

**REPORT FOR: Traffic And Road Safety
Advisory Panel**

Date of Meeting: 3 October 2012

Subject: Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone
Review (specified roads) - Results of
Statutory Consultation

Key Decision: No

Responsible Officer: John Edwards – Interim Corporate Director,
Environmental Services

Portfolio Holder: Phillip O’Dell - Portfolio Holder for
Environment and Community Safety

Exempt: No

**Decision subject to
Call-in:** Yes, following consideration by the
Portfolio Holder

Enclosures: **Appendix A**
Extension of controlled parking zone
consultation documents and plans

Appendix B
Double yellow line restriction consultation
documents

Appendix C
Analysis of the controlled parking zone
extension questionnaire responses

Appendix D
Summary of statutory objections with
officers’ response

Appendix E

Controlled Parking Zone extension plans
recommended for implementation

Appendix F

Double yellow line restriction plans
recommended for implementation

Section 1 – summary and recommendations

This document reports the results of:

- Statutory re-consultation held in spring 2012 on the proposed extension of the existing Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include roads previously agreed by the Panel;
- The statutory consultation on the proposed waiting restrictions (Double Yellow Line) at the western end of High Worple and outside 1-7 High Worple;
- It also requests the Panel to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, to implement the proposals.

Recommendations:

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

- (a) That an extension to the existing CPZ – Zone L be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in **Appendix E**:
 - Central Avenue - Junction with Hillcroft Avenue to junction with Church Avenue
 - Alfriston Avenue – 55 Alfriston Avenue to the junction with Fernbrook Drive
- (b) That residents and businesses within the new CPZ be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
- (c) That double yellow lines be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in **Appendix F**:
 - Raynton Close
 - Trescoe Gardens
 - Waverley road
 - Newlyn gardens
 - High Worple
- (d) That the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone in Fernbrook Drive **not** be included within the extension as detailed in **Appendix A**;
- (e) That the Service Manager – Traffic & Highway Network Management be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown in **Appendix E** and **Appendix F**, subject to all recommendations of the Panel;
- (f) That all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of the final decision.

REASON: (For Recommendation) To control parking on the periphery of the existing Rayners Lane CPZ – Zone L as detailed in the report.

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 Rayners Lane 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 consultation and whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view was reflected in the recommendations made.

Background

- 2.4 In June 2010, as part of the Rayners Lane controlled parking zone (CPZ) review, a public consultation was undertaken to seek the views of residents possibly affected by displaced parking from the Rayners Lane CPZ Zone L.
- 2.5 The consultation asked residents if they experienced any parking problems and if so whether they would support being included within the existing Rayners Lane CPZ.
- 2.6 At the time a mixed response for inclusion within the existing zone was received from the southern section of Alfriston Avenue from property no.55 onwards, Fernbrook Drive and the northern section of Central Avenue between Hillcroft Avenue and Church Avenue.
- 2.7 Given that for progression to statutory consultation a majority support is generally required, recommendations were made to this panel in September 2010 that the southern section of Alfriston Avenue, Central Avenue and Fernbrook Drive not be progressed. These recommendations were supported and approved by the panel and Portfolio Holder. It should be noted that the section of Alfriston Avenue north of property no.55 did indicate a majority support and following a statutory consultation were included within the zone.
- 2.8 In February 2011 residents from the northern section of Central Avenue between Hillcroft Avenue and Church Avenue submitted a petition to the panel requesting a re-consultation to consider inclusion within the CPZ. The petition raised concerns about increased displaced parking because the surrounding roads had shown the required support to adopt the CPZ.

- 2.9 The panel decided that the residents of these roads would be re-consulted and given a further opportunity to respond. It was also determined the consultation should wait until any agreed extensions had been introduced and the impact assessed.
- 2.10 At the June 2011 panel a resident of Fernbrook Drive submitted a public question enquiring why the southern section of Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook Drive had not been included within the proposed extension. The resident expressed a concern that they too would suffer from displaced parking from the proposed extension and requested that they are also re-consulted.
- 2.11 The panel agreed the southern section of Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook drive would also be re-consulted at the same time as the Central Avenue Consultation.
- 2.12 In conjunction with the proposed CPZ extension, another statutory consultation was also carried out concerning permanent waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Trescoe Gardens, Raynton Close, Newlyn Gardens, High Worpel, Waverley Road. These measures are proposed at junctions and locations where inadequate road widths don't allow for safe parking. These roads had previously been through a statutory consultation in March 2011. However following objections and a petition submitted to the June 2011 panel it was requested that officers liaise further with residents with regards to the location of proposals and re-consult at the same time as the CPZ extension re-consultations.

Southbourne Close

- 2.13 In addition to the consultations detailed a resident from Southbourne Close raised concerns directly with officers and through a member of the panel over obstructive parking. It has been highlighted vehicles parking on opposite sides of the narrow carriageway frequently prevent refuse from being collected, with the additional concern that it may prevent emergency service vehicles should there be an incident at the end of the close.
- 2.14 It is understood that displaced parking from recently introduced measures on surrounding roads has increased parking in Southbourne Close contributing to the problems highlighted.
- 2.15 In June 2010 residents were asked if they would support the introduction of measures in the close to reduce external parking, however at this time there was no majority support so proposals did not progress.
- 2.16 As part of the Rayners Lane CPZ review double yellow lines were introduced in the turning head to ensure there is space for vehicles to turnaround and not have to reverse along and out of the close.
- 2.17 Having enquired with the refuse department it has been confirmed that they have historically experienced access issues due to obstructive parking in the close.

- 2.18 At present there is no instruction from the panel and officers are unable to consider measures in this location.

Statutory Consultation

- 2.19 All Councillors in the affected wards were sent the consultation materials prior to distribution. A number of statutory consultees such as the Police and the Fire Brigade were consulted as part of the statutory requirements.
- 2.20 The statutory consultation was then carried out between 17th May and 7th June 2012. Consultation documents as per **Appendix A** were delivered to all properties directly fronting the proposed measures.
- 2.21 Street notices were erected on lamp columns throughout the area giving information as to where details of the proposals could be viewed, and the process to make a formal objection during the statutory period.
- 2.22 Traffic orders were advertised in the Harrow Times and The London Gazette newspapers on 17th May 2012 and this information was also available on the council's web site at www.harrow.gov.uk/raynerslaneparking

Consultation Documents

- 2.23 All businesses and residents were provided with the same general information. Consultation material was delivered on a one-per-household and business basis with an explanation that all responses would also be analysed in this way. In addition residents and businesses had the opportunity to complete their questionnaire online.
- 2.24 Consultation documents were distributed to addresses between 16th and 17th June 2012 to coincide with the start of the statutory objection period.
- 2.25 The leaflet set out background information with details about the proposed zone extension, where to obtain further information and the statutory (legal) consultation process necessary to implement the proposals. A plan showing the detailed proposals relating to the individual addresses was also provided along with information on how to obtain plans of other roads within the consultation area. The consultation leaflets together with the detailed plans can be seen in **Appendix A**.
- 2.26 The consultation document also incorporated a questionnaire which included a simple 'yes or no' question: "Do you support the revised parking proposals in your part of the road?" This was included so that everyone within the proposed CPZ extension could indicate their support or opposition to the proposals. The questionnaire also gives the opportunity for people to change their minds and comment on the revised proposals. This information is used for the Council to take a balanced view when considering objections and petitions in order to revise the proposals to best fit and tailor the extents of the CPZ's. A prepaid envelope was supplied with the consultation documents for people to return the completed questionnaire.
- 2.27 A separate consultation leaflet was also sent out to properties directly fronting the proposed double yellow lines waiting restrictions at the western end of

high Worples. The document provided background information on the safety issues, relevance to the Highway Code Rule 243, a plan indicating the proposals in the residents' immediate vicinity, where to obtain further information and details of the statutory (legal) consultation process necessary to implement the proposals. A copy of the consultation leaflet together with the individual plans can be seen in **Appendix B**.

Consultation responses and objections

- 2.28 The analysis of the results of the questionnaire responses on a street by street basis together with their response and support rate can be seen in **Appendix C**. For the proposed CPZ extensions, 96 responses were received. This represented an overall response rate of 52% from the 183 questionnaires delivered, which is considered high when compared with other similar consultations undertaken recently. For the proposed double yellow lines, 3 responses were received which is considered low.
- 2.29 In response to the CPZ extension consultation a total of 10 statutory objections were received from the 96 responses. A number of properties returned statutory objections in various forms and this therefore resulted in duplication. However for the purposes of this report these have been considered as one objection. A summary of statutory objections with officers' comments can be seen in **Appendix D**. No objections were received from statutory consultees such as the Police and Emergency services. We are aware that informally the Fire Brigade are supportive of the scheme proposals.
- 2.30 Of the 3 responses received concerning the proposed Double Yellow lines, 1 fulfilled the criteria for objection. This is also included in the summary of objections and officers' responses contained in **Appendix D**.

Roads to be included in the CPZ (with majority support)

- 2.31 Appendix C indicates that there is majority support for the proposals in the following roads or part roads as detailed:

Alfriston Avenue

Roads consulted	No. sent out	No. of replies	Response Rate	Support	No support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Alfriston Avenue	19	10	53%	10	0	0	100%

- 2.32 All respondents support the inclusion of the proposed scheme. This was deemed necessary as a consequence of the previous introduction of parking controls in the northern part of the road. Having considered the level of support for the proposal, it is the officers' recommendation that the southern part of Alfriston Avenue is included in the current CPZ Zone L as illustrated in the plan contained in **Appendix E**.

Central Avenue

Roads consulted	No. sent out	No. of replies	Response Rate	Support	No support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Central Avenue	47	31	66%	26	4	1	84%

2.33 Details of the statutory objections along with officer's responses can be seen in **Appendix D**.

2.34 Having considered these objections, given the significant majority support for the proposal due to displaced parking, it is officers recommendation to include the section of Central Avenue from the junction with Hillcroft Avenue to the junction with Church Avenue in the current CPZ Zone L as illustrated in the plan contained in **Appendix E**.

Roads to be excluded from the CPZ (no majority support)

Fernbrook Drive

Roads consulted	No. sent out	No. of replies	Response Rate	Support	No support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Fernbrook Drive	17	55	47%	25	30	0	45%

2.35 Details of the statutory objections along with officer's responses can be seen in **Appendix D**.

2.36 Having evaluated the responses and the objections presented by the residents as the majority are in opposition to the scheme, it is officers' recommendation not to progress proposals to include Fernbrook Drive in the existing Rayners Lane CPZ.

2.37 Double yellow lines have been introduced on bends and junctions on grounds of safety as part of the previous review, therefore no further restrictions are proposed.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines

Roads consulted	No. sent out	No. of replies	Response Rate	Support	No support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Trescoe Gardens	20	1	5%	0	1	0	0%
Raynton Close	14	0	0%	0	0	0	-
Newlyn Gardens	20	0	0%	0	0	0	-
High Worple (1-7a)	9	1	11%	1	0	0	100%
High Worple (60-80)	11	1	9%	1	0	0	100%
Waverley Road	6	0	0%	0	0	0	-

2.38 Officers consider vehicles should not be parking in locations where double yellow lines are proposed as they may obstruct both traffic flow or visibility. Proposals are in line with the Highway Code and will assist in vehicles

adhering to these rules. Emergency vehicle access cannot be predicted and bends and narrow roads need to be clear at all times.

- 2.39 Having considered the objection given, it is officers' recommendation that the proposal to introduce double yellow lines be implemented as illustrated in plans contained in **Appendix F**.

Summary

- 2.40 Notwithstanding the objections considered in **Appendix D**, and with the exception of Fernbrook Drive, there is general support to implement the proposals as advertised.
- 2.41 Having considered the objections and comments it is recommended that measures be implemented as shown in **Appendix E** and **Appendix F** for the benefit of the majority of residents.

Financial Implications

- 2.42 The estimated cost of the scheme is £10K. This funding has been allocated in the parking programme of schemes which was agreed by TARSAP in February 2012 and forms a part of the overall Harrow Capital allocation for parking management schemes in 2012/13 (300k).

Risk management Implications

- 2.43 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. The risk register is included in the Community & Environment Directorate Risk Register.

Equalities Implications

- 2.44 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
- 2.45 A review of equality issues was undertaken as a part of the design risk assessment stage of the scheme and has indicated no adverse impact on any of the specified equality groups. There are positive impacts of the scheme on some equality groups, particularly people with mobility difficulties and children. Benefits are likely to be as follows:

Equalities Group	Benefit
Age	Improved availability of short term parking, residential parking and blue badge holder parking in closer proximity to local amenities and homes. This will help elderly people with restricted mobility. Restrictions on parking at crossing points will make it safer to cross the road particularly for the young and elderly.

Disability	Improved availability of short term parking, residential parking and blue badge holder parking in closer proximity to local amenities and homes. This will help disabled people with mobility impairment and wheelchair users.
Sex	Mothers with young children or pregnant women are more likely to benefit from parking spaces as close as possible to their destination.

2.46 As part of the consultation process, the councils' corporate Equality Monitoring Forms (EMF) was sent out with each set of documents. Of the 96 consultation responses received 70 (73%) residents completed and returned the EMF and fall broadly in line with expectations of the makeup of the community expressed in the 2009/2010 Harrow Vitality Profiles document. Some returns were not completed correctly and some contained comments regarding the necessity of such information for a parking scheme. Therefore officers consider the consultation is valid and representative of the community and further assists the council in its obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

Corporate priorities

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

Corporate priority	Impact
Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe	<p>Parking controls make streets easier to clean by reducing the number of vehicles on-street during the day, giving better access to the kerb for cleaning crews.</p> <p>Regular patrols by Civil Enforcement Officers deter criminal activity and can help gather evidence in the event of any incidents.</p>
United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads.	The council has listened to the community in recommending a scheme that meets the needs of the majority of respondents who favour parking controls, whilst retaining the status quo where the majority do not support parking controls.

Supporting and protecting people who are most in need	Controlled parking zones generally help vulnerable people by freeing up spaces for carers, friends and relatives to park during the day. Without parking controls, these spaces would be occupied all day by commuters and other forms of long stay parking.
Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses.	The additional parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses by providing more short stay parking in order to serve more customers.

2.48 The principle of enforcing parking controls is also integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's Local Implementation Plan.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 14/09/12		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 14/09/12		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Roberto Martinelli, Project Engineer - Parking and Sustainable Transport,
Tel: 020 8424 1535, Fax: 020 8424 7662,
E-mail: Roberto.martinelli@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports