

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

Date of Meeting:	10 th December 2014
Subject:	Pinner Area Parking Review Statutory Consultation results
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise
Portfolio Holder:	Varsha Parmar - Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder
Wards affected:	Pinner Pinner South

Enclosures:**Appendix A**

Pinner Area Parking Review Parking Review – Statutory Consultation Document

Appendix B

Draft Traffic Order and copy of plans that were available to view on council website

Appendix C

Consultation responses listed by road

Appendix D

Cecil Park secondary consultation documents-December 2013

Appendix E

Resident responses with officers comments

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides results of the statutory consultation exercise carried out in the Pinner area in September 2014 regarding the introduction of parking controls. The report seeks the Panel's recommendation to implement the controlled parking measures.

Recommendations:

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

1. Abandon the proposals to introduce new controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the following streets:
 - Cecil Park (proposed zone A1),
 - Barrowdene Close (proposed zone A2),
 - Mayfield Drive (proposed zone A4),
 - Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place (proposed zone A5)

2. Extend the Zone A CPZ, operating Monday – Friday, 11am – 12noon, to include the following streets:
 - Cranbourne Drive,
 - Malpas Drive,
 - Nower Hill (between No. 2 to 20),

- Amberley Close,
 - Barrowdene Close,
 - Mayfield Drive
3. Introduce a new CPZ zone in Bell Close (adjacent to nos. 1 to 23), operational Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm,
 4. Introduce additional permit bays in Chigwell Hurst Court, Milman Close, Elm Park Road, Love Lane, Barrow Point Avenue, Avenue Road, West End Avenue, Leighton Avenue, Ashdene, North Way, Northfield Avenue, Mansard Close and Cecil Park as proposed with the following exceptions:
 - Chigwell Hurst Court - remove 2 proposed permit parking bays in the turning head,
 - Avenue Road - reduce the size of the proposed permit parking bay opposite the Methodist Church,
 - West End Avenue - remove the proposed permit parking bay opposite no. 60,
 - Mansard Close - remove 2 proposed permit parking bays in the turning head,
 5. Install School Keep Clear restrictions outside No. 9 Cecil Park,
 6. Install a Free Parking Bay outside Nos. 42 – 60 Cannon Lane,
 7. Remove the existing Permit Bay outside No.16 Barrow Point Avenue,
 8. Remove the existing Permit Bay opposite No. 2 Northfield Avenue,
 9. Abandon the proposed Permit bay adjacent to 33 – 35 High Street,
 10. Introduce “at any time” loading restrictions in the following roads:
 - High Street – the Northwest side between No. 1 – 43 and the Southeast side between No. 2 – 58
 - Love Lane – the West side between No. 2 – 6 / 10 – 12 and the East side between 1 – 7
 - Bridge Street – the Northeast side between No. 1 – 24 and the Southwest side between No. 11 – 35
 - Chapel Lane – both sides from the junctions of bridge Street to a point outside No. 2 Chapel Lane.
 11. Introduce Pay & Display Bays operating Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm, 2 hours maximum stay, no return within 1 hour at the following locations :
 - Station Approach
 - High Street between No. 24 – 52
 - Love Lane between No. 1 and 19
 12. Abandon the proposed Pay & Display Bays in Love Lane outside St Lukes Catholic Church,
 13. Introduce Loading Bays operating Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm in the following locations:

- High Street – south east side between No. 18 – 24
 - Love Lane – west side between No. 6 – 10
14. Remove the existing disabled parking bays in High Street and Love Lane and introduce new bays operating “at any time”, 3 hours maximum stay in the following locations:
- High Street – between 12 – 16, 29 – 33 and 50 – 52
 - Love Lane – between 1 – 7 and outside St Lukes Catholic Church
15. Introduce waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on all junctions, turning heads, narrow sections of the carriageway and bends within the consultation area as set out in the traffic regulation order advertised with the exception of:
- Marsh Road – outside nos. 40 - 50.
16. The panel agree to fund in the 2015/16 financial year localised reviews of the following areas set out in the report as follows:
- Bell Close (pay and display bays)
 - Cannon Lane outside Nos. 42 – 60 (pay and display bays)
 - Leighton Avenue – permit parking bay outside nos. 8 – 10
17. That all residents in the consultation area be informed of the decision once approved by the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety.

Reason

To regulate parking in the wider Pinner area as detailed in the report. The measures are in direct response to residents and businesses requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area in order to maintain road safety and parking access.

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 residents and businesses and is one of the main concerns reported to the Council regarding transport issues. This report summarises the results and outcomes of the statutory consultation exercise agreed by the Portfolio Holder in February 2014 for roads in the Pinner area.

Options considered

- 2.2 Statutory consultation proposals were developed having taken account of previous consultations, stakeholder meetings and panel meetings involving local residents, businesses, councillors and the panel. The

options available to local people in the consultations were to support or object to the proposals developed by the council.

- 2.3 It should be noted that whilst there were a range of views received from the statutory consultation it was not possible to act on every individual comment, however, all views from responses were analysed so that recommendations could be made based on where majority support was received.

Background

- 2.4 The Pinner Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was the first CPZ to be introduced in Harrow approximately 20 years ago. There have been smaller localised reviews during this period but this is the first wholesale review of the entire area and its surroundings. In the intervening period many residents and businesses have been experiencing parking and congestion problems and have contacted the council to request something is done to address this.
- 2.5 An informal public consultation was undertaken during August 2013 on parking issues and possible measures in the area and the results were presented to the then Portfolio Holder (PH) for Community Safety and Environment in February 2014 together with the officer's recommendations. The PH agreed the recommendations which enabled the scheme to proceed to the statutory consultation stage.
- 2.6 A petition from residents of Cecil Park and a subsequent consultation in December 2013 in the road was also submitted to the PH for consideration in developing the proposals put forward for statutory consultation.

Statutory Consultation

- 2.7 In September 2014 consultation documents were distributed to approximately 6000 properties in the original consultation area. The consultation material delivered included the consultation document and key map plan. A copy of the statutory consultation document is shown in **Appendix A**.
- 2.8 Hard copies of the 15 plans were not delivered with the consultation document as it was felt this was impractical and not cost effective. Hard copies of the plans were available to view at the Civic Centre and the Pinner Library and a complete set were hand delivered to The Pinner Association. Individual hard copies of any plan were also sent to anybody that contacted the Council.
- 2.9 The traffic regulation order was advertised on 4th September 2014 in a local newspaper and on the Harrow Council website. Street notices were also placed in the affected roads during the consultation period. The statutory consultation period ran for 21 days and ended on the 24th September 2014. A copy of the Traffic Regulation Order notice and plans placed on the Harrow Council website is shown in **Appendix B**.

- 2.10 As this is a statutory consultation there was no specific questionnaire delivered with the consultation document. Any objection had to be made in writing as required by legislation and other comments were also invited. Respondents could respond by email to the departments generic email address or reply by traditional mail.

Statutory Consultation results and petitions

- 2.11 During the statutory consultation period, officers received a total of 466 responses of which 414 were statutory objections. However 276 of those were from Reddiford School in Cecil Park as detailed below.

- 2.12 Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses received and a complete copy of all responses is available for members to review privately in the member's library. Members have also been invited to discuss the results of the consultation with officers prior to the report being presented to the panel. A tabulated summary of the responses from consultation can be seen in **Appendix C** and a summary of the formal objections together with officers comments can be found in **Appendix E**.

- 2.13 A petition containing 31 signatures from 18 properties was received from residents of Ashridge Gardens objecting to the change of control times in the road. This is also reported for noting within the petitions report to this meeting.

- 2.14 A petition was received from Pinner Bridge Club containing 113 signatures from 110 addresses in and around Harrow objecting to the change in waiting restrictions around their current headquarters in Marsh Road Pinner. They operate out of a residential style semi-detached property with off-street parking space for only a few vehicles and was established nearly 70 years ago. The property is near the junction of Marsh Road and Eastcote Road, which is one of the busiest junctions in the area. There were also 28 individual objection responses from members of the bridge club with 23 of those containing the same points as the petition. The remaining 5 wrote a more individual response but all were objecting to the more severe waiting restrictions around the club. This is also reported for noting within the petitions report to this meeting.

- 2.15 The use of the motor car and the demands for parking has increased in the time since the bridge club opened. As the highway authority the Council must try to keep the network moving as freely as possible particularly at such a busy location. This junction is also used by four bus routes that pass through the area. As a consequence the current location of the club is not as ideal for people driving to the area as it once was. It is suggested that the club consider prioritising their off street parking for its more vulnerable members rather than relying on parking on the public highway.

- 2.16 A petition consisting of standard letter responses objecting to the proposed CPZ in Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive was received from 49 residents from 49 properties in Lloyd Court. This is also

reported for noting within the petitions report on the Agenda for this meeting.

- 2.17 A document signed by 22 signatories from 19 properties was also received from residents of Rochester Drive expressing concerns about the proposed CPZ area in nearby roads. This is also reported for noting within the petitions report to this meeting.
- 2.18 During the consultation period 276 standard form letters were received from staff (58 no.) and parents (218 no.) of Reddiford School in Cecil Park objecting to the additional 3pm - 4pm 1 hour restriction proposed for the road. Included in this number were 11 letters received with no name but their address details were included so they have been included in the consultation results. Unfortunately a further 10 parent letters were also received which did not include full address details which means they cannot be considered a formal objection and are not included in the consultation results.

Analysis of results - Extension of existing Zone A CPZ

Amberley Close

- 2.19 In Amberley Close, the introduction of an extension to the existing Zone A operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon was proposed. Of the 4 properties consulted, only 1 chose to respond giving an overall response rate of 25%.

Amberley Close Join Zone A	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	3 (100%)	-
Do not support	0 (0%)	-
Objections	-	1 (100%)
Comments (support)	-	0 (0%)
Total	3	1

- 2.20 As the above table shows, all the respondents from the initial public consultation stated that they would like the CPZ introduced in their road. The results of the statutory consultation validated this with one response indicating support for the proposal. The Pinner Association agreed with the measures proposed for this road.
- 2.21 Officers therefore recommend that Amberley Close becomes part of the Zone A CPZ operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon.

Cranbourne Drive

- 2.22 In Cranbourne Drive, the introduction of an extension to the existing Pinner Zone A operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon was proposed. Of the 34 properties consulted, only 1 chose to respond from the road itself giving an overall response rate of 3%.

Cranbourne Drive Join Zone A	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	7 (50%)	-
Do not support	6 (43%)	-
No Opinion	1 (7%)	-
Objections	-	-
Comments (support)	-	1 (100%)
Total	14	1

- 2.23 As the above table shows, 7 (50%) respondents from the initial public consultation stated that they would like the CPZ introduced in their road. The results of the statutory consultation, although low, validate this as there were no objections received directly from this road.
- 2.24 There were objections and other comments received from other nearby roads saying that the CPZ should be extended to all roads in the area, including Rochester Drive, Winchester Drive, Colchester Drive and Lloyd Court because it will displace parking from Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. This includes the document from residents of Rochester Drive mentioned in the Statutory Consultation results and petitions section of the report. These roads did not support any additional parking controls in their road at the public consultation stage and were consequently not included in the proposals for extending the Zone A CPZ. It is, however, proposed to introduce install “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at all junctions in the area.
- 2.25 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals. In general they were in favour of controls in the lower section of Cranbourne Drive, assumed to mean West End Lane end, but objected to the CPZ being installed beyond Malpas Drive. Comments were made that beyond this, parking near drives could be dealt with by non-statutory vehicle access markings. It should be noted that TARSAP has approved as assessment criteria for the introduction of such markings and it is unlikely that these properties would meet the necessary criteria.
- 2.26 Concerns were raised about the bend where Cranbourne Drive and Rochester Drive meet and the parking that can occur at this location causing hazards for traffic. This location is proposed to have “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) introduced as a part of the wider introduction of such measures at all junctions, bends and narrow sections of road throughout the scheme.
- 2.27 Officers therefore recommend that Cranbourne Drive becomes part of the Zone A CPZ operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon.

Malpas Drive

2.28 In Malpas Drive, the introduction of an extension to the existing Pinner Zone A operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon was proposed. Of the 31 properties consulted, 5 chose to respond giving an overall response rate of 16%.

Malpas Drive Join Zone A	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	2 (10%)	-
Do not support	18 (86)	-
No Opinion	1 (4%)	-
Change if adjoining road was in	12 (57%)	-
Not change mind if adjoining road in	7 (33%)	-
No opinion	2 (10%)	-
Objections	-	3 (60%)
Comments (support)	-	2 (40%)
Total	21	8

- 2.29 As the above table shows a majority did not want to be included in a CPZ during the public consultation, however, a majority also indicated that they would change their mind if an adjoining road did have a CPZ introduced in that road. Cranbourne Drive adjoins this road and as 12 supported inclusion and 7 opposed it on this basis it was therefore included in the proposals.
- 2.30 One response listed for Malpas Drive was actually an objection in relation to Reddiford School in Cecil Park and so is not included in the above table.
- 2.31 One of the supporting respondents listed above suggested that the bays be located on one side of the road only, that residents should get two free permits and that the CPZ only operate Monday to Friday. At the statutory consultation stage it is not possible to make such changes to the order without consulting on the proposal again and advertising the traffic regulation order again so in isolation these comments cannot be addressed.
- 2.32 One formal objection from a resident of Malpas Drive objected to the other roads in the area (Winchester Drive and Colchester Drive) not being included in the zone because it would cause displaced parking, and problems with congestion. These roads did not support any additional parking controls in their road at the public consultation stage and consequently were not included in the proposals to extend the Zone A CPZ. It is, however, proposed to introduce install “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at all junctions in the area.
- 2.33 The other two objectors signed the same letter of objection which explained that there is no demand for parking in Malpas Drive based

on their own observations. They suggested that there is other free on-street parking in other roads at a similar distance to the station and suggested that commuters will use other means of getting to the station, or use other stations, if controls were introduced in Cranbourne Drive particularly south of Winchester Drive. They were also concerned about the cost of permits and the inconvenience to them and their visitors / tradesman if the CPZ went ahead.

- 2.34 As mentioned in the Statutory Consultation results and petitions section of the report a petition received as standard letter responses objecting to the proposed CPZ in Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive was received from 49 residents from 49 properties in Lloyd Court. This is also mentioned in the petitions report on the Agenda for this meeting.
- 2.35 The petition concerns the lack of parking space for residents already within Lloyd Court and explains that residents currently make use of the surrounding roads to park their cars. The proposed CPZ would therefore affect them as well.
- 2.36 During the public consultation residents of Lloyd Court were not supportive of any parking controls being introduced in their road and indicated that they would not change this view if adjoining roads were in a CPZ and so Lloyd court was not included in the proposals.
- 2.37 As mentioned in the Statutory Consultation results and petitions section of the report a document was received from 22 residents from 19 properties in Rochester Drive concerned about the possible displaced parking in their road caused by introducing a CPZ. This was included with a covering letter from the neighbourhood champion which reiterated their concerns.
- 2.38 This document is not an objection to the proposals as the merit in trying to deal with the commuter parking is recognised, however, their concerns centre around the displacement of these motorists into their road.
- 2.39 Three other individual letters were received from residents of Rochester Drive. One letter was an objection to the proposals as they consider them to be short sighted if the whole estate was not included.
- 2.40 During the public consultation residents of Rochester Drive were not supportive of any parking controls being introduced in their road and did not want to change their mind if adjoining roads were in a CPZ, such as Malpas Drive have.
- 2.41 Only 3 objections were received compared with the 12 responses that supported the scheme at the public consultation stage. Both Lloyd Court and Rochester Drive had an opportunity to be included in the scheme at the same stage but did not support inclusion. Therefore it is recommended that Malpas Drive becomes part of the Zone A CPZ operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon.

Nower Hill

- 2.42 In Nower Hill (between No.2 to 20) the introduction of an extension to the existing Zone A operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon was proposed. Of the 61 properties consulted only 2 chose to respond giving an overall response rate of 3%.

Nower Hill Join Zone A	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	8 (67%)	-
Do not support	3 (25%)	-
No Opinion	1 (8%)	-
Objections	-	2 (100%)
Comments	-	-
Total	12	2

- 2.43 As the above table shows 8 respondents from the public consultation stated that they would like the CPZ introduced in their road. The results of the statutory consultation, although low, validate this as there were only two objections received from this road. They were from different properties that objected during the public consultation.
- 2.44 One response listed for Nower Hill Drive was an objection in relation to other proposals in the area and so is not included in the above table.
- 2.45 Both objections objected to being charged to park outside their own property if the CPZ was to go ahead. Neither had responded to the previous public consultation. It is proposed that a permit parking bay will be located outside these properties.
- 2.46 There were 3 objections received from Copperfield Way regarding the proposals for Nower Hill. These were concerned about the displaced parking affecting Nower Hill which currently does not have a problem. During the public consultation 11 of the 12 responses from Copperfield Way did not want a CPZ in their road and 7 of those rejected inclusion in a CPZ if a nearby road was included. Therefore no CPZ has been proposed for Copperfield Way.
- 2.47 There was 1 objection noted from Marsh Road at the junction with Pinner Road. Their objection related to the reduction of parking that a CPZ in Nower Hill could cause for the local residents and the dental practice nearby. They mention the dental practice reserves its off-street parking for patients with staff parking in Nower Hill and The Chase. They also mention the multiple vehicles owned by properties in the area that rely on the public highway for parking.
- 2.48 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals as they considered it unnecessary because it was not a commuter parking problem but a safety related parking problem and

they thought double yellow lines would be more appropriate. A CPZ will also encourage safe parking but allows the opportunity for residents to purchase permits if they so wish and provide greater opportunities to find a parking space during the CPZ control times. A double yellow line restriction prohibits motorists from parking at any time in the area with no exceptions.

- 2.49 As part of the proposals for Nower Hill there are extensive lengths of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) being installed along the road, including all junctions, from Pinner Road to Church Lane. This will put pressure on the remaining parking in the area as this section of road is known to attract a significant number of vehicles.
- 2.50 Only 2 objections were received compared with the 8 responses that supported the scheme at the public consultation stage. Therefore it is recommended that Nower Hill (between No.2 to 20) becomes part of the Zone A CPZ operating Monday to Friday, 11am – 12 noon.

Barrowdene Close

- 2.51 In Barrowdene Close, the introduction of a new CPZ Zone A2 operating Monday to Saturday operating 11am – 12 noon was proposed. Of the 38 properties consulted 3 responded giving an overall response rate of 8%

Barrowdene Close New Zone A2	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	10 (53%)	-
Do not support	8 (42%)	-
No Opinion	1 (5%)	-
Objections	-	2 (67%)
Comments	-	1 (33%)
Total	19	3

- 2.52 As the above table shows, 10 respondents from the public consultation stated that they would like the CPZ introduced in their road. Of these 3 wanted operational times of Monday to Sunday, 4 wanted Monday to Saturday, 2 wanted Monday to Friday and 1 did not specify which days but only a time.
- 2.53 The results of the statutory consultation, although low, validate this as there were only three responses received from the road, two of which were objections. One sought clarification of the costs of a permit and the other objection was from a resident who indicated that they did not want a CPZ in their road. Both the objections wanted the hours of operation reduced to Monday to Friday 11am – 12noon which are the same hours as the existing CPZ Zone A.

- 2.54 One other comment indicated that more double yellow lines were required in the road. These were not deemed appropriate at the time of initial design and if the CPZ goes ahead then there will be potentially less vehicles parking in the locations identified by the resident.
- 2.55 It is intended that this road will have the new style of CPZ layout which has a reduced requirement for road markings and signs to reduce street clutter. Only zone entry / exit signs would be installed at the entrance to the road and “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) installed at junctions within the road but parking bays will not be marked. This will maximise the parking space for residents but will mean the residents will need to be responsible for how they park within the available space.
- 2.56 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals as they considered it unnecessary because the rest of Pinner was only operational Monday to Friday and claimed there is no justification for inclusion of the Saturday.
- 2.57 At the public consultation stage the responses regarding operational hours marginally favoured Monday to Saturday, however, in response to the objections received and discussions with ward councillors it is recommended that the original proposal for a new CPZ Zone A2 is abandoned and that Barrowdene Close becomes part of CPZ A operational Monday to Friday 11am - noon.

Bell Close

- 2.58 In Bell Close, the introduction of a new CPZ Zone A3 operating Monday to Saturday 8am – 6.30pm was proposed. Of the 20 properties consulted only 2 responses were received from the road directly giving an overall response rate of 10%

Bell Close New Zone A3	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	5 (100%)	-
Do not support	-	-
Objections	-	2 (100%)
Comments	-	-
Total	5	2

- 2.59 As the above table shows 5 respondents from the original consultation stated that they experienced parking problems and supported the introduction of a CPZ in their road. Of these 3 wanted operational times of Monday to Sunday and 2 wanted Monday to Saturday. Four of the five also wanted 8am – 6.30pm restrictions with the remaining wanting a 1 hour morning restriction.

- 2.60 One objector explained how they feel the CPZ is unnecessary as there is no demand and is costly for residents. The other resident objector was mainly concerned about the necessity of the scheme and the costs to residents.
- 2.61 It should be noted that there were 3 objections received from businesses on Pinner Green saying that if the CPZ in Bell Close does go ahead they would be affected because businesses and their customers park in this location. Two objections were also received from residents living above one of the shops also saying this would affect them as well. It should be noted that outside of the proposed CPZ operational hours it will still be possible to park on-street in Bell Close unrestricted so residents parking overnight for example.
- 2.62 All the businesses and residents that submitted objections do have limited off street parking. The business premises like so many over the years have been extended at the rear of the premises to create extra internal space or used for covered storage.
- 2.63 The residents of the road that previously responded expressed concerns about the non resident parking that occurs in the road. They were also concerned about some obstructive parking by customers of the shops blocking the road at its entrance while they are in the shops. The Pinner Association agreed with the measures proposed for this road.
- 2.64 Given the level of support from the residents during the public consultation it is recommended that the proposals for Bell Close to become a new CPZ A3 be amended so that the CPZ commences at the northern property boundaries of Nos. 1 and 2 rather than at its junction with Pinner Green. This would leave approximately 3 unrestricted car parking spaces for customers to visit the shops.
- 2.65 Officers further recommend that the panel set aside future funding during 2015/16 for further investigation, legal processes and installation of Pay and Display parking bays in this location operating at the same times as the CPZ Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm. The current 20 minute free parking period allowed for on-street pay and display bays would encourage a turn over of vehicles visiting local shops for short duration shopping periods. Longer duration parking would be set at the agreed charge rate appropriate for this area.

Mayfield Drive

- 2.66 In Mayfield Drive, the introduction of a new CPZ Zone A4 operating Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm was proposed. Of the 31 properties consulted 2 responded given an overall response rate of 6%.

Mayfield Drive New Zone A4	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support	2 (29%)	-
Do not support	3 (42%)	-
No Opinion	2 (29%)	-

Change if adjoining road was in	3 (42%)	-
Not change mind if adjoining road in	2 (29%)	-
No opinion	2 (29%)	-
Objections	-	1 (50%)
Comments (no support)	-	1 (50%)
Total	7	2

2.67 As the above table shows a majority did not support a CPZ, however, a majority did support a CPZ if an adjoining road showed support. At time of writing this report Nower Hill near Mayfield Drive is to become a CPZ and so therefore it is proposed that Mayfield Drive has a separate CPZ introduced.

2.68 Two respondents suggested that the control hours should be the same as the existing Pinner CPZ Zone A (Monday to Friday, 11am – 12noon) one of which was a formal objection and also suggested reducing the double yellow lines in the turning head. The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals and they considered it unnecessary.

2.69 It is therefore recommended that the original proposal for a new CPZ Zone A4 is abandoned and that Mayfield Drive becomes part of CPZ A operational Monday to Friday 11am - noon.

Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place

2.70 In Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place it was proposed to extend the existing Pinner CPZ Zone A restrictions to operate Monday to Saturday operating 8am – 6.30pm in response to residents requests during the previous public consultation. In doing so this would make it an independent CPZ area within the existing Pinner CPZ. This would be CPZ Zone A5 operational Monday to Saturday 8am – 630pm.

2.71 Of the 92 properties consulted 4 individuals responded only from Ashridge Gardens, given an overall response rate of 4%

Ashridge Gardens & Holwell Place New Zone A5	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support existing CPZ times	3 (21%)	-
Do not support existing CPZ times	11 (79%)	-
No opinion	-	-
Objections	-	3 (75%)
Comments	-	1 (25%)
Total	14	4

- 2.72 As the above table shows 11 respondents from the original consultation stated that they did not support the existing CPZ operational hours and requested more extensive hours, mainly from Holwell Place.
- 2.73 Those that individually responded to the statutory consultation suggested that the hours remain the same with one also wanting an hour in the afternoon restriction.
- 2.74 One response for Ashridge Gardens was an objection in relation to Reddiford School in Cecil Park so is not included in the above table.
- 2.75 During the statutory consultation period a petition was received from 31 signatories from 18 properties in Ashridge Gardens. This is also included in the petitions report elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting. Their concerns were that the extended CPZ hours were too restrictive for residents and visitors given the number of existing permit parking bays and costs of permits for visitors to cover the afternoon period. They were also concerned they would lose the ability to park in other roads of Zone A if this became necessary because of the number of vehicles the residents own and the availability of on-street parking in their road.
- 2.76 They also requested that no additional “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) be installed particularly on the bend in Ashridge Gardens as this would restrict resident parking outside of the control times. There are no double yellow lines proposed at that location as part of this scheme. There are however double yellow lines proposed for the junction of Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place as per the consultation drawings which was a concern from some respondents. The Pinner Association agreed with the measures proposed for these roads.
- 2.77 The Pinner Bridge Club based in Marsh Road, near the junction with Eastcote Road, submitted a petition objecting to the extended parking restrictions in Holwell Place and Ashridge Gardens because it will affect their members who use these roads to park while using the club, particularly the more elderly, who may not be able to walk from the other car parks in the Pinner area.
- 2.78 Although there was an indication from residents during the public consultation that they wanted additional times in the area on reflection it is considered that in response to the objections and the petition from local residents it is recommended that the proposal to create a new CPZ A5 be abandoned and the existing CPZ control hours be maintained.

Cecil Park

- 2.79 In Cecil Park it was proposed to introduce an additional one hour afternoon restriction following consultation with the local residents of the road who were mainly concerned about the inconsiderate parking by parents attending the local school. This meant that Cecil Park would

become a separate CPZ zone to the existing Pinner CPZ area. This would be CPZ Zone A1 operational Monday to Friday 11am – 12 noon and 3 – 4 pm. This would also include School Keep Clear restrictions outside No. 9 Cecil Park.

- 2.80 Of the 87 properties consulted 35 individuals responded giving an overall response rate of 40%.

Cecil Park New Zone A1	Original consultation results (questionnaire)	Statutory consultation results
Support additional afternoon hour	33 (58%)	-
Do not support additional afternoon hour	23 (40%)	-
No opinion	1 (2%)	
Objections	-	18 (51%)
Comments (no support)	-	12 (34%)
Comments (support)	-	5 (37%)
Total	57	35

- 2.81 During the statutory consultation 276 standard letters were received from the staff (58 no.) and the parents (218 no.) of Reddiford School objecting to the proposed additional afternoon hour restriction. The detrimental impact of the afternoon pick up activities by parents of pupils at the school initiated the petition from the local residents requesting the council to do something to tackle this.
- 2.82 Sixteen of the eighteen objections listed above were from residents who were objecting to the additional afternoon hour restriction claiming that it was not made clear that they would become a separate CPZ area and would therefore lose the ability to park in other roads within CPZ Zone A. They claimed this would put them and friends at a disadvantage as they would not be able to use their existing permit to visit other parts of the existing CPZ zone or for friends to visit them. During a local consultation in December 2013 in Cecil Park it was made clear to all residents that if they chose an additional afternoon hour existing Zone A permit holders would not be able to park in Cecil Park and visa versa. A copy of this consultation document and questionnaire can be seen in **Appendix D**.
- 2.83 The other two responses were objections directly connected with Reddiford School, including the school, and have been included in the above table. The remaining 274 standard letter responses from staff have been noted but not included in the table above.
- 2.84 There was also a formal objection from the Pinner United Synagogue expressing concerns over the creation of additional permit bays outside the synagogue instead of the current waiting restrictions (single yellow line)

which could lead to vehicles being parked there all day. They were concerned it would create problems for deliveries, visitors to the premises and to parents collecting children from the adjacent nursery as well as expressing security concerns because vehicles would be able to park in front of the synagogue all day.

- 2.85 Some resident objectors were concerned about what would happen to the school traffic if afternoon restrictions were installed. They expressed the view that it would not resolve the issue but lead to the parents just sitting in their cars waiting or driving around until the appropriate time. Some suggested that the school would just change their end time to get around the new restriction.
- 2.86 Some objectors commented that any problems with the school afternoon pickup only occur during term times but the measures to try to resolve the issue affect the residents all year and this was therefore unnecessary.
- 2.87 As mentioned above there were 276 letters of objection letters from Reddiford School. There were two forms of the letter, one signed by staff and one by the parents. They both are variations on the same letter and consider child safety as their main reason for objecting as the parents need to collect their children from the school. The letters further say that the changes will make matters worse rather than better and although the school says it works closely with the borough to try to mitigate the problems they suggest that parents would just hover in the middle of the road while waiting for their child.
- 2.88 Both school groups have said that the safety of the children is their main concern and feel that the additional parking restrictions will increase the chance of a child being injured or killed on this busy road. The letter from staff also highlights in bold that the main concern is that these changes will endanger the lives of Reddiford children. Both letters also highlight that the school has been there over 100 years, however I am sure the school and the residents appreciate that the travel requirements of the school's staff and pupils have changed considerably over this time. The location of the school may not be as appropriate as it once was.
- 2.89 The school does have a travel plan and does try to encourage safer use of the road by all the parents that have to drive to the school, however with any group there are some parents who act in a totally inappropriate and inconsiderate manner towards the local residents including abusive language and parking over resident driveways.
- 2.90 The situation with parking outside schools is very much a national problem and it is obvious that the road is busy at certain times because of the parents dropping off and collecting their children. Other vehicles associated with the school such as the coaches that return students from off site games on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons also lead to an unusual amount of traffic for this residential road. Outside of school drop-off pick-up time this road is no busier than any other residential road near a shopping centre in Harrow would expect to be.
- 2.91 It was also proposed to install additional School Keep Clear marking on the northern bend of Cecil Park opposite No.9 Cecil Park. Those that mentioned this part of the proposal were in favour of this progressing.

- 2.92 The Pinner Bridge Club submitted a petition objecting to the additional parking restrictions in Cecil Park. They claim it will affect their members as they use this road to park while using the club, particularly the more elderly, who may not be able to walk from the other car parks in the Pinner area.
- 2.93 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding these proposals and they considered the additional control hour unnecessary, however, they have agreed with the introduction of the School Keep Clear markings and the additional permit parking bays. They did suggest that any additional permit parking bays could be made free bays as some of the current permit parking bays were underused by residents during the control times.
- 2.94 It is therefore recommended that the proposals for a new CPZ Zone A1 CPZ be abandoned and the existing CPZ control hours be maintained. In addition it is recommended that the School Keep Clear marking at the northern bend of Cecil Park outside No.9 and the additional permit parking bays be installed.

Cannon Lane

- 2.95 A proposal to introduce a free parking bay outside Nos. 42 - 60 Cannon Lane was proposed.
- 2.96 There were 2 objections received from local businesses in the parade of shops immediately adjacent to this proposed parking bay. They both used a very similar letter of objection. Their concerns were that if the bay was left uncontrolled then it would fill up with vehicles that are not using the local shops.
- 2.97 The shops do benefit from having a rear service road, however, both businesses want the service road restricted to vehicles delivering to the shops and for customers of the shops. Unfortunately this does not cater for the residents who live above the shops who will expect somewhere to park close to their property. There were no responses from these properties during this consultation.
- 2.98 They suggested the use of parking bays similar to those that operate in the Rayners Lane area which offer a short period of free parking for users of the shops and quote this as an ideal example. This would require the introduction of Pay and Display bays which are not part of these proposals and have not previously been advertised.
- 2.99 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals and they would like to see more free bays introduced where there is light use of permit bays throughout the area.
- 2.100 Officers therefore recommend that the free parking bay be installed as advertised.

- 2.101 Officers further recommend that the panel set aside funding during 2015/16 for further investigation, legal processes and installation of Pay and Display parking bays operational Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm with a 20 minute free period.

Barrow Point Avenue.

- 2.102 In Barrow Point Avenue it is proposed to replace the existing permit bay with a single yellow line outside 16 Barrow Point Avenue and to install additional permit parking bays within CPZ zone A.
- 2.103 This existing permit bay ends at the edge of a wide vehicular access to the property. This is a location that would not have a permit bay installed under current guidelines due to the restricted space and therefore it is to be removed and replaced with a single yellow line. This will remove the chance of a permit holder parking in the bay and potentially blocking the resident's driveway.
- 2.104 The loss of this one bay is being offset by the installation of additional bays on the other side of the road outside No. 5 Barrow Point Avenue. This new bay will be larger and accommodate two vehicles providing a gain of one parking space.
- 2.105 Another minor reduction in size of a permit bay is proposed outside No. 6 Barrow Point Ave to also provide better access to that vehicular access. The length of this bay is not significantly compromised and so does not need to be removed.
- 2.106 The Pinner Association submitted an objection to the removal of the bay as they thought it unnecessary but have not commented on the difficulty for vehicles using the access.
- 2.107 It is therefore recommended that the permit bay outside No. 16 is removed and replaced with a single yellow line, a permit bay outside no. 5 is installed and a permit bay outside no. 6 is reduced in size in Barrow Point Avenue as advertised.

Northfield Avenue.

- 2.108 In Northfield Avenue it is proposed to replace an existing permit bay with a single yellow line opposite no. 2 Northfield Avenue and install an additional permit parking bays within CPZ zone A.
- 2.109 The existing permit parking bays near the junction of Hillcrest Avenue could cause visibility issues for traffic. It is therefore proposed to relocate these bays to the other side of the road adjacent to the tennis courts. This proposal will provide additional parking space and improve visibility at the junction with the proposed double yellow lines towards Crest View and the single yellow line the other way towards the dead end.
- 2.110 Officers therefore recommend the removal of the permit bay opposite 2 Northfield Avenue and other bay alterations as advertised.

Residential permit bays – Various locations

- 2.111 In a number of locations in CPZ Zone A it is proposed to introduce additional permit bays. The locations are Chigwell Hurst Court, Milman Close, Elm Park Road, Love Lane, Avenue Road, West End Avenue, Leighton Avenue, Ashdene, North Way, Northfield Avenue, Mansard Close and Cecil Park.
- 2.112 Chigwell Hurst Court - There was one objection to the proposals for additional permit parking bays as it was explained that the existing bays are often empty. A specific concern was also given regarding the position of some of the additional bays in the turning head blocking access for larger vehicles. This part of the proposal can be removed as there are other permits parking bays proposed in the road.
- 2.113 Milman Close – No comments were received from the residents.
- 2.114 Elm Park Road – One objection from a resident of Elm Park Road did not relate to Elm Park Road.
- 2.115 Two other comments were received. One was from the Christian Science Church near Waxwell Lane, saying that the proposed layout of the bays would reduce the parking in the layby and is not the most efficient way of parking in the layby. They have suggested angled parking. The bays have been proposed parallel to the kerb and not in the tapers at each end and this arrangement formalises the existing inset free parking bay currently in place. This ensures that any vehicle parking there can drive into and out of the bays without compromising road safety.
- 2.116 The other comment came from a resident who lives further up the road claiming the road is becoming more dangerous due to the existing parking and permit parking bays and wants the existing bays removed opposite their property to stop vehicles parking close to the driveway and restricting access to the property.
- 2.117 Love Lane – There were 8 objections or comments directly from the residents of Love Lane. Two were from people connected with Reddiford School in Cecil Park and so these did not relate to Love Lane.
- 2.118 One resident supported the introduction of the double yellow lines near Avenue Road.
- 2.119 One resident supported the additional permit parking bays but wanted the double yellow lines curtailed as they thought the single yellow line was sufficient.
- 2.120 Four responses related to the existing and proposed additional permit parking bay near nos. 83 - 87. They wanted the existing bay extended as it is an odd size and cannot properly accommodate 3 vehicles. In

addition there were concerns that the proposed bay outside nos. 85 - 87 may obstruct the access to one of the properties.

- 2.121 Avenue Road – There were 3 responses from properties in Avenue Road directly. Two related to the location of the additional parking bays, one near the Pinner Methodist Church and one near a private property. These can be amended on site as mentioned below.
- 2.122 The proposed bay outside the Methodist Church will affect one of their accesses to the front of the church and require an additional short section of double yellow line to replace part of the bay. As the church is the only affected property the Panel are requested to approve the small extension of the double yellow line at this location as part of these proposals.
- 2.123 The proposed permit parking bay near the private property could be reduced in size due to its location on a bend to accommodate concerns of the local resident.
- 2.124 The other response related to other parking bays proposed for the lower part of Love Lane near Bridge Street are dealt with later on in this report.
- 2.125 West End Avenue – There were 5 responses from residents of West End Avenue. One related to the changes to the bay at the rear of their property in Meadow Road and this has been discussed with the resident. It does not affect West End Avenue.
- 2.126 One resident made a general comment about parents parking in the road between 3 - 4pm and suggested additional double yellow lines.
- 2.127 The remaining 3 residents raised concerns about the proposed permit parking bay on the bend in the road near No.60. They considered this to be a dangerous location. This bay can be removed as there are other additional bays proposed along the road.
- 2.128 One of the above residents also raised concerns about another bay proposed outside their property as they were intending to alter their off street parking area at the front of the premises and required a vehicular access. Until an application has been received it is proposed to proceed with implementing the proposed bay. This can be removed as and when the resident applies for and constructs their additional driveway access point.
- 2.129 Leighton Avenue – There were 3 objections recorded from Leighton Road. Two were connected with Reddiford School in Cecil Park and so were not in relation to Leighton Avenue. The remaining resident wanted an additional permit parking bay installed outside their house as they have trouble parking in the road close to their house due to non-residents parking on the existing single yellow zone outside of the operational hours.

- 2.130 They suggest that the problem is caused by staff at the Pinn Medical Centre. They wanted the control hours extended or dedicated spaces for the medical centre created in the local car park. There were no other responses recorded from Leighton Avenue.
- 2.131 At time of detailed design it may be possible to install an additional permit parking bay outside this property providing there is sufficient length for the bay and clearances to the driveways on both sides of the road.
- 2.132 Ashdene – No comments were received.
- 2.133 North Way – One objection received from a resident saying additional permit parking bay is not needed as the current ones are often unused.
- 2.134 Mansard Close – There were 3 objections received from properties in Westbury Lodge Close regarding the two proposed permit parking bays opposite no.15. These properties have vehicle accesses at this point and the proposed permit parking bays would cause obstruction. Therefore it is proposed to remove these two permit parking bays during the detailed design phase and replace them with a single yellow line. The other 3 additional permit parking bays will be installed as advertised.
- 2.135 General - When reviewing an area the council will maximise the amount of on-street parking during the control hours wherever possible. The actual dimensions of the final permit parking bays will be assessed on site when the detailed design is undertaken. Any existing bays that need to be reduced or extended will be kept clear of driveways by 1 to 1.5 m as is now standard practice for all permit parking bays.
- 2.136 The Pinner Association submitted comments regarding this aspect of the proposals. Although they were generally in favour of the proposals they would like to see more free bays introduced where there is light use of permit parking bays throughout the area.
- 2.137 Officers therefore recommend that the proposed additional permit parking bays be installed with the amendments in Chigwell Hurst Close, Avenue Road, West End Avenue, Leighton Avenue and Mansard Close as detailed above.

Loading restrictions “at any time”

- 2.138 High Street – There was one comment from a Pinner resident suggesting that no loading restrictions would help with the congestion caused by blue badge holders in this area. As a national dispensation blue badge holders can park on single or double yellow lines if there are no other loading restrictions in place and they do not cause an obstruction. In this area the number of blue badge holders parking in the area without regard for other road users have caused congestion due to the narrowness of this historic road.

- 2.139 Love Lane – There was one comment from a Pinner resident suggesting that loading restrictions would help with the congestion caused by blue badge holders in this area. In this area the number of blue badge holders parking in the area without regard for other road users have caused congestion due to the narrowness and layout of this historic road.
- 2.140 Bridge Street – No comments received although one resident did want double yellow lines near Waxwell Lane which are included in the overall proposals for double yellow lines throughout the area.
- 2.141 Chapel Lane – No comments received
- 2.142 The Pinner Association responded that they welcomed all these proposals.

Pay and display bays

- 2.143 At various locations it is proposed to introduce pay and display bays operating Monday to Saturday 8am – 6.30pm with a 2 hour maximum stay and no return within 1 hour.
- 2.144 Station Approach – This road is only partly public highway at the closest to Marsh Road and the proposed bays are located in the public highway. The remaining part of the access road to Sainsbury's or the station is not public highway and has privately operated parking and traffic controls.
- 2.145 There were 3 individual objections to this proposal advising that congestion would be caused as vehicles try to get in or out of the spaces and cause disruption to the traffic trying to use the road at busy times.
- 2.146 One objector also mentions that there is adequate parking in Sainsbury's and in front of the station already so there is no need for any other parking bays. They were also concerned that during periods of snow and ice that the road is not gritted and would pose a danger for vehicles and pedestrians trying to negotiate the slope.
- 2.147 The Pinner Association objected to this proposal as they thought it could impede emergency vehicle access to the station and cause congestion as drivers manoeuvre in and out of the bays
- 2.148 There is currently some illegal parking activity occurring opposite this site in front of the small businesses. This will formalise the parking as double yellow lines and other loading restrictions are also planned for this section of road. The pay and display bays may benefit the immediate local businesses, including those through under the rail bridge, because with the current 20 minute free parking period allowed within Harrow this will encourage a turnover of short stay parking in the area.

- 2.149 High Street – There were 4 responses regarding the parking in this area and the associated congestion it causes particularly in the evening. All seemed to suggest banning parking on one side of the road which accords with what is proposed for this area. By formalising the parking and the other waiting and loading restrictions proposed for the north side of the road this should relieve the congestion.
- 2.150 The Pinner Association welcomed this part of the proposal.
- 2.151 Love Lane – There were 3 responses regarding the parking in this area and the associated congestion it causes particularly in the evening. In general by formalising the parking and the other waiting and loading restrictions proposed this should relieve the congestion
- 2.152 The Pinner Association did not submit any comment on this part of the proposals.
- 2.153 One resident raised concerns about the proposed pay and display bays outside St. Lukes Church front entrance in Love Lane. They indicated that vehicles parking in front of the church would potentially block the church entrance for services. As mentioned previously as part of the review officers have tried to increase the amount of available on-street or permit parking in the area where possible.
- 2.154 In this instance officers have reviewed this proposal and agree with the resident and therefore recommend that the proposal for pay and display bays outside the church are abandoned.
- 2.155 The other aspects of the proposals in Love Lane including the proposed disabled bay next to the church should proceed as advertised with the existing permit parking bays and single yellow line in front of the church to remain as they are. This will ensure there is dedicated disabled blue badge parking on both sides of the road and is further detailed in the section below.

Loading bays

- 2.156 It is proposed to introduce loading bays in Love Lane and the High Street operating Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6.30pm.
- 2.157 High Street – There was one objection from the Queens Head public house in relation to the general proposals for the parking and loading bays in the High Street near their property. They were concerned that the loading facilities proposed will not be of any assistance to them. Being a public house their deliveries are substantial and heavy and therefore they would appreciate having a loading bay near the front of the premises.
- 2.158 Although this is not originally proposed this could be accommodated with a slight alteration to the proposed additional permit parking bays

and the proposed disabled parking bay locations nearby. It would also benefit other businesses in the area by having a loading bay on that side of the road which is not currently proposed.

- 2.159 The Pinner Association also recommended that a loading bay is required outside the Queens Head public house.
- 2.160 As this is not included in these proposals officers recommend that the panel set aside funding during 2015/16 for further investigation, legal processes and installation of a loading bay and alterations to the proposed disabled and permit parking bays.
- 2.161 In the interim the proposals for additional permit bays adjacent to the Queens Head should be abandoned pending the review of the loading bay. Further consideration may be given to the location of the disabled bay at that time.
- 2.162 Love Lane – There were 3 comments received from residents not living in Love Lane, in relation to this proposal saying that if a loading bay was installed opposite the proposed disabled bays and Pay and Display bays then this would not alleviate the current congestion. They suggested that all the parking should be on one side of the road.
- 2.163 During the control hours the loading bay is unlikely to be in use all the time but will enable servicing of the local businesses that may not have been possible due to the disabled blue badge drivers parking along the road and blocking loading activities. In the evening this loading bay can be used by any motorist as it is not operational. The loading bay is short and congestion will be mitigated in conjunction with the other proposed waiting and loading restriction. It is expected that this will be a significant improvement on the current situation.

Disabled bays

- 2.164 It is proposed to remove existing disabled bays and introduce new disabled bays operating “at any time” with a 3 hour maximum stay.
- 2.165 The existing disabled parking bays are not time restricted therefore it is proposed to introduce a 3 hour maximum stay limit to bring them in line with other on-street disabled bays throughout the borough. This also ensures that other disabled blue badge holders have the opportunity to park within the shopping centre area as the bays cannot be occupied all day.
- 2.166 High Street – It is proposed to move one of the existing disabled parking bays on the south side of the road closer to Bridge Street. It is proposed to move a second bay to the other side of the road near the Queens Head public house and install an additional bay by the war memorial.
- 2.167 Other waiting and loading restrictions proposed for the area will ensure that the north side of the High Street will be kept clear of parked

vehicles up to the Queens Head and allow a more free flow of traffic through the area.

- 2.168 Love Lane – It is proposed to split up the existing disabled parking bays and move one closer to Bridge Street. The other will be relocated across the road near the church.
- 2.169 There were objections received in relation to the proposal, however, the objectors may have been under the impression that the bays were being removed rather than relocated. The Pinner Association responded that they welcomed all these proposals.

Are wide waiting restrictions

- 2.170 It is proposed to introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on all junctions, turning heads, narrow sections of the carriageway and bends within the consultation area for safety and access reasons in accordance with the principles of the Highway Code.
- 2.171 The Pinner Association submitted a general comment that in order to minimize the environmental impact these are only introduced where necessary for safety reasons. They also recommend consideration be given to putting double yellow lines where High View joins with Cuckoo Hill and in Westway. As mentioned above the Pinner Bridge Club objected to more stringent waiting restrictions as they rely on the nearby public roads for their members to park while at the club.
- 2.172 Another local chiropractic business operating out of a residential style property on Marsh Road objected to the proposals to put in more double yellow lines along Marsh Road. They also objected to the proposal to replace the existing single yellow line in front of the property with one operating Monday to Saturday 8am – 6.30pm. They explained that their patients often are unable to walk any distance or suffer extreme pain when moving so being able to park in front of the clinic is vital.
- 2.173 This upgrade of the single yellow line could be abandoned to assist this business and allow the Pinner Bridge Club some on-street parking near the club. Officers therefore recommend that this proposal is abandoned.
- 2.174 There were various isolated objections throughout the consultation area that thought the double yellow lines were not necessary and other comments received highlighting other areas where they feel double yellow lines or the proposed lines should be introduced.

Summary

- 2.175 Officers have met with local ward councillors prior to the panel meeting to discuss all the results from the consultation. They have supported the officer’s recommendations in this report.

- 2.176 There is always a variety of views expressed during consultation and it can sometimes be difficult to balance the needs and requirements of all respondents or objectors and the Council's role as the highway authority to ensure the highway is safe and accessible. This ultimately means that compromises have been made in order to put forward the recommendations in this report.
- 2.177 Where future reviews are highlighted in this report these will be reported to the February 2015 panel meeting for consideration in the 2015/16 programme of works.

Risk Management Implications

- 2.178 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects, which covers all risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway and this would include all aspects of the proposals included in this report.

Legal implications

- 2.179 Subject to statutory consultation requirements, which the council has complied with, the council has powers to introduce and change CPZ's 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

- 2.180 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 £75k for statutory consultation and implementation of the Pinner Area Parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2014 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder. The scheme is scheduled for completion in year.
- 2.181 If the scheme is implemented parking income will be generated from resident / visitor permits charges, pay & display charges as well as from penalty charge notices for parking offences. Any income raised will be used to fund the costs of administration and enforcement.

Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.182 A review of equality issues was undertaken as a part of the original scheme design process and was recently reviewed to consider the latest changes to the scheme. This review 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.

- 2.183 Equalities monitoring data on public consultations were collected to monitor the equality of access to the consultation. These responses were compared with the most recent census data.

Council Priorities

- 2.184 The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with the administration's 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>By introducing demand management measures the demand to travel by car can be regulated leading to reduced road congestion and greater use of sustainable transport modes like public transport and cycling lessening the impact on the local environment.</p>

Making a difference for the vulnerable	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 commuters and other forms of long stay parking.
Making a difference for families	
Making a difference for local businesses	The changes to parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to give more customers parking access to shops.

2.185 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: 24/11/14		
Name: Ian Goldsmith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 24/11/14		

Ward Councillors notified:	YES
EqIA carried out:	NO
EqIA cleared by:	An EqIA has been undertaken for the Transport Local implementation Plan of which this project is a part. A separate EqIA is therefore not necessary

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Andrew Leitch – Team Leader – Parking
020 8424 1888

Background Papers:

Portfolio Holder Decision Notice – February 2014