

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	6 February 2013
<b>Subject:</b>	Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual Review
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Caroline Bruce – Corporate Director, Environment & Enterprise
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Phillip O'Dell, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<p><b>Appendix A:</b> Borough-wide map of Controlled Parking Zones/Residents' Parking Schemes</p> <p><b>Appendix B:</b> Proposed Parking Management Programme for 2013/14</p> <p><b>Appendix C:</b> Stages involved in preparing a CPZ</p> <p><b>Appendix D:</b> List of Significant Parking Issues Raised</p>

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides information about the identification, prioritisation, development and implementation of parking management schemes in Harrow. It informs Members about requests for parking schemes received by the Council and also recommends a programme of work for 2013/14.

### Recommendations:

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

- i) the priority list of parking management schemes for 2013/14 as shown in **Appendix B**, subject to confirmation of the funding allocation at Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013, be agreed;
- ii) officers be authorised to carry out scheme design and consultation on the schemes in **Appendix B**;
- iii) officers be authorised to implement the schemes in **Appendix B** subject to a further report and receiving the Panel's recommendation to proceed.
- iv) any substantive requests to undertake a parking review on an existing scheme be considered by the Panel for inclusion in the annual programme of work.

**Reason:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes programme for 2013/14

## Section 2 – Report

### Background

- 2.1 The annual review of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and other parking schemes in February each year is the means by which the parking management schemes programme for the forthcoming financial year is set. This takes account of progress to date, available budgets and current issues.
- 2.2 The council's programme of CPZ reviews has historically been demand led and addresses parking pressures highlighted by local residents and businesses. This report includes assessments of existing CPZs and requests for new or extended CPZs, including petitions and other representations received in the last 12 months.

- 2.3 **Appendix B** shows the recommended programme and priority list for the next two financial years and also provides a list of schemes which are not yet programmed. The priority list has been updated to allow for schemes that have been completed, other events during the year that might have affected the programme, and the available funding. The estimated cost of the programme is also shown. The programme takes into account the council's current financial position, staff resources and capital programme (due to be confirmed at cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013).
- 2.4 Progress with implementing the 2012/13 CPZ programme of work agreed by this Panel in February 2012 is shown in a separate progress report on the agenda for this meeting.

### **Options considered**

- 2.5 There are strong strategic reasons for introducing CPZs, as well as the local need to manage parking problems and parking demand as effectively as possible. CPZs are a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport policies. They form part of the Mayor for London's Transport Strategy, West London Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the council's local transport strategy in the form of a Local Implementation Plan (LIP).
- 2.6 CPZs incorporating residents parking schemes improve safety, access and residential amenity and assist management of parking in town centres to ensure more short stay shopper/visitor spaces are available. Restraint based parking standards in new developments, as required by national and regional policy cannot be effective unless on-street parking controls exist, otherwise parking can simply take place in local streets rather than lead to reduced car use. CPZs also allow the introduction of "resident permit restricted" developments, which is in line with the strategy of reducing car parking provision at sites well served by public transport.
- 2.7 Parking is not a static situation but dynamic and constantly changing. This can be due to factors such as new development, conversion of dwellings, changes to rail fares, economic situation. Existing schemes designed over 10 years ago to mitigate the problems at that time may no longer be as robust in terms of area or control period.
- 2.8 The only option available is to take forward parking management schemes because these form a key part of national and local transport strategies and make a significant contribution to the wider aspirations of improving safety, reducing congestion and encouraging modal shift and sustainable transport.
- 2.9 Any adverse impacts of introducing parking controls on the general public is mitigated by undertaking extensive public consultation, seeking majority support for proposals and consulting with TARSAP

prior to consideration by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

## **Parking management schemes**

### Controlled Parking zones

- 2.10 A CPZ is an area where parking is restricted during a regular period or periods of the day (the operational hours) as specified on signs in and around a defined zone. Other parking restrictions can exist within the zone (which is different from the operational hours), for instance on main roads, which are separately signed. At its simplest a CPZ may just consist of yellow lines, but they normally incorporate parking bays. In most cases these are permit bays such as those designated for use by residents. In shopping or commercial areas pay and display bays are used which allow for short term parking for customers during the working day. For flexibility some bays are designated for shared use, which allow for the display of either a permit or a pay and display ticket. Almost all permits are issued to residents whose addresses are within the defined zone. Residents may also purchase permits for visitors. Businesses may also purchase permits for operational purposes only but these are strictly controlled and only a few permits have been issued. Other types of permit can be issued to, doctors, health care workers, etc but there are strict eligibility criteria in place.
- 2.11 CPZs therefore provide preferential parking access for permit holders (e.g. residents) during the hours of the zone. Whilst the zone hours in some instances may be as little as one hour during the day, this effectively protects parking in residential areas from long stay duration parking by commuters or local workers. Disabled blue badge holders are allowed to park free of charge in all parking bays except those designated for a special purpose, such as doctor's parking bays.
- 2.12 Schemes which use waiting restrictions only (yellow lines) within CPZ schemes where there is no demand for on-street residents' parking have the advantage of being cheaper and more environmentally friendly because the only signs normally needed are at the entry/exit points (signs don't need to be repeated within the zone where the restrictions are the same as those shown on the entry/exit points). However such schemes should be used with great caution, as even a minority of residents who need on-street parking for themselves or their visitors will also be affected and may be severely disadvantaged.
- 2.13 **Appendix A** is a borough map showing the locations of existing CPZ's. Existing CPZ cover about 34% of the length of roads in the borough's road network and have been developed over the last 25 years in response to demand from the public.

### CPZs - reducing street clutter

- 2.14 The council has implemented a number of new style CPZ's which originally required specific Department of Transport (DfT) site

authorisation and is suited to cul de sac and short sections of road. It is possible to simply put a sign to a specific design at the entrance to the road stating permit holders only beyond this point followed by the times of operation. There is no need to mark out bays although some double yellow lines may be necessary to keep certain lengths of road such as junctions and bends free of parked vehicles.

- 2.15 Three sites were implemented in Stanmore during the DfT trials which have been successful. This has a number of advantages in that it minimises the signing and lining with aesthetic and cost benefits. It also means that it is easier to make adjustments on these types of road that are already within a CPZ where there is a desire to change the hours of control to that of the main CPZ. The DfT announced in 2012 that they had removed the need for site authorisation. Two further sites near Whitmore School and in Honeybun Estate South became effective on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013. The DfT published a document on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2013 "Reducing Street Clutter" which highlights how these new style CPZ can contribute to the de-cluttering process in suitable locations.

#### CPZs - safety at road junctions

- 2.16 The occurrence of dangerous or obstructive parking has continued in recent years due to increasing vehicle ownership and usage. It continues to represent a large proportion of complaints from the public be it residents or businesses and continues to be of concern to the emergency services and council refuse collection service. This is despite the introduction of CPZs, especially if their operational hours are limited say to one hour.
- 2.17 Even with all day parking controls in operation problems can occur at evenings and weekends. To address this double yellow lines are now being proposed at all junctions within a proposed zones and immediately surrounding CPZ zones. Although the Highway Code states that drivers should not park within 10m of a junction, this distance is used as a starting point and the actual distance required may be less than 10m and is determined by using a computer simulation programme to determine the swept path of a large vehicle such as a refuse vehicle or fire appliance. Although the council is under no requirement to provide on-street parking, this procedure allows as much on street parking that can safely be accommodated as possible.

#### CPZs - public perception of schemes

- 2.18 As parking pressures increase, there is a public perception that CPZs will increase on street parking provision when in practice it might not always be possible to make space for all the residents' own vehicles. Whilst schemes are designed to maximise on street parking space the overall quantity of spaces provided during the controlled hours may actually reduce due to the need to apply design standards. This is of course compensated by the fact that demand to park reduces because there are vehicles that are ineligible to obtain permits meaning that available space is dedicated to permit holders (residents). This is of

relevance in residential roads with vehicle crossovers to private parking where some configurations can mean that only one or two vehicles spaces can be accommodated between crossovers taking into account space for vehicles manoeuvring in and out of properties.

- 2.19 This, together with waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposals at junctions, leads to CPZs being more contentious with residents wanting the beneficial effects but not wanting any disadvantages and has the effect of increasing the level of resources required to deal with these issues. Increasingly during consultation residents respond that they consider the council is trying to make money rather than the desire to help those residents who are requesting help. It is observed in consultation responses over the last few years that references to money have increased and this is influencing people's decision making.

#### Local Safety Parking Schemes

- 2.20 In addition to the development and implementation of CPZs an initiative to progress a localised safety parking schemes programme (LSPS) has been taken forward. Examples of this type of scheme are waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions and bends, where refuse vehicles and the emergency services have reported persistent access difficulties. These schemes are generally outside of CPZs and are a valuable initiative primarily targeted at improving road safety and facilitating adequate vehicular access.

#### Developer funded parking schemes

- 2.21 Additional funding that could support the parking management programme are possible through section 106 developer contributions via planning applications where parking controls to facilitate development are required. Monthly liaison meetings are held with the planning department so that the public's aspirations for parking controls and opportunities to address existing problems in the vicinity of development can be met. Increasingly over the last few years it has become more difficult to obtain the actual funds from S106 agreements. There is ongoing work between both transportation and planning departments to minimise such problems in future agreements.

#### Member funded parking schemes

- 2.22 There are sometimes parking situations which are of local concern but have been unable to be prioritised within the programme agreed by this Panel. These requests can sometimes be progressed through the use of the neighbourhood Investment Scheme (NIS) programme. Three schemes have been progressed through this route to implementation during 2012/13, two at Pinner and one at Harrow Town Centre. A potential scheme at West Harrow for 2013/14 has already been identified although there is currently no confirmation of funding provision for next financial year.

## Assessment of service requests

- 2.23 The programme of schemes in appendix B is developed by including those projects where the greatest areas of need are identified.
- 2.24 To determine these areas of need all requests for schemes or actions to tackle parking problems received by the Council are assessed against an agreed set of assessment factors. This allows the requests to be assessed and prioritised in a consistent and fair manner. At the panel meeting in November 2012 the panel agreed the Transport Programme Entry Procedure which formalised these assessment factors and a methodology making the process more transparent.
- 2.25 The report sets out for each category of transport related work the key factors that are used in assessing and prioritising the requests for parking schemes. In summary these are as follows:

### Area parking management schemes

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

### Minor localised parking issues

<u>Assessment factor</u>	<u>Typical areas of priority</u>
Key stakeholders	Emergency services / Local services / Residents petitions
Traffic accidents and speed	High numbers of accidents / high vehicle speeds
Vehicle flows	High vehicular flows
Pedestrian flows	High flow areas like shopping parades, schools
Level of accessibility and visibility	Continuous obstruction of sightlines

Other local factors with an impact

Adverse impact on bus services, the disabled

### **Scheme Costs**

2.26 Although the estimated costs of schemes shown in this report have been reviewed to best reflect likely costs of both consultation and implementation, the process is not able to be accurately forecast since in many cases the costs are dependant on the views of the public. The estimates relate to the total cost of developing and implementing the proposals and includes:

- a) Staff time in carrying out consultation and scheme designs including site surveys. This includes all correspondence, telephone and personal visits to the civic centre or site.
- b) The preparation, printing and distribution of all consultation material, reply paid postage, analysis of data, updating of website.
- c) Arranging and staffing exhibitions where appropriate including venue costs and display equipment.
- d) Preparation of reports and other documents such as briefing notes
- e) Drafting and advertising draft traffic orders and orders of making.
- f) Replacing existing CPZ signs (where relevant) that don't contain the operation times following the commitment by Cabinet a number of years ago.
- g) Setting out and implementing scheme of lining and or signing.
- h) Dealing with related complaints, freedom of information requests and comments both pre and post implementation.

2.27 It can be seen that there are significant costs associated with preparing a scheme apart from just the implementation of any physical works on street.

### **Scheme development**

2.28 The time taken to investigate and design a CPZ is influenced heavily by the extent of public and statutory consultation undertaken. A summary of the typical stages involved in the currently agreed process is shown in **Appendix C**. A medium to large area scheme will typically take 12 to 18 months from inception to completion.

2.29 In the past the Council had a policy of undertaking an automatic follow up review of a new scheme within 6-12 months in order to address any issues arising from implementation, however, the panel agreed to abandon this process in February 2012. This was because the work involved in undertaking the follow up review was as extensive as



implementing the original scheme and was causing other areas on the priority list to wait an excessive amount of time to be included in the works programme at the current level of funding. Public concern continues to be expressed that it takes too long to implement measures and that the programme is slow to respond to specific needs.

- 2.30 Follow up scheme reviews are now only considered where substantive issues arise and reported to the panel and where the panel have recommended a change to the programme.
- 2.31 The existing scheme reviews that are included in the programme will be those areas where an existing CPZ has been operating for a lengthy period of time and new operational issues are being highlighted and assessed as a priority area of need. This is generally where the original scheme design is no longer suitable for the current parking pressures which will have changed since implementation. Typically this involves issues to do with the extent of the zone, operational times and types of controls in place.
- 2.32 The table in **Appendix B** shows the indicative costs of any schemes and follow up reviews.

#### **Parking management programme 2013/14**

- 2.33 To summarise this report provides a comprehensive explanation of the types of schemes, sources of funding, assessment processes, costs and development processes required to deliver the parking management programme and is intended to assist the panel in understanding how the programme has been developed.
- 2.34 A summary of the current parking issues within the various locations of the borough highlighted in the proposed programme is shown in **Appendix D**. This will assist the panel to refer quickly to the relevant issues in each particular area when considering the programme.
- 2.35 The proposed programme for 2013/14 can be seen in **Appendix B** and members are recommended to ask the portfolio holder to give approval.

#### **Legal implications**

- 2.36 The programme of schemes highlighted in this report will all individually involve introducing restrictions or controls on parking that require a legal process to be undertaken before they can be physically implemented.
- 2.37 Subject to statutory consultation requirements, which the council has complied with, the council has powers to introduce and change CPZs under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) 1996 and The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

## **Financial Implications**

- 2.38 Transport for London (TfL) has not provided funding specifically for CPZs in recent years as it considers that these should be funded by boroughs. TfL only funds parking measures where they form a part of an identified traffic, public transport or cycling scheme in the agreed Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment.
- 2.39 The funding available for 2013/14 from the Harrow Capital programme is likely to be £300K, of which £260K has been allocated for new CPZs or CPZ parking reviews and £40K for the local safety parking schemes programme. These amounts are due to be confirmed at the Cabinet meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013.
- 2.40 It is expected that allocations for future years will be about £300K and this assumption has been used to compile the programme shown in **Appendix B**. In the current economic climate it is no longer appropriate to significantly populate the future years programme as there is a risk that it will raise expectations that cannot be fulfilled.

## **Risk management Implications**

- 2.41 Risk included on Directorate risk register? Yes
- 2.42 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. This would include the schemes detailed in the proposed programme in this report.

## **Equalities Implications**

- 2.43 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
- 2.44 A programme of CPZ schemes was included in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was approved by full Council. The LIP was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where schemes were identified as having no negative impact on any equality groups. In addition, all CPZs have a positive impact on those with mobility difficulties as more spaces are identified for disabled parking. As a result of double yellow lines at junctions, there is also increased protection at junctions which will protect dropped crossing and prevent dangerous parking at these locations and thereby further assist those with mobility difficulties.
- 2.45 Each Scheme that is developed has a design risk assessment undertaken which includes an assessment of the impact on equalities issues. In addition all public consultations are subject to issue of the councils corporate Equality Monitoring Forms. The returned forms are subject to analysis to ensure that they reflect the local community by comparing them to data held by the council at the time such as Census, vitality profiles. Any significant differences are used to adapt

future consultations and would be reported to the Panel as part of the scheme reports.

### Corporate priorities

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

Corporate priority	Impact
Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe	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. Regular patrols by Civil Enforcement Officers deter criminal activity and can help gather evidence in the event of any incidents.
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 changes to parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to serve more customers.

### **Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 15/01/13		
Name: Stephen Dorrian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 17/01/13		

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

**Contact:** Paul Newman, Team Leader, Parking and Sustainable Transport;  
Tel: 020 8424 1065; E-mail: [paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk)

#### **Background Papers:**

Previous reports to TARSAP  
Mayor of London Transport Strategy  
West London Transport Strategy  
Local Implementation Plan (LIP)  
DfT TAL 1/13  
Parking Management Plan  
Petitions  
General correspondence