

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	15 July 2014
<b>Subject:</b>	Welbeck Road Area Controlled Parking Scheme - Public Consultation
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Varsha Parmar - Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> Stakeholder meeting notes – Welbeck Road area parking review <b>Appendix B</b> Welbeck Road area parking review - public consultation document <b>Appendix C</b> Consultation responses listed by road and questions <b>Appendix D</b> Copy of petition – Rayners Lane estate - against parking controls <b>Appendix E</b> Area recommended for detailed design and statutory consultation

## **Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

This report details the results of the public consultation carried out in the Welbeck Road area in March 2014 on a possible controlled parking scheme. The report requests the Panel to recommend proposals to the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety and to proceed with a statutory consultation.

### **Recommendations:**

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

- (a) A controlled parking zone including resident permit bays (as detailed in the report) is introduced operating Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm in:
  - Welbeck Road – Coles Crescent to Twyford Road,
  - Tintern Way – Welbeck road to no. 75 Tintern Way,
  - Drinkwater Road adjacent to Cerise Court,
  - Coles Crescent – Welbeck Road to no.83 Coles Crescent
  - Eliot Road – adjacent to Annan Court,
- (b) To advise officers whether Scott Crescent should be included in the statutory consultation to provide another opportunity for residents to consider the potential for parking displacement in this road,
- (c) Introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) throughout the consultation area at junctions, crossing points, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends as shown in Appendix E.

### **Reason: (For recommendation)**

To regulate parking in the Welbeck Road area as detailed in the report. The measures are in response to residents requests to address parking problems in their area 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 transport issues reported to the Council. This report sets out how parking issues raised by residents and businesses at the southern end of Welbeck Road are being addressed by an area wide parking review.

### **Options considered**

- 2.2 A stakeholder meeting was held in November 2013 prior to the public consultation with community representatives and councillors to review the scope and objectives of the public consultation proposed. The consultation material was developed based on the feedback from the meeting.
- 2.3 A public consultation exercise was undertaken to establish the geographic extent that residents considered parking to be a problem. It also measured support for controlled parking or other parking restrictions in the area. The consultation questionnaire provided a range of options for residents to consider as well as an opportunity to provide comments. These have been assessed and are presented in this report for consideration.
- 2.4 It should be noted that there is a wide range of opinion within the consultation area on a road by road basis. Whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view is reflected in the recommendations made in this report.

### **Background**

- 2.5 At the February 2013 Panel meeting it was agreed to include the Welbeck Road area scheme in the 2013/14 Parking Management programme of work for investigation and consultation. Schemes are included in the programme based on a borough wide review of public requests for parking schemes and an assessment of the severity of the problems based on agreed criteria and their respective priorities.
- 2.6 The area consists of residential properties, businesses in The Arches, Grange school, the Beacon Community Centre and a church. The area adjoins the South Harrow CPZ to the south east. The nearest shops are to the west of the area in Rayners Lane although the Rayners Lane CPZ is not close to the consultation area. The area is split by the London Underground railway line but the nearest stations are also distant from this area and so do not contribute to the parking issues.
- 2.7 To the north-east of the railway line there are mainly semi detached houses with some off street parking. To the south west is the Rayners Lane estate with a variety of types of accommodation but very little off-street parking. Much of this area has been redeveloped in the last few years but is still high density. Parking in on-street parking bays is mainly perpendicular to the road. Several of the roads in the redeveloped Rayners Lane estate are unadopted including Blossom Lane, Eastway Crescent, Osprey Lane, Pelican Drive, Serenity Close and part of Swift Close. Parking restrictions cannot normally be introduced into unadopted roads. Currently the only

parking controls in the immediate area are the existing school “no stopping” restrictions.

- 2.8 The main parking issues raised by residents was on-street parking generated by the businesses in The Arches, a private road owned by Transport for London and London Underground. Almost all of these businesses are connected with the motor industry and undertake the servicing / repair of cars and light vans. Parking for Grange Primary School also exacerbates the problems for school drop off and pick up at either end of the school day by parents and guardians of school children.
- 2.9 Correspondence has been received subsequently from residents suggesting that the problems could be alleviated by only allowing parking adjacent to (even numbered) Welbeck Road addresses southeast of its junction with Twyford Road where there is no off-street parking and this has been investigated during the course of the scheme development process.
- 2.10 The consultation area was determined by undertaking surveys and site observations but was finalised at a stakeholders meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2013. This meeting also helped refine the general consultation format and questionnaire to reflect local circumstances and feedback from community representatives. Notes of the stakeholder meeting can be seen in **Appendix A**.
- 2.11 The area was also identified for a 20mph zone by the Panel in July 2014 and formed a part of the Local Transport fund proposals for 2013/14 within the Council's Transport Local implementation Plan allocation for the year. The scheme included waiting restrictions on Welbeck Road between its junctions with Coles Crescent and The Arches and opposite the main school entrance as a consequence of safety and access concerns raised at the stakeholder meeting. These have received local support and have now been implemented.

### **Public consultation**

- 2.12 The public consultation for the Welbeck Road area parking review was undertaken between 13<sup>th</sup> March and 7<sup>th</sup> April 2014. A copy of the consultation document and questionnaire can be seen in **Appendix B**. The consultation documents were hand delivered to approximately six hundred and fifty properties within the consultation area and were also made available on the Harrow Council public website to enable online responses.
- 2.13 The responses were either received by post or on line and were analysed on a road by road basis to ascertain where a majority indicated parking problems, what type of restrictions were preferred and where localised support within road sections was demonstrated. Residents were also asked whether their opinion regarding support for a scheme would change if a majority in an adjoining street supported a scheme so that the panel could consider the implications of any parking displacement issues.
- 2.14 The consultation area selected by the stakeholder meeting was intentionally set to a wider area than that where specific parking problems were observed so that residents could determine the extent of any proposed measures without any limitations.

- 2.15 As a part of area based schemes such as these “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are also proposed for safety and access reasons within the area and are recommended separately from the outcome of the controlled parking review. This is because these restrictions are intended to reinforce the requirements of the highway code which set out where vehicles should not park (e.g at junctions) to prevent obstruction and improve road safety.

### **Responses**

- 2.16 Approximately 638 properties within the consultation area received a consultation document. There were 127 responses received either by post or online. Some of these included addresses outside the consultation area, duplicate responses from the same address or did not specify an address and these have been excluded leaving 116 valid responses. This represents an overall response rate of 18% and is consistent with the expected response rate for this type of consultation.
- 2.17 A tabulated summary of responses to the consultation questionnaire is provided on a road by road basis in **Appendix C**. There is some variation in the totals because some respondents have ticked more than one option, generally on the paper questionnaire.
- 2.18 A petition was presented to the Council meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2014 shortly after the consultation period closed. The petition organised by the Rayners Lane Residents Estate Tenants & Residents Association (RLETRA) received 259 visible signatures from 236 addresses. The petition statement at the head of the signatures was:

*“I am aware of the consultation on Welbeck Road Area Parking Review and do not think I have a problem with parking big enough to merit introduction of a CPZ in my area. I am likely to suffer a disadvantage with any introduction of CPZ other yellow lines for safety reason and access purposes.”*

There was a separate terms of the petition from RLETRA entitled “*Terms of petition against the possible introduction of yellow lines/CPZ on Rayners Lane Estate under Welbeck Road Area Parking Review consultation.*”

It goes on to make four points: a) complaining about lack of prior consultation with residents or RLETRA prior to the CPZ consultation; b) that there were not parking problems to justify introducing a CPZ, that a CPZ would not guarantee parking space, would do little to improve parking as it would reduce number of spaces and would cost residents at least £64.90 annually; c) previously raised road safety measures (viz. pedestrian crossing and one way traffic system) should be given priority for limited funding; d) we the undersigned do object. Both these are attached as **Appendix D**.

- 2.19 The petition referred to has been considered along with all the other consultation responses received. The petition is also included in the petitions information report which is included on the agenda for this Panel meeting.
- 2.20 A meeting was held with the ward councillors, in accordance with standard practice, to discuss the distribution of responses and the detailed responses. This information is not reproduced in this report for data protection reasons
- 2.21 Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses received and a complete copy will be made available for members to review in the member’s library.

## Analysis of consultation results

- 2.22 The agreed approach to all area-wide parking consultations is first to establish where residents feel existing parking problems exist. Further questions are then asked about what form of parking restriction or control is preferred and for what period any restrictions should apply. **Appendix C** gives a full breakdown of the responses received on a road by road basis.
- 2.23 An assessment of question 2 indicated that with the exception of Welbeck Road the majority of residents in most roads especially from the Rayners Lane estate part of the consultation area did not consider parking an issue. The exceptions to this were Coles Crescent and Swift Close where opinion is equally divided. This first assessment substantiates the general views expressed in the petition with the majority of support confined to Welbeck Road. The opinion of residents who responded is summarised in table 1 below.

Road	Delivered	Responses	% response	Q1 Occupancy			Q2 Do you experience parking problem?		
				Resident	Business/ Organisation	Both	Yes	No	No opinion
<b>Adopted Road</b>									
Coles Crescent (part)	78	14	18%	13	1		7	7	0
Drinkwater Road	106	11	10%	11			4	6	1
Eliot Drive	35	5	14%	5			1	4	0
Scott Crescent	69	9	13%	9			2	7	0
Swift Close (part)	53	4	8%	4			2	2	0
Tintern Way (part)	53	16	30%	16			6	10	0
Twyford Road (small part)	7	0	0%	0					
Welbeck Road (part)	99	35	35%	35			19	16	0
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Unadopted Road</b>									
The Arches	30	1	3%	0	1		1	0	0
Blossom Avenue	15	1	7%	0	0	1	0	1	0
Eastway Crescent	11	1	9%	1			0	1	0
Juniper Close	26	8	31%	8			0	8	0
Osprey Lane	9	1	11%	1			0	1	0
Pelican Drive	15	5	33%	5			0	5	0
Serenity Close	32	5	16%	5			2	3	0
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1</b>

(this table shows all responses)

Table 1: Consultation Responses - showing whether parking is a problem

- 2.24 The focus of the parking problems identified by residents was centred around the Welbeck Road / The Arches junction and the consultation area was generally based on a common distance around this point which included whole and part sections of

neighbouring streets. The layout and arrangement of streets and their proximity to the focal point was carefully considered.

2.25 The responses were analysed geographically to see if views on parking problems were consistent throughout the whole length of streets in the consultation area or localised in only part sections of streets. This analysis of responses predictably indicated that the number of people indicating a parking problem diminished the further away responses were located from the focal point. In the following sections of streets residents considered there to be a parking problem:

- Welbeck Road – Coles Crescent to Twyford Road,
- Tintern Way – Welbeck road to no. 75 Tintern Way,
- Drinkwater Road adjacent to Cerise Court,
- Coles Crescent – Welbeck Road to no.83 Coles Crescent
- Eliot Road – adjacent to Annan Court,

2.26 In those areas where a parking problem was identified, an analysis of question 3 showed a majority for controlled parking over the other forms of control. This is probably because permit parking provides preferential parking for residents and maximises space for permit holders. Table 2 shows that 22 of the 33 responses identifying a parking problem also support controlled parking.

Section of Road	Q2 Do you experience a parking problem?				Q3 If yes to Q2 what approach should council take?						
	Responses	Yes	No	No opinion	Do nothing	CPZ with bays	Other unspecified	P&D	single yellow line restrict business parking	other specified	
Welbeck Road (Coles Cres to Twyford Rd)	34	19	15	0	2	13	0	0	3	1	0
Coles Crescent (Welbeck Rd to no.83)	13	7	6	0	0	4	1	1	0	1	0
Tintern Way (Welbeck Rd to no. 75)	4	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
Drinkwater Road (by Cerise Court), Eliot Drive	4	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
(by Annan Court)	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

(this table shows responses where sections of street showed geographical clusters of support)

Table 2 – Consultation responses - preferred type of parking control

2.27 It is a recognised consequence of introducing parking controls in an area that some parking displaces to locations just beyond the restrictions. Although the extent of this displacement is difficult to assess in advance of introducing restrictions the council offers residents in question 4 the option of saying that they would reconsider having a scheme if a neighbouring street opts to do so. However, the results have indicated

that the vast majority of people did not indicate a preference to reconsider their opinion and this does not affect the results shown in Table 2 above.

2.28 A further analysis was undertaken of questions 5 and 6 to determine the preferred operating hours for the controlled parking. Table 3 below shows the days and hours of controls preferred in the areas where controls were supported.

Section of Road	Responses		Q5 If you supported controls which days should they apply?				Q6 For what times would you like restrictions?				
	Total supporting parking controls		Monday to Friday	Monday to Saturday	Monday to Sunday	No opinion	In the morning (1 hour)	In the afternoon (1 hour)	Morning & afternoon (1 hour each)	All day (eg 8am to 6.30pm)	No opinion
Welbeck Road (Coles Cres to Twyford Rd)	34	19	5	5	8	2	1	0	7	11	1
Coles Crescent (Welbeck Rd to no.83)	13	7	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	6	1
Tintern Way (Welbeck Rd to no. 75)	4	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Drinkwater Road (by Cerise Court), Eliot Drive	4	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	1
(by Annan Court)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>

(this table shows responses where sections of street showed geographical clusters of support)

Table 3 - Consultation responses - Preferred hours of control

2.29 The most popular response is conclusively for Monday to Sunday, 8am to 6.30pm however it is felt by officers and ward councillors that Monday to Saturday is more suitable given the reduced activity in the area on a Sunday and this has been put forward in the recommendations to go to statutory consultation.

### Summary

2.30 Based on the analysis of consultation results there is support for a scheme in the Welbeck Road area and the proposal recommended is to implement a controlled parking zone, operating Monday – Saturday, 8:00am – 6:30pm in the following sections of road:

- Welbeck Road – Coles Crescent to Twyford Road,
- Tintern Way – Welbeck road to no. 75 Tintern Way,
- Drinkwater Road adjacent to Cerise Court,
- Coles Crescent – Welbeck Road to no.83 Coles Crescent
- Eliot Road – adjacent to Annan Court,



- 2.31 One area that may be exposed to parking displacement is Scott Crescent due to its proximity to the proposed zone. Residents have clearly indicated that they do not want to have a scheme in this area, however, the Panel could choose to include a part of this road in the statutory consultation to allow residents a second chance to be consulted on inclusion in the proposal due to the possibility of parking displacement. If residents still choose not to support it at this stage then it would be excluded.
- 2.32 Alternatively the panel could choose not to include it in the statutory consultation based on the results of the public consultation, however, in this instance it would not be possible then to add it to the proposal at a later stage. This is because the draft traffic regulation order advertised at the statutory consultation stage can only be amended by reducing the scale and extent of restrictions when the Panel considers the final scheme. If the scale or extent of restrictions needs to be increased then the statutory consultation would need to be repeated increasing costs.
- 2.33 Members are asked to advise officers if Scott Crescent should be included in the statutory consultation.
- 2.34 In addition to the main proposal there are no waiting “at any time” restrictions (double yellow lines) also proposed throughout the consultation area as shown in **Appendix E**. These are generally introduced 10 metres back from junctions, in turning heads, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends in accordance with guidance from the Highway Code. These measures take account of vehicle tracking computer simulations to eliminate any potential for obstruction by parked vehicles so that vehicular access is maintained and there is good visibility for motorists which improves road safety.
- 2.35 TARSAP panel are recommended to take the proposals to statutory consultation which is the next stage of the scheme development process. This will provide a further opportunity to consult on the scheme and refine the proposals before a scheme is considered for implementation.
- 2.36 Subject to approval all residents living within the consultation area will be advised of the outcome of this consultation, the proposals agreed and the next steps involved in undertaking statutory consultation. The statutory consultation phase if agreed offers the opportunity for representations and objections to be made which will be reported to a future meeting of the Panel for consideration before a final decision on the scheme is made.

### **Legal implications**

- 2.37 This report is recommending that the CPZ proposals be taken forward to a statutory consultation. Statutory consultation is part of the process required before parking controls can be implemented and the Council must follow the statutory consultations procedures under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) and The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) 1996 (LATO)
- 2.38 The principal traffic and management powers given to local authorities are contained in the RTRA and traffic regulation orders made by the Council are governed mainly by the RTRA and LATO.
- 2.39 Under the LATO the Council is required to publish notice of its proposals to make a traffic regulation order in the London Gazette and to take such other steps as they

consider appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity about the order is given to persons likely to be affected. CPZ's are defined in Section 4 of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

## Financial Implications

- 2.40 This scheme is part of the Parking Management programme. There is a Harrow Capital allocation for this programme of £300k in 2014/15. A sub allocation of £35k for the implementation of the Welbeck Road area parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2014 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.41 The cost of the final scheme will be dependent on the results of the planned statutory consultation.
- 2.42 If the scheme is implemented parking income will be generated from resident / visitor permits charges, as well as from penalty charge notices for parking offences and such income can only be used towards parking and traffic management.

## Risk Management Implications

- 2.43 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
- 2.44 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

- 2.45 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
- 2.46 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 generally benefit most from controlled parking as the removal of all-day commuters frees up spaces closer to residents' homes. These groups are more likely to desire parking spaces with as short a walk to their destination as possible.
Disability	The retention of double yellow lines at junctions will ensure level crossing points are kept clear.  Parking bays directly outside homes, shops and other local amenities will make access easier, particularly by blue badge holders for long periods of the day.
Age	Fewer cars parked on-street in residential roads will improve the environment for children. Parking controls can help reduce the influx of traffic into an area, and therefore reduce

	particulates and air pollution, to which children are particularly sensitive.
--	---

2.47 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

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

Corporate priority	Impact
Making a difference for communities	<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>
<p>Making a difference for the vulnerable</p> <p>Making a difference for families</p>	<p>Parking controls 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 long stay parking associated with local businesses.</p>

2.49 The principle of enforcing parking controls is integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's adopted Transport Local implementation Plan.

### Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 24/06/14		
Name: Ian Goldsmith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 25/06/14		

**Ward Councillors notified:**

**YES**

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

**Contact:** Stephen Freeman - Project Engineer, Traffic & Parking Management  
020 8424 1484

### **Background Papers:**

Annual Parking Review Report, to this Panel February 2014  
Consultation responses- copies placed in member's library