

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	10 December 2014
<b>Subject:</b>	Canons Park Area Parking Review Statutory Consultation results
<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>Wards affected:</b>	Belmont Canons Edgware
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> – Statutory consultation documents <b>Appendix B</b> – statutory consultation results tabulated on a road by road basis. <b>Appendix C</b> – Consideration of individual objections <b>Appendix D</b> – Plans of proposals

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

This report provides results of the statutory consultation exercise carried out in the Canons Park area in September / October 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. That the Stanmore CPZ Zone H, operational Monday to Saturday, 10-11am and 3 - 4pm, as set out in the advertised traffic order is extended into the following roads:
  - Dovercourt Gardens (to the junction of Heronslea Drive),
  - Heronslea Drive
2. That the Stanmore CPZ Zone B, operational Monday to Friday, 2 - 3pm, as set out in the advertised traffic order is extended into the following road:
  - Craigweil Close
3. That waiting restrictions operating Monday to Friday, 2 - 3pm (single yellow lines) as set out in the advertised traffic order are installed in the following roads:
  - Bromefield (between no.46 and Bush Grove)
  - Bush Grove (between nos. 26 - 30)
  - Cheyneys Avenue (between no. 106 and Howberry Road)
  - Home Mead
  - Howberry Road (between Peters Close and Wychwood Avenue (south))
  - Wemborough Road (St Andrews Drive to Bush Grove)
  - Wychwood Avenue (between no. 18 and Howberry Road)
4. That the proposed waiting restrictions operating Monday to Friday, 2 - 3pm (single yellow lines) are not implemented in the following roads and the objectors informed:
  - Buckingham Gardens
  - Peters Close
  - Dalkeith Grove
5. That all "at any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) be installed on bends, narrow sections of road and other locations as detailed in the advertised traffic regulation order,

6. That Permit Holder bays are installed in the service road Station Parade, Whitchurch Lane, on the southern side of the service road, and pay & display bays and one disabled persons parking bay on the northern side of the service road, operating Monday to Saturday, 8am-6:30pm with a maximum stay of 4 hours for pay & display,
7. That shared use bays (pay & display and permits) are installed on the western side of Donnefield Avenue between the junction with Whitchurch Lane and 36 Canons Park Close, operating Monday to Saturday 8am - 6:30pm with a maximum stay of 4 hours for pay & display,
8. That shared use bays (pay and display and permits) are installed in the Honeyput Lane Shopping Parade on the western side of the service road fronting the shops, operating Monday to Friday, 8am to 6:30pm with a maximum stay of 2 hours for pay & display and the existing disabled persons parking bay to remain,
9. That a school keep clear marking is installed outside no. 86 Dalkeith Grove on the northern side of the carriageway and between nos. 21 to 25a Dalkeith Grove on the southern side of the carriageway, operating Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 4:30pm,
10. The panel agree to make available funding in the 2015/16 financial year to carry out localised reviews in the following areas:
  - Buckingham Gardens – new controlled parking zone
  - Dalkeith Grove – new controlled parking zone / parking restrictions
  - Dovercourt Road – extend controlled parking zone
11. 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 Canons Park 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 summarises the results and outcomes of the statutory consultation

exercise agreed by the panel on 15<sup>th</sup> July for roads in the Canons Park 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.
- 2.1 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**

- 2.3. An informal public consultation was conducted during March and April 2014 to review some of the parking controls introduced in 2013 in the Canons Park area parking review.
- 2.4. The results of that consultation along with officer recommendations for proposed parking controls were presented to the Panel on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014 for consideration to proceed to statutory consultation. The proposals within that report were based mainly on the consultation responses received from residents and businesses.
- 2.5. Following representations and discussions at the Panel changes to the recommendations were made which were subsequently approved by the Panel and by the Portfolio Holder (PH). The proposals are summarised below and detailed in the report.
- 2.6. 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 wider consultation area and reinforce the established rules of the Highway Code which set out where vehicles should not park to prevent obstruction and improve road safety.

## **Statutory Consultation**

- 2.7. In September 2014 consultation documents were distributed to approximately 1600 properties in the original consultation area. The consultation material delivered included the consultation document and a key plan. A copy of the statutory consultation document is shown in **Appendix A**.
- 2.8. The traffic regulation order was advertised on 18<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014.

2.9. 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

2.10. **Statutory Consultation results**

2.11. During the statutory consultation period, officers received a total of 81 responses of which 57 were statutory objections. One general objection to the proposals was received from a resident in Culverlands Close with no specific location mentioned.

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 in the member's library. A tabulated summary of the responses can be seen in **Appendix B** and a summary of the formal objections together with officers comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

**Analysis of consultation results – Area 1**

2.13. This section details the responses received from Area 1 which includes Howberry Road (northern section), Peters Close, Cheyneys Avenue, Wychwood Avenue and Wychwood Close. A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.

Howberry Road (northern section)

2.14. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm.

<b>Howberry Road</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	22 (79%)	-
Do not Support	5 (18%)	-
No Opinion	1 (3%)	-
Objections	-	-
Comments (support)	-	7(100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>7</b>

2.15. All 7 responses from residents in the directly affected section of Howberry Road and a further response from further south on the road received via their Member of Parliament support the proposals. This restriction is recommended on both sides of Howberry Road between the junctions with

Peters Close and the southern arm of Wychwood Avenue where it is currently uncontrolled except on the east side of Howberry Road.

- 2.16. There was a comment received from a commuter who uses the roads surrounding the station to park close to the train or bus. They were concerned that these blanket restrictions will cause them inconvenience when using the public transport. They suggested single or double yellow lines on one side of the road only to allow some commuter parking.
- 2.17. Some “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are proposed on the east side of Howberry Road between its junctions with Peters Close and Cheyneys Avenue. All the responses were in support of the proposal.
- 2.18. The installation of single and double yellow lines in Howberry Road as advertised is therefore recommended.

Peters Close

- 2.19. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm and “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on the bends.

<b>Peters Close</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	7 (41%)	-
Do not Support	5 (29%)	-
No Opinion	5 (30%)	-
Objections	-	4 (66%)
Comments (support)	-	2 (33%)
<b>Total</b>	17	6

- 2.20. Four formal objections were received directly in relation to Peters Close and two responses in favour of the proposal. The responses to the public consultation showed a small majority, however, there were 5 responses with no clear opinion.
- 2.21. The objectors were concerned about the lack of parking spaces during the control times and the inconvenience this would have on them and their visitors. There was also a concern raised by a resident in another local road who uses this area to park because they have no off-street parking and are in an existing area with Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm restrictions. They were concerned that if the restriction came in here they would be severely disadvantaged. Officers recommend that the proposed single yellow line restrictions in Peters Close be abandoned.
- 2.22. No formal objections were received concerning the proposed double yellow lines. It is therefore recommended that the double yellow lines are installed as advertised.

Cheyneys Avenue

- 2.23. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm on both sides of Cheyneys Avenue and “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on the bend.

<b>Cheyneys Avenue</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	21 (75%)	-
Do not Support	7 (25%)	-
No Opinion	0	-
Objections	-	1 (17%)
Comments (support)	-	1 (17%)
Comments (no support)	-	4 (66%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>

- 2.24. There was strong support for the proposal in this road which is currently unrestricted. Four residents stated objection at the statutory consultation stage but three of these provided no material reasons and therefore cannot be considered as formal objections. The level of objection is small in comparison to the strong support previously received. No formal objections were received concerning the proposed double yellow lines on the bend outside Nos 146 to 154.

- 2.25. Officers therefore recommended that the single yellow line and double yellow lines proposals are installed as advertised.

#### Wychwood Avenue

- 2.26. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm between Howberry Road and no. 16 Wychwood Avenue.

<b>Wynchwood Avenue</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire) Nos. 3-15 &amp; 4-16 only</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	19 (45%)	7 (88%)	-
Do not Support	15 (36%)	1(12%)	-
No Opinion	8 (19%)	0	-
Objections	-	-	1 (33%)
Comments (support)	-	-	1 (33%)
Comments (no support)	-	-	1 (33%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>

- 2.27. The main support for single yellow lines in the previous consultation came from Nos. 3 to 15 and nos. 4 to 16 Wychwood Avenue and the proposals for the statutory consultation were developed on that basis. One formal objection and one response in support was received from this section of Wychwood Avenue. A further response from an address in Wychwood Avenue further away from these proposals does not refer specifically to the proposals in this road and makes wider comments about parking restrictions in general.
- 2.28. In view of the previous strong support for restrictions from this section of road officers recommend that the single yellow line in the southern arm of Wychwood Avenue are installed as advertised.

**Analysis of consultation results – Area 2**

- 2.29. This section details the responses received from Area 2 which includes Buckingham Road, Buckingham Gardens, Chandos Crescent, Whitchurch Lane and Merlin Crescent. A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.

Buckingham Road

- 2.30. The proposal consists of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at vehicular accesses to the private car parks on the north side of Buckingham Road opposite No.102 and no. 120. No objections were received concerning these proposals, It is therefore recommended that the double yellow lines are installed as advertised.

Buckingham Gardens

- 2.31. The proposals consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm.

<b>Buckingham Gardens</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	4 (57%)	-
Do not Support	2 (29%)	-
No Opinion	1 (14%)	-
Objections	-	13 (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>

- 2.32. Thirteen identical formal objections were received from addresses in Buckingham Gardens and a further two from Buckingham Road as separate standard letters. The grounds of objection is that in placing a single yellow line (without any bays) residents and visitors are penalised by being unable to park in their road during the controlled times.
- 2.33. Given this level of objection which is significantly larger than the level of support shown at the initial consultation stage it is recommended that the single yellow line proposals in Buckingham Gardens are abandoned.



- 2.34. It is recommended that the panel agree to fund in the 2015/16 financial year a localised review of this road at their meeting in February 2015 with for a controlled parking zone with permit bays so that residents and their visitors have the availability of parking in the road during the control times.

### **Analysis of consultation results – Area 3**

- 2.35. This section details the responses received from Area 3 which includes Whitchurch Lane, Howberry Road (southern end) and Donnefield Avenue. A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.

#### Whitchurch Lane parade parking bays and Howberry Road (southern section)

- 2.36. A proposal to implement some shared use bays outside the shopping parade for both permit holders and pay and display users on the shops side of the road was agreed previously by this Panel. This was despite being only supported by 11 of the 25 responses in the original consultation because of the wider benefit to the community.
- 2.37. Two formal objections were received from businesses in the parade during statutory consultation. The reason for their objection was the perceived reduction in available space for their customers to park. The objectors feel all the space should be available for pay and display as it is in a shopping parade. There are currently 17 residents permits issued for zone CS for residents living above the shops and the service road is the only location where the permits are valid.
- 2.38. The proposals involve converting the shared use bays into pay and display bays on the shops side of the service road. This would remove any permit holders from these spaces and increase the potential number of dedicated pay and display bays available. With the current 20 minute free parking period for all on-street P&D in Harrow this should allow a good turnover of short stay parking for those that wish to use the shops. If a longer period is required this can be paid for as required.
- 2.39. There is an existing single yellow line operating Monday to Friday, 10 - 11am and 2 - 3pm on the south side of the service road. It is proposed to introduce dedicated Permit Holder parking bays to accommodate the number of residents who currently have permits. This will also allow them to have visitors in this area with the use of visitor permits. Outside of the proposed controlled times any vehicle can park in the bays in the service road.
- 2.40. It is recommended that the proposal be installed as advertised.
- 2.41. The proposed “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposed on the west side of Howberry Road near the service road attracted no comments in the statutory consultation and therefore it is recommended that the double yellow lines be installed as advertised.

### Donnefield Avenue

- 2.42. A proposal to convert the parking areas in Donnefield Avenue from permit holders only to shared use pay and display / permit holders to allow pay and display parking was agreed by this Panel. This was despite being only supported by 7 responses in Donnefield Avenue during the original consultation because of the wider benefit to the community. Donnefield Avenue provides access to Canons Park, cricket, tennis and other community facilities. The present restrictions cause problem for users of these facilities arriving by car as they are not permit holders.
- 2.43. One formal objection was received during statutory consultation suggesting that the shared use should be confined to Monday to Friday, 9am to 4pm and the remaining operational period confined to permit holders. It was also suggested that some short stay parking could be shared with residents only in the area around the railway station or to install pay and display bays in other roads where properties have off-street parking. The concerns are that the numbers of pay and display vehicles will leave insufficient space for permit holders.
- 2.44. The proposed maximum stay for the pay and display parking is 4 hours to allow visitors to use these bays for activities in the area but will not allow for all day parking by any commuters. There are 30 resident permits issued for approximately 30 spaces available on Donnefield Avenue so if all the permit holders are at home the lack of permit space may be a valid concern. However this has to also be balanced against the needs of the wider community who are currently excluded from using this public highway road to access public facilities. On site observations indicate that the road is generally only half full with the current controls in force and so not all permit holders are parked in the road at the same time. There is therefore some space available for pay and display parking which may not necessarily be detrimental to permit holders.
- 2.45. It is therefore recommended that the existing permit holder only bays be converted to shared use pay and display / permit holder bays as advertised.

### **Analysis of consultation results – Area 4**

- 2.46. This section details the responses received from Area 4 which includes Bromefield, St Andrews Drive, Wemborough Road, Gyles Park, Home Mead, Crowshott Avenue, Pickett Croft, Bush Grove, Lyon Meade and Honeypot Lane (shopping parade). A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.

### Bromefield and Home Mead

- 2.47. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm in various sections of the roads.

<b>Bromefield</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire) Nos. 37 - 53 &amp; 30 - 46 only</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	11 (28%)	6 (66%)	-
Do not Support	11 (28%)	2 (33%)	-
No Opinion	18 (44%)	-	-
Objections	-	-	2 (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>Home Mead</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	3 (50%)	-
Do not Support	1 (17%)	-
No Opinion	2 (33%)	-
Objections	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

2.48. Two formal objections were received from Bromefield but only one of these came from the section directly affected by the proposals. No response were received from Home Mead.

2.49. Based on the strong support in the initial consultation and limited objections received it is recommended that the proposed single yellow line be installed in Bromefield and Home Mead as advertised.

#### Bush Grove

2.50. The proposal consists of waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operating Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm in a small section of the road from Nos. 27 to 33.

<b>Bush Grove</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire) Results from nos 27 - 33 &amp; 26 – 30 only</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	7 (28%)	3 (75%)	-
Do not Support	10 (40%)	1 (25%)	-
No Opinion	8 (32%)	0	-
<b>Objections</b>		-	1 (50%)
<b>Comments</b>		-	1 (50%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>

2.51. Two responses were received from Bush Grove both from the section beyond where restrictions are proposed. Both of these express concern

about proposals in Wemborough Road and its potential for displacing parking. One response is also a formal objection to the proposed extension to single yellow lines in Bush Grove.

- 2.52. This response in objection also attaches a petition of 49 Bush Grove residents, in objection to the proposals in Bush Grove on the grounds that it will displace parking to the section of Bush Grove which would remain uncontrolled. It was received on 4 October 2014 and is also referenced in the petitions report also on the Agenda. The petition states:

*“We the undersigned object to this proposal for the following reasons; the knock on effect of the above proposal in conjunction with the proposal of a CPZ in Wemborough Road will result in commuter traffic parking along the remaining section of Bush Grove. These vehicles will cause a problem to that section of Bush Grove as vehicles are likely to park there all day especially Monday to Friday. Consultation results Appendix B ask if residents of Bush Grove experience parking problems in their street. The majority said no and the overall support level was 28%. However this question is misleading as those who replied to the questionnaire were clearly happy with the status quo. The above mentioned proposal will change the status quo and cause the problems already mentioned as those vehicles that currently park during commuter hours along Wemborough Road and from 19-33 Bush Grove will have to park elsewhere probably from number 33 Bush Grove onwards. We therefore ask you to reconsider this proposal.”*

- 2.53. Only one signatory to the petition is from an address immediately adjacent to the proposed restriction. This resident also did not support proposal in the earlier consultation. The vast majority of signatures come from the unrestricted section of Bush Grove, however, six signatures come from the northern section which is already restricted.
- 2.54. The petition relates to possible displaced parking from the proposed restrictions in Wemborough Road, however, there were only two responses received from Wemborough Road itself as detailed below. Previous responses from these residents as mentioned above did not necessarily support any further controls in their section of road and hence none were proposed.
- 2.55. On the basis of allowing immediate frontages to choose to have restrictions outside their address it is recommended that the proposed single yellow line in Bush Grove be installed as advertised.

#### Wemborough Road

- 2.56. Concerns raised in during the previous consultation regarding safety and congestion caused by parked vehicles led to waiting restrictions operating Monday to Friday, 2-3pm (single yellow lines) in the unrestricted sections on both sides between the junctions with Bromefield and St Andrews Drive being proposed following discussions with local ward councillors. This is

despite only three of the nine responses from this road being in support as the wider community benefit was taken into consideration.

- 2.57. Parking has been displaced from the side roads in particular Bromefield, Bush Grove and Gyles Park since introduction of restrictions in the previous phase of the parking review which now prevents parking through the day. The situation is made worse along Wemborough Road (a borough distributor road) during school collection and drop off times.
- 2.58. One formal objection, the petition mentioned above and one response in support of the proposed restrictions were received as a result of statutory consultation. The individual objection although mentioning Wemborough Road objects to the extension of restrictions in general. The objector raises legitimate concern for those with insufficient or no off-street parking regarding where they will park near to their premises.
- 2.59. Taking account of the low level of response it is recommended that the proposed single yellow line in Wemborough Road be installed as advertised.

Honeypot Lane (shopping parade)

- 2.60. The proposals consist of changing the Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm waiting restriction on the shops side of the service road to shared use bays for for permit holders and pay and display, operating Monday to Friday 8am - 6.30pm, with a maximum stay of 2 hours for pay and display.

<b>Honeypot Lane (shopping parade)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation results</b>
Support	7 (58%)	-
Do not Support	2 (17%)	-
No Opinion	3 (25%)	-
Objections		3 (60%)
Comments (support)	-	1 (20%)
Comments (no support)	-	1 (20%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>

- 2.61. There were three objections to the proposal. Two of these objections were from business in the shopping parade. A further business opposes the proposals and suggested a number of other restrictions instead. Six of the customers from this business who lived some distance from the parade (two from outside the borough) also raised objection because they visit the shops / businesses on the parade for longer periods than the 20 minute free period that would be available with pay and display parking. Each of the objectors oppose the requirement for payment to park here. One response whilst welcoming the proposals, requested the operational hours be extended to cover Saturday as well. The current waiting restrictions in

force prevent any vehicles from parking in this parade during the controlled times.

- 2.62. The pay and display and permit parking proposals came in response to local requests for such measures. Other parking will potentially be available quite close by in roads only restricted between 2pm and 3pm. It will encourage parking turnover during the day and with the first 20 minutes free period available to on-street pay and display parking now in Harrow this will allow a short visit to these shops without incurring a charge. Even with the objections, the majority of the responses from addresses local to the proposals are in favour.
- 2.63. It is therefore recommend that the change to shared use permit bays and pay and display is installed as advertised.

### Analysis of consultation results – Area 5

- 2.64. This section details the responses received from Area 5 which includes Dalkeith Grove, Dovercourt Gardens, Heronslea Drive. The table below provides details of the various consultation results. A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.

Road	Original Consultation: Support proposed measures in your street?			Original Consultation: Support proposed inclusion into Stanmore CPZ?			Statutory Consultation Results	
	Yes	No	No Opinion	Yes	No	No Opinion	Objection	Comment
Dalkeith Grove	10	29	4	31	11	2	10	7
Dovercourt Gardens	12	4	1	10	6	1	1	0
Heronslea Drive	5		1	5		1	0	0

#### Dalkeith Grove

- 2.65. In the initial public consultation there was strong objection from residents to the proposed sections of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) intended to address the severe congestion at school / college opening and closing times. These proposals were changed following discussions at this Panel in July 2014 to propose waiting restrictions operating Monday to Friday, 2 - 3pm (single yellow lines) along both sides of Dalkeith Grove east of the railway line to the bend in the road by no. 28 Dalkeith Grove.
- 2.66. In the statutory consultation 10 objections were received, 6 of these specifically calling for the original double yellow line proposal developed from the public consultation to be implemented. All the objections stated

that the 2 - 3pm period was the wrong period and that the proposed single yellow line will not address this because the traffic and parking associated with school drop-off and pickup was considered the main issue. There was also concern that it penalised residents and their visitors by preventing them parking on street during the controlled times.

- 2.67. There were also seven responses in favour of the proposed single yellow line restrictions.
- 2.68. This feedback shows a divergence of opinion amongst residents. Site observations confirm the traffic congestion is confined to either end of the school day when the amount of on-street parking is much heavier than at other times. It is considered likely that removing all day parking may just allow more space for parking associated with school journeys.
- 2.69. It is necessary to review the consultation responses objectively and consider in particular road safety, accessibility and the local amenity of the public highway for the wider public. Based on the objections received during the statutory consultation it is recommended that the proposed single yellow line in Dalkeith Grove be abandoned.
- 2.70. It is considered that a new proposal will need to be developed consisting of a controlled parking zone with permit bays, operational Monday to Friday 2 - 3pm, but with the inclusion of additional no parking areas to allow passing of vehicles during the busy school period.
- 2.71. It is therefore recommended that the panel consider a further review of this road at their meeting in February 2015 and agree to make available funding in the 2015/16 financial year for this purpose.
- 2.72. A separate proposal to introduce and extend school safety zone zig-zag markings at the entrances of Aylward Primary school and North London Collegiate school (NLCS) received much less comment. There was one formal objection to the extension of the school zig zag markings by the entrance to NLCS from a nearby resident who stated it would prevent them parking on street near their home. The property does have off-street parking for several vehicles and any visitor parking on-street would still be relatively close to the premises.
- 2.73. The new and extended school zig-zag restrictions were welcomed by another resident. The extended markings will make it easier for coaches and other large vehicles to access the school entrance and remove potentially parked vehicles from the exit of the bridge.
- 2.74. In this instance the extension is considered appropriate and it is recommended that these markings be installed as advertised..

#### Dovercourt Gardens and Heronslea Drive

- 2.75. It was proposed to include the northern part of Dovercourt Gardens in the Stanmore CPZ Zone H up to its junction with Heronslea Drive and in all of

Heronlea Drive. The CPZ operates Monday to Saturday, 10 - 11am and 3 - 4pm.

- 2.76. Only one objection was received from these two roads.
- 2.77. There were two further responses which although specifying no address would appear to come from the unrestricted section of Pangbourne Drive. These expressed concern about the displaced parking if the CPZ were to be extended and restrictions introduced in Dalkeith Grove. They are not objecting to the proposals as directly affected residents within the extent of the proposed measures. The representation from Dovercourt Gardens just outside of the proposed CPZ requests to be included within the zone due to family circumstances.
- 2.78. Setting the boundary of a proposed CPZ is difficult because it has to specify inclusion and exclusion from the zone. Although sympathetic to the resident's personal circumstances it is not possible to add something that has not been advertised at this time. This premises can only be included if the zone is extended to include these two properties but that would require a new consultation to consider a different proposal and so cannot be considered at this time.
- 2.79. There was also one objection to the extension of CPZ Zone H but not specifically mentioning any roads. They were objecting to the 3 - 4pm hour and suggested that it be 2 - 3pm to allow parents to park closer to the school. They did appreciate the need to control commuter parking but would prefer the 2 - 3pm as it would be less restrictive for the parents. Again such a proposal would affect the whole zone and would require a new consultation to consider a different proposal and so cannot be considered at this time.
- 2.80. Officers therefore recommend that the proposed CPZ extension in Dovercourt Garden and Heronslea Drive be installed as advertised.
- 2.81. It is therefore recommended that the panel consider a further review of Dovercourt road at their meeting in February 2015 and agree to make available funding in the 2015/16 financial year for this purpose.

## **Analysis of consultation results – Area 6**

### Craigweil Close

- 2.82. This section details the responses received from Area 6 which includes Craigweil Close. A plan of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix D**.



- 2.83. Proposals to include Craigweil Close in the adjacent Stanmore CPZ Zone B, which operates Monday to Friday 3 - 4pm were part of the statutory consultation. There were no responses or objections received so it is recommended that this road be included in the CPZ as advertised.

### **Summary**

- 2.84. 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.
- 2.85. It can be seen that most of the proposals have been approved based on the objections and comments received as detailed in the main part of the report. The proposals to extend CPZs, introduce waiting restrictions and introduce or amend permit / shared use / pay and display bays have all been agreed with the following exceptions:
- Peters Close – remove single yellow lines
  - Buckingham Gardens – remove single yellow lines and consider a future controlled parking zone
  - Dalkeith Grove – remove single yellow lines and consider a future controlled parking zone / parking restrictions
  - Dovercourt Road – consider future extension controlled parking zone
- 2.86. Subject to approval all residents living within the consultation area will be advised of the outcome of this consultation.
- 2.87. 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**

- 2.88. 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.

### **Legal implications**

- 2.89. 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**

- 2.90. 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 £30k for the implementation of the Canons Park area parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2014 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.91. In addition there is a £40k allocation from developer contributions (section 106 agreement) from the development of the Old Government Offices site on Honeypot Lane (now known as Fountain Park). The monies have been received by the Council and must be used within 5 years. In accordance with the legal agreement this funding will be used to treat parking issues that are within 400 metres of the site. This allocation will therefore be used in conjunction with the Harrow Capital monies to implement the recommended proposals.
- 2.92. 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. Any income raised will be used to fund the costs of administration and enforcement.

### **Equalities implications / Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 2.93. 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:

<b>Equalities Group</b>	<b>Benefit</b>
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.

- 2.94. 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.

### **Council Priorities**

- 2.95. The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with the administration's priorities as follows:

<b>Corporate priority</b>	<b>Impact</b>
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 commuters and other forms of long stay parking.</p>
Making a difference for local businesses	<p>The changes to parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to give more customers parking access to shops.</p>

- 2.96. 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



on behalf of the  
Monitoring Officer

Date: 26/11/14

**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, Traffic & Parking Management  
020 8424 1888

### **Background Papers:**

Annual Parking Review Report, to this Panel February 2014

Consultation responses- copies placed in member's library

Previous TARSAP report dated 17<sup>th</sup> July 2014