# Draft Report

# **REVIEW OF CONSULTATION FOR HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION SCHEMES**

### 1. <u>Executive Summary</u>

#### 2. <u>Background</u>

It was agreed at the sub committee meeting on 5 September 2002 that:-

(a) the scope of the review be

To identify and evaluate the effectiveness of current consultation procedures with the objective of incorporating best practice and standardising where possible.

Areas for examination to include:-

Highway maintenance Street Tree Removal Enforcement Local Safety Schemes CPZ Crossovers Pedestrian Crossings London and other Cycle Networks Waiting restrictions

(b) The Methodology be

The review will be conducted through a combination of officer reports, views of customers, traffic panel inc. Advisors etc. and by comparison with best value in other Boroughs.

Current procedures, the views of traffic panel and advisors, and customers, legal requirements and costs will be taken into account. The relationship between speed of carrying out schemes and the consultative mechanism employed will be explored.

## 3. Initial Review

A full set of documents for each of the areas under review was assembled by the officers and considered by a working group (copies at Appendix A if considered necessary). The examined each set of documents against the criteria of consultation and drew up a list of those which it was considered should be examined in more detail and those where it was felt there was no real consultation aspect. The table below sets out their conclusions which were endorsed at the December meeting of the Sub Committee.

# Consultation arrangements for Highway and Transportation Services

(Figures in brackets refers to consultation letters deposited in the Member Library)

<u>Examine</u>	<u>Service</u>	Consultation/Information Process	Other Authority Practice
Yes	Controlled Parking Zones Mike Symons Ext: 2535	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel has adopted a 4 stage approach to CPZ consultation (20 June 2002) and this is set out on see CPZ1 (attached). All schemes are subject to the procedure but where a fast track is agreed by Members stage (b) is omitted.	Hertfordshire advertise in a local paper and display in the library.
		<ul> <li>The stages are:</li> <li>a) Stakeholder meeting to discuss study area, with residents, businesses, emergency services</li> <li>b) Seek views of residents and businesses and Ward Members in proposed scheme on whether or not to proceed (see CPZ/2)</li> <li>c) Amend design/area in the light of comments and re-consult (see CPZ/3)</li> <li>d) Statutory notice of proposed scheme advertised (see CPZ/4)</li> </ul>	
		Statutory Notices for all schemes involves widespread notification and include statutory bodies, local residents associations, pedestrian and cycle groups etc but not individual residents	Newham publish glossy consultation papers but in a trial of glossy vs plain paper Westminster saw no difference in response from residents
		The scheme as implemented is reviewed in about 12 months if there are outstanding concerns. Average response to the consultation stage (b) and (c) is about 20%-30%. Schemes only proceed with majority agreement. It takes about 2 years from the start to the implementation of a scheme due to the extent of consultation and the need to report to Traffic Panel. Omitting stages can in the long run delay schemes due to counter petitions.	
		Scrutiny Committee of 29 September and 22 May 2001 reviewed the consultation arrangements for CPZs.	

<b>Examine</b>	<u>Service</u>	Consultation/Information Process	Other Authority Practice
Yes	Cycle route schemes Sajadd Farid Ext: 2484	Major cycle route schemes are subject to consultation and results are reported to the traffic panel. There is a separate notification where traffic management schemes are also involved.	
Yes	Local Safety Schemes	Local safety schemes are carried out following an analysis of accidents in the area and the work is fully funded by Transport for London who will only grant monies if a rigorous approach is used. Frontagers are therefore informed of their scheme but not consulted. This has caused concern to some individuals in the past generally when the scheme reduced their parking options.	
Yes	Bus Lanes Elaine Wyatt Ext: 2548	All schemes have one consultation (see BL1). All of these schemes are carried out by a consultant engaged to work for NW London Boroughs and managed by a lead Borough. Response rate is very low typically less than 10%.	
Yes	Traffic Calming Mohsen Nekouzad Ext: 2888	Funding has been secured for TFL for the first time in many years.	
Yes	Waiting Restrictions Mike Symons Ext: 2535	These are usually a response to representation and petitions and where there is clear agreement the consultation is by way of the statutory traffic order.	
No	Street Tree Removal Ext: 2759	Trees are removed if they are dead or endanger safety, where subsidence is being caused to private property and sometimes where a pavement crossing has been agreed. In the case of safety removal and for subsidence claims the immediately adjoining residents, Ward Members and Portfolio Holder are informed about the planned removal (see ST/1)	Ealing advised residents of planned removals. Bexley also do so and post Notices on the tree affected. Hillingdon consult and provide options where appropriate.

<b>Examine</b>	Service	Consultation/Information Process	Other Authority Practice
No	Highway Maintenance Dave Masters Ext: 2580	Consultation is carried out by way of letter drops to affected residents on major schemes. IN addition letters are put on vehicles where parking is an issue which could impede the works. Copies of letters are also sent to Ward Councillors. In most cases one of several standard letters is (see HM1)	
No	Highway Enforcement Dennis Thompson Ext: 2500	As an enforcement duty there is no consultation undertaken but there are many standard notices depending upon the infringement (see HE1).	
No	Crossovers John Almond Ext: 2497	An information leaflet 'Parking in front gardens – a guide' is available to applicants and one of 31 standard letters is used for various stages. (see C1) Neighbours and Ward members are informed in the case of tree removal, where the Principal Landscape Architect considers that the tree is not significant to the overall streetscene.	

# 4. <u>Joint Meeting of the Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee and the</u> <u>Transport and Road Safety Advisory Panel</u>

This meeting took place on 25 February 2003 and Members were given presentations from officers within the Transportation Section on Harrow's CPZ. Procedure which is set out below, and that of other London Boroughs.

# **STAGES INVOLVED IN PREPARING A CPZ**

NB – This is a simplified model approach, for illustrative purposes, assuming no complications.

There is an annual review of priorities and agreement of work programme. All petitions and requests received during the year are considered at this meeting. Once the principle of investigating a CPZ is agreed, the following stages are typically involved:

- a) Define study area including consideration of area(s) that are likely to receive displaced parking
- b) <u>Stage 1 Consultation</u> stakeholder meeting to discuss study area and clarify issues, problems and policy framework
- c) Agree boundary and scheme principles with Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder
- d) <u>Stage 2 Consultation</u> do people want a CPZ/residents permit scheme or not? Only proceed with majority support
- e) Analyse results and determine area to go forward to detail design agreement by Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder if necessary ie. if contentious or uncertain
- f) Detail design of selected area
- g) <u>Stage 3 Consultation</u> on detail design
- h) Amend design in light of consultation and agree "final" design (via Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder if contentious or uncertain)
- i) Draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- j) Consult Police on TRO (statutory)
- k) <u>Stage 4 Consultation</u> Advertise TRO (statutory)
- I) Consider objections to TRO (statutory) Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder
- m) Agree final scheme (can be concurrent with previous stage)
- n) Prepare detailed drawings for manufacturers and contractors and arrange procurement
- o) Implement
- p) Review within 12 months, subject to demand

q) Further reviews subject to workload prioritisation

A discussion then took place on both Harrow's and other Boroughs procedures and the following conclusion was reached:-

That overall the consultation process worked. However, in order to achieve a higher response rate and greater customer satisfaction, the following recommendations should be considered:-

- 1) That where there is firm evidence of overall support for the scheme Stages 1 and 2 should be combined
- 2) That more use be made of Public Meetings and/or exhibitions at Stage 2
- 3) That use is made of Street Notices, the Council Website and Press Notices to alert people to the Consultation Process
- 4) There is a need to improve consultation with business and face to face meetings are suggested
- 5) Where schemes have a low response rate respondees should be targeted in an attempt to increase the response rate
- 6) The results of the consultation should be published on the Council Website, in a Press Release and at Local Libraries
- 7) A one off use of a communications advisor to review language and layout to create a Clear consistent style and identity
- 8) Roads just outside the CPZ area should be alerted to possible consequences that might arise once the CPZ is in operation

The lessons that Harrow might learn from other Boroughs were considered but mainly confirmed that Harrow was on the right lines i.e. most boroughs had a response rate of 30% similar to Harrow's. However, some of the more innovative steps from elsewhere form part of the recommendations above/

We would also recommend that a Parking Guide for the Zone is issued to coincide with the commencement of the scheme and be issued to all Householders and local libraries.

It was also felt that on Cycle Networks that the Harrow representatives of The London Cycling Campaign should be consulted.

## 5. Consultation with London Borough of Harrow Staff

To be carried out

## 6. <u>Feedback from Residents</u>

To be carried out

## 7. <u>Recommendations</u>

List those above and others from final stage at 5 and 6.