

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	10 December 2014
<b>Subject:</b>	Welbeck Road 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, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Roxbourne West Harrow
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> Statutory Consultation Document <b>Appendix B</b> Statutory consultation responses listed by road and issues raised <b>Appendix C</b> Consideration of individual formal objections and other representations <b>Appendix D</b> Recommended proposals for implementation

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides results of the statutory consultation exercise carried out in the Welbeck Road area in 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 for approval the following :

1. That a new controlled parking zone as set out in **Appendix D** operating Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am and 3pm to 4pm is introduced at the following addresses:
  - Welbeck Road - Nos. 123 to 171 (odds) and 144 to 194 (evens),
  - Tintern Way - Nos. 75 to 95 (odds) and 64 to 80 (evens),
  - Scott Crescent - nos. 35 to 53 Unity Terrace only,
  - Coles Crescent - Leafy Court (No. 83), Annan Court, Concord Terrace and Roxeth Green Free Church,
  - Cerise Court, Drinkwater Road,
  - Eliot Drive nos. 18 & 20
2. That the controlled parking proposals in the following roads are not implemented:
  - Welbeck Road nos. 91 to 121 and nos. 104 to 142,
  - Scott Crescent.
3. That "at any time" no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are introduced at junctions, bends, and narrow sections of road as detailed in the advertised traffic regulation orders,
4. That the formal objections to the revised proposal as indicated in the report be set aside and the objectors informed,
5. 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 Welbeck Road 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 Panel on the 5<sup>th</sup> February 2014 for roads in the Welbeck Road area of South Harrow.

### **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 consultation were to support or object the proposals developed by the councils.
- 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 area surrounding the junction of Welbeck Road and The Arches has suffered from parking and access issues for a number of years. The Panel consequently prioritised this area for a parking review in February 2013.
- 2.5 The main parking issues are generated by the businesses in The Arches, a private road owned by Transport for London and London Underground. Almost all of these businesses are connected with the motor industry and undertake the servicing / repair of cars and light vans. Parking for Grange Primary School also exacerbates the problems for school drop off and pick up at either end of the school day by parents and guardians of school children.
- 2.6 The results of an informal public consultation on parking issues in this area were reported to the Panel on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014. A statutory consultation on a reduced size controlled parking zone was agreed. The area agreed was where the majority of responses noted a parking problem and believed a controlled parking zone (CPZ) offered the best means of addressing it.

### **Statutory Consultation**

- 2.7 In late September 2014 consultation leaflets were delivered to a total of 750 addresses which explained the CPZ proposals, the statutory consultation process involved and detailed instructions on how to make a

formal objection to the proposals. This included all of the original consultation area at the informal consultation stage. A copy of the statutory consultation leaflet is shown in **Appendix A**.

- 2.8 The traffic regulation order was advertised on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 for a 21 day period in a local newspaper as well as on street notices placed in the affected roads during this period. The statutory consultation ended on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014.

### **Statutory Consultation results**

- 2.9 During the statutory consultation period, officers received a total of 60 responses of which 40 were statutory objections.. A “hybrid” petition, from residents of Welbeck Road objecting to the CPZ, was attached to one of the formal objections. The detail of this petition is reported separately on the agenda to this Panel and is analysed in this report.
- 2.10 Independent 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 road by road summary of the statutory objections and other responses is shown in **Appendix B**. The reasons for each objection are summarised together with officers comments in **Appendix C**.
- 2.11 Following an analysis of the responses, the most common reasons for objection are summarised below:
- Having to pay for residents and visitors permits to park and this being perceived as revenue generation by the council,
  - That there was not a significant parking problem,
  - The controlled times and days of operation were not appropriate,
  - The impact of parking displacement on nearby residential roads not included in the scheme, in particular parts of Coles Crescent and Tintern Way.
- 2.12 There were no specific objections to any of the “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposed.
- 2.13 A meeting was held with the ward councillors to discuss the results and the issues raised and to consider how the proposals might be modified to address the objections raised.

### **Analysis of results in proposed areas**

Welbeck Road - Twyford Road to Coles Crescent  
Tintern Way - Welbeck Road to no. 75 Tintern Way

- 2.14 Welbeck Road is a relatively long residential street with the majority of the parking issues at the Coles Crescent end. Approximately half of the addresses were included within the original consultation area agreed at the stakeholder meeting.

- 2.15 The scheme proposed in Welbeck Road at statutory consultation stage was reduced to an area between Twyford Road and Coles Crescent as a consequence of the consultation results. The strongest support for a CPZ came from addresses between the Railway line and the school entrance with diminishing support toward the Twyford Road end.
- 2.16 Approximately half of Tintern Way at the Welbeck Road end was consulted in the informal consultation. The scheme extents were reduced based on the consultation results to the first 20 addresses in the road nearest Welbeck Road as the responses showed support in this area.
- 2.17 The responses and representations are considered jointly in this section because of the relatively small number of addresses in Tintern Way and close proximity to Welbeck Road.
- 2.18 The distribution of formal objections and other representations received follows a similar pattern to the informal consultation and is shown below.

<b>Welbeck Road (Coles Crescent to Twyford Rd) Tintern Way (Welbeck Rd to no. 75)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation (no questionnaire)</b>
Support	22 (58%)	-
Do not support	16 (42%)	-
No opinion/other	-	-
Objections	-	25 (67%)
Comments	-	12 (33%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>

- 2.19 The main reasons for objections raised are as follows:
- that there is no parking problem (especially from addresses closer to Twyford Road);
  - that residents do not want to pay to park outside their address (some of whom suggest action should be taken to prevent The Arches business parking in their road without resorting to a CPZ),
  - that the time of operation is too long.
- 2.20 An analysis of the objections has indicated that in Welbeck Road 10 objections were received between Tintern Way and the railway bridge. The remaining 13 objections were between Tintern Way and Twyford Road. In Tintern Way 2 objections were received that were outside of the extent of the CPZ.
- 2.21 In the section of Welbeck Road between Tintern Way and the railway bridge the objections are further analysed as follows:
- 6 objections state that the period of restriction is too long,

- 6 objections state that they do not wish to pay to park outside of their homes,
- 4 objectors regard the CPZ as a means of revenue generation by the council,
- 3 objectors consider that there is not a parking problem or that the residential situation make a CPZ inappropriate,
- 2 objectors express concerns over whether enforcement will be effective as recently painted yellow lines have not been enforced.

2.22 In the section of Welbeck Road between Tintern Way and Twyford Way which is further away there are 7 objections which specifically state there is not a parking problem. The objections from Tintern Way similarly express that the current parking situation does not justify a CPZ. This infers that the residents furthest from the source of the problem at the Arches do not feel the need for any measures to be introduced.

2.23 These and other individual grounds from objection are addressed on an individual basis within **Appendix C**.

2.24 In addition to the formal objections received one petition was received which expressed opposition to the proposals in Welbeck Road. The petition contains 37 signatures and stated that:

*“We, the undersigned, object to Harrow Council’s plan to introduce a Controlled Parking zone along Welbeck Road”*

2.25 The covering e-mail for the petition also indicates that 12 people supported the CPZ and 3 expressed no opinion or were undecided, however, no signatures are recorded where opposition is not indicated.

2.26 An analysis of the petition indicates that 17 of the signatories were located between Tintern Way and the railway bridge and the remaining 20 signatories between Tintern Way and Twyford Road.

2.27 Consideration was given to reducing the length of Welbeck Road included in the zone as there was strong evidence to suggest that parking controls had greater support in the section between the railway bridge and Tintern Way. In this part of the road there were 14 responses in favour of a scheme at the informal consultation stage compared with 10 objections received at the statutory consultation stage. It is therefore recommended the CPZ area on Welbeck Road be reduced to the area between properties nos. 144 to 194 (even nos. side) and between properties nos. 123 and 171 (odd nos. side) and the area in Tintern Way should remain as advertised.

#### Coles Crescent – Welbeck Road to Serenity Close

2.28 Coles Crescent is another relatively long residential street with the majority of the parking issues at the Welbeck Road end. Approximately half of the addresses were in the original consultation area as agreed at the stakeholder meeting. The addresses further away from the junction with Welbeck Road by Serenity Close were not included in the CPZ proposals

as a majority did not support a CPZ here in the informal public consultation.

- 2.29 This section of the analysis includes Annan Court, Cerise Court, Concord Terrace, the junction with Welbeck Road and adjoining sections of Drinkwater Road and Elliot Drive. This because the main entrances to these premises are predominantly facing Coles Crescent and the location of parking bays in close proximity. The distribution of formal objections and other representations received is shown below.

<b>Coles Crescent (Welbeck Rd – Serenity Cl) Drinkwater Road (part) Eliot Drive (part) Serenity Court</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation (no questionnaire)</b>
Support	11 (61%)	-
Do not support	7 (39%)	-
No opinion/other	-	-
Objections	-	10 (71%)
Comments	-	4 (29%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>

- 2.30 Ten objections were raised in this area, however, 3 of these were outside of the proposed CPZ. Two were from Serenity Close and 1 from Eliot Drive. These objections from outside of the proposed CPZ were mainly concerned about parking becoming worse near their addresses. The one from Eliot Drive felt the CPZ is only needed in Welbeck Road and should be confined to school times. The 2 formal representations received from Serenity Close were split between 1 objector that felt there was no problem and another that felt they should have been included in the CPZ due to the existing parking problems.

- 2.31 Of the remaining 7 formal objections that were within the extent of the proposed scheme the reasons for objections are summarised as follows:

- One objection was outside the CPZ
- Objections to paying for permits for either themselves or visitors,
- Some objectors are disabled or have health problems and have concerns about friends, family or professional carers requiring large numbers of visitor permits in order to visit,
- Most were concerned that deliveries especially from the pharmacy would be adversely affected,
- The small size of the zone would allow most visitors to find parking spaces outside the zone relatively close to any address in Coles Crescent.

- 2.32 Many responses expressed the view that that parking problems caused by the businesses from The Arches should be controlled without recourse to a permit parking scheme or costs to its residents. However, in the absence

of any controls vehicles are currently entitled to be parked on the public highway irrespective of whether they are residents or not. The introduction of parking controls through permits does allow residents the opportunity to have priority over this road space during the controlled hours.

- 2.33 The objections should be viewed in the context of the 11 responses favouring restrictions in the previous informal consultation compared with 7 objections at the statutory consultation stage. It is recommended that the CPZ area in Coles Crescent and the adjacent sections of Drinkwater Road and Eliot Road should remain as advertised.

#### Scott Crescent

- 2.34 Scott Crescent did not show support for a CPZ at the informal consultation, however, the panel agreed to include Scott Crescent due to concerns over potential parking displacement from Coles Crescent and Welbeck Road that were included in the scheme. This allowed these residents another opportunity to consider whether they wanted to be within the CPZ. The responses from both consultations are shown in the table below.

<b>Scott Crescent (Welbeck Rd – Austen Rd)</b>	<b>Original consultation results (questionnaire)</b>	<b>Statutory consultation (no questionnaire)</b>
Support	2 (22%)	-
Do not support	7 (78%)	-
No opinion/other	-	-
Objections	-	5 (63%)
Comments	-	3 (37%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>

- 2.35 On the basis of responses received in both consultations there is no justification for continuing with CPZ proposals in Scott Crescent and it is recommend these proposals should be removed from the scheme.
- 2.36 The entrances to Nos. 35 to 53 Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent face onto Welbeck Road where there is an inset parking bay used for residential parking. This parking is more convenient to these Scott Crescent addresses and therefore it is recommended that these residents be allowed to purchase permits to park within the CPZ area if this part of Welbeck Road is approved for inclusion in a CPZ by the panel.

#### CPZ operational hours

- 2.37 The hours of operation of the CPZ proposed in the statutory consultation were Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6.30pm. These hours were based on the responses received in the informal public consultation reported to the Panel in July 2014. This was considered the longest hours justifiable in this location based on site observations.



- 2.38 The selection of the most appropriate hours for a new CPZ is often a difficult balance between adequately addressing the parking issues whilst allowing as much flexibility for residents and their visitors to park unrestricted. The worst periods observed are at school opening and closing times and residents that responded to the consultation have expressed reservations at the length of the operational hours proposed.
- 2.39 In Welbeck Road 13 of the formal objections received during the statutory consultation specifically objected to the time, all stating it was excessive and 5 of the 10 objections in the revised CPZ area suggested in this report have this as their main reason for objecting. This would suggest that a shorter operational period would make the scheme more acceptable.
- 2.40 In Coles Crescent many objections highlighted the cost of visitor permits and their dependence on visitors as their main grounds for objection. A reduction in the operating hours would allow more scope for visitors to avoid parking during the operational hours. In addition a number of residents who use their vehicles for travel to work may not need a permit if the hours are shortened. Of those objecting to the advertised operational hours the need for restrictions on Saturday was challenged by almost all.
- 2.41 Introducing a CPZ with shorter operational hours would still be an improvement on the current situation. Residents have complained about vehicles associated with the businesses being left for extended periods of the day and this would be disrupted by introducing measures. Whilst reduced operational hours may provide scope for businesses to still park vehicles for a shorter duration it would still prevent any all-day parking. Parking for the school also exacerbates pressure on available road space at school opening and closing times and so a Monday to Friday 9am - 10am and 3pm - 4pm operational period is recommended.

Double yellow lines at junctions, turning heads, along narrow sections of the carriageway and at the bends throughout the consultation area

- 2.42 The introduction of 'at any time' waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and specific crossing points throughout the consultation area are in accordance with guidance from the Highway Code and computer simulation of vehicle swept paths throughout the consultation area.
- 2.43 No objections were received specifically to these proposals and it is recommended that these proposals proceed as advertised.

Summary

- 2.44 Officers met with local ward councillors on 6<sup>th</sup> November prior to the panel meeting to discuss all the results from the consultation. They have supported the officer's recommendations in this report.
- 2.45 It is evident that the parking issues although exacerbated by parking at either end of the school day around the school also occur across a wider area focussed on The Arches. These problems should be addressed by the introduction of a CPZ in the sections of Welbeck Road, Tintern Way and Coles Crescent identified in the report and as shown in **Appendix D**.

## **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.46 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**

- 2.47 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**

- 2.48 This scheme is part of the Parking Management programme. There is a Harrow Capital allocation for this programme of £300k in 2014/15. A sub allocation of £35k for implementation of the Welbeck Road area parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2014 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.49 If the scheme is implemented parking income will be generated from resident / visitor permits charges and 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**

- 2.50 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:

<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 non-residents vehicles 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 and the elderly are particularly sensitive.

2.51 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

2.52 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>
<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>There is no specific benefit to businesses, however, the detrimental and anti-social impact of parking on residents is moderated by controlled parking.</p>

2.53 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: Ajay Thakerar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 25/11/14		

<b>Ward Councillors notified:</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>EqIA carried out:</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>EqIA cleared by:</b>	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: Stephen Freeman- Project Engineer – Traffic and Parking  
020 8424 1437

#### Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports – July 2014 / February 2013  
Consultation responses