel planning and sustainable transport modes. <br> Ongoing programme of promotions for sustainable transport initiatives including smarter driving throughout the year. <br> Car clubs and electric charging points are promoted via the sustainable transport campaign and through travel plans secured via the planning process. <br> Support has also been provided to Transport for London, Living Streets and Sustrans initiatives during the Olympics to promote sustainable transport including a campaign which encourages sustaining the Olympic legacy through active travel and cycling. | Hanif Islam | Mar 2013 |


| Scheme | Details | £ k | Status | Contact officer | Planned finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road safety education | Numerous road safety education initiatives at all schools in Harrow. | 35 | Interactive road safety education programs continue in all schools in Harrow from nursery children and parents up to 6th form students. <br> Scooter training continues to be very popular for KS 1 children and training is on going across several schools in Harrow. Over 4000 children have been trained in the last year. <br> Road Safety Week starts early in Harrow with numerous safety talks planned for October and November. These will promote the Be Bright Be Seen message and over 5000 reflective bag tags will be given out to Junior school children to help keep them safe and visible during the winter months. | Barry Philips | Mar 2013 |
| Adult and Child cycle training | TfL funded cycle training is offered free to children and adults, who live, work or are educated in the borough. All courses are promoted via the council website and throughout schools and businesses in the borough. | 95 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | Mar 2013 |
| School travel plan advisor | Staff funding support | 22 | An officer is in post providing school travel plan support to schools. | Hanif Islam | Mar 2013 |
| Pedestrian and cycle safety campaign | Undertake road safety campaigns to educate and warn vulnerable cyclists of hazards on the boroughs roads. | 10 | See main body of report | Barry Philips | July 2012 <br> Aug/ Sept $2012$ |


| Scheme | Details | $\mathbf{£ k}$ | Status | Contact <br> officer | Planned <br> finish |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Travel Training | This will provide support to <br> those with learning difficulties to <br> use public transport | 5 | Harrow Association of Disabled People to <br> provide training | Hanif <br> Islam | Mar 2013 |  |
| Future programme <br> development | Support ongoing work and for <br> traffic surveys | 25 | Traffic surveys to support ongoing work. | Barry <br> Philips <br> Identify future work through <br> assessments and studies. | 25 | Mar 2013 <br> Studies and traffic surveys to develop future <br> work programmes |
| Walk \& cycle legible <br> London school map <br> Islam | Development of travel <br> information maps for schools to <br> include the Legible London <br> maps | 5 | Liaised with TfL to create mock ups of <br> conversion of the travel information maps to <br> include the Legible London Mapping as a base <br> layer. Initial investigation carried out. Concept <br> not going ahead due to issues with map scaling. | Hanif <br> Islam | Mar 2013 |  |
| Star-track integration | Integration of Harrow's school <br> travel planning website into the <br> TfL system | 4 | The developer successfully integrated <br> harrowtp.org into the TfL system prior to the <br> commencement of the new school year. | Hanif <br> Islam | Mar 2013 |  |
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## APPENDIX C
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Appendix E
Pedestrian safety campaign poster
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## Appendix F <br> Cycle Training Poster
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This chart does not include major schemes.

[^1]:    2.6 A meeting was held with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety following the outcome of the informal public consultation exercise in September. The results of the consultation and the petition, which were reported to TARSAP in September, were

