

REPORT FOR: Traffic And Road Safety Advisory Panel

Date of Meeting:	23 November 2015
Subject:	Headstone Lane area parking review - Public Consultation
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Venetia Reid-Baptiste - Divisional Director Commissioning Services
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Graham Henson - Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes
Wards affected:	Hatch End, Headstone North
Enclosures:	Appendix A Stakeholder meeting notes – Headstone Lane area parking review Appendix B Headstone Lane area parking review - public consultation document Appendix C Consultation responses listed by road and questions Appendix D Petitions received Appendix E Area recommended for detailed design and statutory consultation

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report details the results of the public consultation carried out in the Headstone Lane area in September 2015 on a possible controlled parking scheme. The report requests the Panel to recommend proposals to the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety and to proceed with a statutory consultation.

Recommendations:

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

- (a) A controlled parking zone including resident permit bays is introduced operating Monday to Friday, 10am – 3pm within the boundary shown in Appendix E in the following roads and that eligibility for permits is restricted to the following addresses:
 - Headstone Lane (Nos. 155 to 291 odds, 194 to 350 evens, Letchford House and Letchford Terrace),
 - Long Elmes (207 to 283 odds and 200 to 252 evens),
 - Chantry Road,
 - West Chantry,
 - Chantry Place (public highway section only),
 - Mullion Close,
 - Broadfields,
 - Randon Close,
 - Fernleigh Court,
 - Barmor Close, and
 - Parkfield Avenue (Nos. 23 to 63 odds, 42 to 94 and Laura Court).
- (b) To introduce Shared use bays (“pay & display” and permit holders) and “Pay & Display” bays in Long Elmes and Headstone Lane by the shopping parades with a tariff of 10p per 20minutes for pay and display (first 20 mins per day free),
- (c) Introduce a loading bay in Long Elmes to operate Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm,
- (d) Introduce Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm waiting restrictions in Headstone Lane and Courtenay Avenue (between Secker Crescent and Pinner Park Avenue)
- (e) Introduce “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions, crossing points, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends throughout the consultation area.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To regulate parking in the Headstone Lane area as detailed in the report. The measures are in response to requests from residents and businesses to address parking problems in their area to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

- 2.1 Parking has a significant impact on the quality of life of Harrow's residents and a significant impact on the viability of Harrow's businesses and is one of the main transport issues reported to the Council. This report sets out how parking issues raised by residents and businesses in the area around Headstone Lane station are being addressed by an area wide parking review.

Options considered

- 2.2 A stakeholder meeting was held in July 2015 including community representatives and councillors to review the scope and objectives of the public consultation proposed. The consultation material was developed based on the feedback from the meeting.
- 2.3 A public consultation exercise was undertaken to establish the geographic extent that residents considered parking to be a problem. It also measured support for controlled parking or other parking restrictions in the area. The consultation questionnaire provided a range of options for residents to consider as well as an opportunity to provide comments. These have been assessed and are presented in this report for consideration.
- 2.4 There was a wide range of opinion expressed by people within the consultation area. Whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view is reflected in the recommendations made in this report.

Background

- 2.5 At the February 2015 Panel meeting it was agreed to include the Headstone Lane area scheme in the 2015/16 Parking Management programme of work for investigation and consultation. Schemes are included in the programme based on a borough wide review of public requests for parking schemes and an assessment of the severity of the problems based on agreed criteria and their respective priorities.
- 2.6 The area consists of residential properties, businesses in a small industrial estate on the west side of Headstone Lane, two shopping parades in Long Elmes and Headstone Lane, Headstone Lane London Overground station,

St Teresa's RC primary school, Shaftesbury School and Hatch End High School. The area is split by the West Coast main line railway line which forms the boundary between Hatch End and Headstone North wards.

- 2.7 To the north-east of the railway line and east of Headstone Lane in Hatch End ward it is mostly local authority housing some of which has been sold. Few properties have off street parking although there are some parking areas owned by Harrow Housing either side of Augustine Road. The high density of housing and limited off street parking combine to leave little free parking space especially in the evenings and at weekends. There is a service road on the north side of Long Elmes which provides parking for the adjacent shopping parade.
- 2.8 A petition from Long Elmes businesses and local residents called on the council to introduce parking controls to address parking problems outside the shops and in surrounding streets to address non-residential long stay parking, particularly rail commuters. The petition claimed businesses were being damaged by a lack of parking available for customers and requested 2 hours free parking in the service road and consideration of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) around the station. It was this petition along with other residents' complaints which led this Panel to prioritise the area for a parking review. The parking situation in Long Elmes and nearby roads is exacerbated by parents / carers driving children to and from St Teresa's school.
- 2.9 In Headstone South ward apart from the 24 maisonettes by the station the properties are privately owned mainly detached or semi-detached houses generally with off street parking. Broadfields, a side road leading from Headstone Lane opposite the railway station has heavy parking during week days. This has led to complaints from residents and even a petition, reported separately to this Panel meeting, specifically requesting a CPZ.
- 2.10 The provisional consultation area was determined by site observations and including roads where parking issues had been raised. This area was finalised at a stakeholders meeting held on 7 July 2015. This meeting also helped refine the general consultation format and questionnaire to reflect local circumstances and feedback from community representatives. Notes of the stakeholder meeting can be seen in **Appendix A**.

Public consultation

- 2.11 The public consultation for the Headstone Lane area parking review was undertaken between 14 September and 4 October 2015. A copy of the consultation document and questionnaire can be seen in **Appendix B**. The consultation documents were hand delivered to approximately eight hundred and thirty properties within the consultation area and were also made available on the Harrow Council public website to enable online responses.

- 2.12 The responses were either received by post or on line and were analysed on a road by road basis to ascertain where a majority indicated parking problems, what type of restrictions were preferred and where localised support within road sections was demonstrated. Residents were also asked whether their opinion regarding support for a scheme would change if a majority in an adjoining street supported a scheme so that the panel could consider the implications of any parking displacement issues.
- 2.13 The consultation area selected by the stakeholder meeting was intentionally set to a wider area than that where specific parking problems were observed so that residents could determine the extent of any proposed measures without any limitations. This consultation area is shown in **Appendix E**.
- 2.14 Area based parking management schemes such as these incorporate a review of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) across the consultation area which are proposed for safety and access reasons within the area and are recommended separately from the outcome of the controlled parking review. This is because these restrictions are intended to reinforce the requirements of the Highway Code which set out where vehicles should not park (e.g at junctions) and to prevent obstruction and improve road safety.

Responses

- 2.15 Approximately 830 properties within the consultation area received a consultation document. There were 150 responses received either by post or online. Some of these included addresses outside the CPZ consultation area, duplicate responses from the same address or did not specify an address and these have been excluded leaving 124 valid responses. This represents an overall response rate of 15% and is consistent with the expected response rate for this type of consultation.
- 2.16 A tabulated summary of responses to the consultation questionnaire is provided on a road by road basis in **Appendix C**. There is variation in the totals because some questions allowed multiple selections and some respondents did not answer all of the questions. This applies to the appendix and the following summary tables in which the results are tabulated.
- 2.17 A 17 signature petition was received during the consultation period from residents of Chantry Road & West Chantry against the proposed double yellow lines in Chantry Road shown on a plan in the consultation documents. A copy of the petition is in **Appendix D** and the petition statement reads:

“We, the undersigned residents of West Chantry and Chantry Road are extremely concerned at the proposal to mark part of Chantry Road with double yellow lines.

West Chantry is a narrow pedestrianised cul-de-sac with no access to cars, serving its residents without driveways, whose only means of parking is along Chantry Road- Many residents of Chantry Road also need to park along that road, which is presently already quite congested, due also to the need of Belmont Motors to place cars there for service or repair.

Therefore reducing parking facilities by double yellow lines would deprive the West Chantry residents below of any ability to park their cars, and cause residents of Chantry Road severe restriction for themselves or visitors.

We earnestly request that no double or single yellow lines are placed along Chantry Road, and strongly recommend a member of Harrow Council to inspect this area, so as to understand our problem first-hand.”

- 2.18 The extent of the proposed double yellow lines to which the petition refers has been reconsidered along with all the other consultation responses received in the analysis section of the report below.
- 2.19 A further petition from residents of Broadfields and Randon Close was received after the consultation period. This followed correspondence from several residents of Broadfields voicing concerns that they might not have any parking restrictions introduced in their road. Reassurance was given that proposals would be taken forward provided there was support demonstrated in the (questionnaire) responses received.
- 2.20 These petitions can be seen in **Appendix D**.
- 2.21 A meeting was held with the ward councillors, in accordance with standard practice to discuss the distribution of responses and the detailed responses. This information is not reproduced in this report for data protection reasons
- 2.22 Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses received and a complete copy will be made available for members to review in the member's library.

Analysis of consultation results

Support for a scheme

- 2.23 The agreed approach to all area-wide parking consultations is first to establish where residents feel existing parking problems exist and then whether they want parking controls introduced to address these issues. Further questions are then asked about what form of parking restriction or control is preferred and for what period any restrictions should apply. **Appendix C** gives a full breakdown of the responses received to the questionnaire on a road by road basis.

- 2.24 An assessment of question 2 “Do you or your visitors find it difficult to find a convenient parking space nearby?” and question 3 “Should the council introduce a parking control scheme to improve the situation?” indicated that occupiers in Headstone Lane, Letchford Terrace, Long Elmes, Broadfields, Fernleigh Court, and Barmor Close indicated at least 60% support for parking controls and should be included in an area scheme.
- 2.25 Consideration of question 4 “would you change your mind if adjoining roads have parking controls?” shows that Randon Close residents would want to be included if a scheme proceeds in the adjacent Broadfields which has shown support. Further consideration of the question 4 responses from Mullion Close, Chantry Road, West Chantry and Parkfield Avenue shows that these should be considered within a scheme if a scheme proceeds in Headstone Lane and Letchford Terrace which have also shown support.
- 2.26 The table below gives a summary of the responses to questions 2, 3 and 4.

Street Name	Number of Addresses	Number of responses	Response rate	Q2 – Difficulty in parking	Q2 - Percentage (yes)	Q3 – Introduce a scheme	Q3 – Percentage (yes)	Q4 – Neighbouring street	Q4 – Percentage (yes)
HATCH END (northeast of railway line)									
Headstone Lane	60	4	7%	1	25%	3	75%	3	75%
Letchford Terrace	19	5	26%	4	80%	4	80%	5	100%
Long Elmes	83	6	7%	6	100%	5	92%	5	92%
Mullion Close	14	2	14%	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%
Chantry Road / West Chantry	34	14	41%	6	42%	2	14%	8	57%
Augustine Road	113	9	8%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%
Juxon Close (not public highway)	20	2	10%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Bancroft Gardens	46	5	11%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%
Secker Crescent	21	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Theobald Crescent	30	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Courtenay Avenue	30	1	3%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Winston Court	10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
HEADSTONE NORTH (southwest of railway line)									
Broadfields	97	10	10%	9	90%	9	90%	10	100%
Fernleigh Court	20	10	50%	6	60%	9	90%	9	90%
Barmor Close	13	9	69%	4	44%	7	78%	9	100%
Headstone Lane	111	29	26%	19	66%	23	79%	24	83%

Randon Close	15	2	13%	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%
Parkfield Avenue (Headstone Ln - Parkfield Cres)	57	12	21%	8	67%	5	42%	7	58%
Parkfield Avenue (all)	93	17	18%	8	47%	5	29%	7	41%

- 2.27 Roads with greater than 60% of the responses received in support of a scheme are shown in bold. All roads to be included in the zone are shaded in the table above and also include streets which would support inclusion of a neighbouring street that showed support.
- 2.28 The responses from Parkfield Avenue are strongly polarised along its length. There is strong demand for parking controls towards the north-western end which is closest to the railway station (and shops). The table above indicates a separate assessment of the responses in Parkfield Avenue which focuses on the section with strongest support between Headstone Lane and Parkfield Crescent to show the level of support.
- 2.29 The two responses from Mullion Close both recognise a parking problem but are equally split on whether parking controls should or should not be introduced. It is recommended to include the road in the scheme due to the existing parking displacement problems observed so that residents can have a second opportunity to comment during the statutory consultation.
- 2.30 West Chantry is an unsurfaced unadopted access to eight properties which has insufficient width to accommodate parking. Residents of West Chantry therefore park vehicles in Chantry Road, from which it leads. This situation is reinforced by the petition from addresses in both roads against the proposed double yellow lines and has a bearing on whether the roads are included in the parking scheme. For this reason the responses of Chantry Road and West Chantry are combined to determine the best approach. The majority of the responses regarding question 4 in both roads favour inclusion on the basis of adjacent neighbouring roads (Headstone Lane, Letchford Terrace) supporting the parking scheme.
- 2.31 Chantry Place provides access from Headstone Lane to Chantry Road and the southern end of Letchford Terrace it also leads to an unadopted section of Chantry Place which gives access to industrial premises. There is only one residential address and a garage business on the adopted part of Chantry Place neither of whom responded to the consultation. Most of the road is already restricted with the exception of the western end beyond the junction with Chantry Road. It is therefore recommended to include the adopted section of the road within the parking scheme as this ensures that a continuous zone can be introduced.
- 2.32 The relatively few responses received from Augustine Road, Bancroft Gardens, Secker Crescent and Juxon Close did not support inclusion and do not acknowledge any parking problems. There were no responses from Theobald Crescent. Given the proximity to the station and observations on site this is quite surprising. Juxon Close is not an adopted street and does

have its own parking and so controls would not be introduced in this location. The one response from Courtenay Avenue was in support of parking controls but not permit parking. It is recommended that all of these roads are not included in the parking scheme area.

Types of parking control and operational hours

- 2.33 An analysis was undertaken in the streets that demonstrated support for a parking control scheme in the table above (questions 2 – 4) in order to determine which form of parking controls are the most appropriate and what operational hours are preferred. Questions 5 and 6 in the questionnaire were used for this analysis. Question 5 allows respondents to indicate their preferences for different parking control measures and question 6 to indicate preferences for different operational hours.
- 2.34 The table below shows the figures only for the particular roads supporting the introduction of a scheme. Please note that in the descriptive text for question 5 in the questionnaire it is suggested that single yellow lines are suitable for Headstone Lane and “pay and display” bays, loading bays and shared use bays are suitable for use in the vicinity of shops.

		Question 5					Question 6			
Street Name	Number of responses	Resident permit parking bay	Single yellow line only	Pay and Display bays	Shared use bays	Loading bays	Mon - Fri, 1 hr am	Mon - Fri, 1 hr pm	Mon - Fri 10am - 3pm	Mon - Sat, 8am- 6pm
HATCH END (northeast of railway line)										
Headstone Lane	4	0	4	3	1	2		1	2	1
Letchford Terrace	5	3	5	3	3	3			2	
Long Elmes	6	4	2	4	4	2	1	1	2	3
Mullion Close	2		1							1
Chantry Road & West Chantry	14	6	4	6	3	2	1	0	5	0
HEADSTONE NORTH (southwest of railway line)										
Broadfields	10	9	2	2	3	2	6		7	
Fernleigh Court	10	7	2	5	4	4	1		7	1
Barmor Close	9	5	7	6	2	5	1		5	5
Headstone Lane	27	16	16	13	17		8	12	7	6
Randon Close	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		1
Parkfield Avenue up to junction with Parkfield Cres	12	4	4	4		4	2	1	2	1
	101	55	49	47	38	25	21	16	39	19

(the preferred type of control and operational hours are shown shaded and in bold)

- 2.35 It can be seen in the table above that there is variation from road to road, however, it is clear that the most popular form of parking control overall is for resident permit parking bays as part of a CPZ. This is supported by over 50% of the responses throughout the scheme area. A high level of support was also indicated for single yellow lines (Headstone Lane) as well. Detailed proposals for permit parking bays in residential streets and single yellow lines in Headstone Lane will therefore be taken forward and more detailed design developed.
- 2.36 The other options in question 5 (pay and display bays, loading bays and shared use bays) relate to measures in the vicinity of local shops. It can be seen in the table above that the most popular form of parking control overall is for “pay and display” bays as part of a CPZ. The other options also had a reasonable level of support.
- 2.37 The Panel will recall the receipt of a petition in December 2014 from the businesses from the Long Elmes shopping parade calling for parking controls to assist their customers. This petition asked for up to 2hours free parking. The consultation document explains that limited period free parking (like 2hours) is impractical due to the excessive enforcement resources required to do this but does also explain the Council’s current policy to allow a 20 minutes free period of parking in “pay and display” bays.
- 2.38 An additional question 9 in the questionnaire asked about what parking controls should be provided outside the shops in Headstone Lane and Long Elmes to support customers of local shopping parades. The table below summarises the responses and indicates “pay and display” as the preferred form of control with shared use bays as the second most popular choice.

Question 9 - Which parking controls should be introduced outside the shops? (as business customers)	Headstone Lane	Long Elmes
Pay & Display (incl initial free 20minutes)	57	44
Shared use (also allows permit parking)	31	18
Permit bay (for permit holders only during operational hours)	15	9
Loading bay (small amount of dedicated space just for loading)	22	16
Other including no restriction (please specify in comments)	16	16
No opinion	14	17

- 2.39 In respect of Long Elmes the provision of “pay and display” bays only would limit parking access to people purchasing tickets and these bays would not accommodate permit holders for residents living above the shops or elsewhere in Long Elmes. Most of the road is already controlled with waiting restrictions (yellow lines) and the only parking areas available are the service road and layby by the shops. It should be noted that there

are no other roads in close proximity within the wider scheme proposed that would provide access to permit bays. It is important to ensure there are adequate spaces to which potential permit holders have access and so it is recommended that a combination of shared use permit parking and “pay & display” bays are provided outside the shops in Long Elmes. Loading and unloading for shops can be undertaken in these types of parking bays, however, access is dependent on the level of parking demand and it is possible that loading could be difficult at peak times when the bays have higher levels of occupation. It is therefore further recommended that a loading bay be provided outside the shops to allow unrestricted access to loading and unloading so that these activities are not obstructed by other parking.

- 2.40 The situation outside the smaller shopping parade in Headstone Lane is simpler in that there is more potential for permit holders to park in permit bays in adjacent side roads in close proximity to the shops within the wider scheme proposed. It is recommended to have a combination of shared use permit parking and “pay & display” bays provided outside the shops in Headstone Lane with a larger proportion of “pay and display” bays.
- 2.41 More detailed designs will be developed for the shopping parades on this basis.
- 2.42 An additional question 7 was asked to clarify which waiting restrictions (yellow lines) should be provided in Headstone Lane and Courtenay Avenue (the area shown in the consultation document between Secker Crescent and Pinner Park Avenue). The results indicated a majority in support of a Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6.30pm single yellow line waiting restriction in both roads. As there is no permit bay provision in Headstone Lane it is recommended that residents living in these roads within the proposed zone be eligible for permits to enable parking in appropriate side streets.
- 2.43 An additional question 8 was asked about whether the two inset parking bays on the west side of Headstone Lane between the railway station and the shops should be controlled or left as free parking. People from across the consultation area responded and a majority favoured it being permit parking. It is recommended that parking in two inset bays made into permit parking which is consistent with these bays being within the CPZ recommended. The splitter island adjacent to 252-258 Headstone Lane may need to be altered to provide sufficient room to accommodate permit parking bays. Double yellow lines will be installed around the island itself. More detailed investigation and costings will be obtained to ensure parking bays can be installed while still allowing other vehicles to pass parked vehicles.
- 2.44 In the table above question 6 provides options for the operational hours of a scheme. The most popular response from those within the scheme area recommended was for Monday to Friday, 10am to 3pm in the majority of streets. It is recommended that the scheme proposals go ahead on that basis.

Other parking issues

- 2.45 An additional question 11 was asked about formalising parking on the eastern footway of Theobald Crescent in anticipation that this road probably would be within the parking scheme area. No responses were received from residents of Theobald Crescent and this aspect of the proposal will not be taken forward.
- 2.46 An additional question 10 was asked about introducing parking controls in the off highway parking spaces either side of Augustine Road owned by Harrow Housing. However, this question became irrelevant because Augustine Road did not show support for inclusion in a scheme.
- 2.47 In addition to the main proposal there are “at any time” no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) also proposed throughout the consultation area as shown in **Appendix B**. These are generally introduced 10 metres back from junctions, in turning heads, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends in accordance with guidance from the Highway Code. These measures take account of vehicle tracking computer simulations to eliminate any potential for obstruction by parked vehicles so that vehicular access is maintained and there is good visibility for motorists to improve road safety.
- 2.48 The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder that the proposals go to statutory notification which is the next stage of the scheme development process. This will provide a further opportunity to consult on the scheme and refine the proposals before a scheme is considered for implementation. The statutory notification phase offers the opportunity for representations and objections to be made which will be reported to the Portfolio Holder for consideration before a final decision on the scheme is made.

Risk Management Implications

- 2.49 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
- 2.50 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

- 2.51 This report is recommending that the CPZ proposals be taken forward to a statutory consultation. Statutory consultation is part of the process required before parking controls can be implemented and the Council must follow the statutory consultations procedures under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) and The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) 1996 (LATO)

- 2.52 The principal traffic and management powers given to local authorities are contained in the RTRA and traffic regulation orders made by the Council are governed mainly by the RTRA and LATO.
- 2.53 Under the LATO the Council is required to publish notice of its proposals to make a traffic regulation order in the London Gazette and to take such other steps as they consider appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity about the order is given to persons likely to be affected. CPZ's are defined in Section 4 of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

Financial Implications

- 2.54 This scheme is part of the Parking Management programme. There is a Harrow Capital allocation for this programme of £300k in 2015/16. A sub allocation of £50k for the consultation and implementation of the Headstone Lane area parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2015 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.55 The cost of the final scheme will be dependent on the results of the planned statutory consultation.
- 2.56 If the scheme is implemented parking income will be generated from resident / visitor permits charges and from penalty charge notices for parking offences. A small sized CPZ typically generates approximately £10k - £15k per annum depending on the parking layout design. Any income raised will be used to fund the costs of administration and enforcement.

Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.57 A programme of CPZ schemes was included in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was approved by full Council. The LIP was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where schemes were identified as having no negative impact on any equality groups.
- 2.58 A review of equality issues was undertaken and has indicated no adverse impact on any of the specified equality groups. There are positive impacts of the scheme on some equalities groups, particularly, women, children and people with mobility difficulties. Benefits are likely to be as follows:

Equalities Group	Benefit
Gender	Mothers with young children and elderly people generally benefit most from controlled parking as the removal of all-day commuters frees up spaces closer to residents' homes. These groups are more likely to desire parking spaces with as short a walk to their destination as possible.
Disability	The retention of double yellow lines at junctions will ensure level crossing points are kept clear. Parking bays directly outside homes, shops and other

	local amenities will make access easier, particularly by blue badge holders for long periods of the day.
Age	Fewer cars parked on-street in residential roads will improve the environment for children. Parking controls can help reduce the influx of traffic into an area, and therefore reduce particulates and air pollution, to which children are particularly sensitive.

- 2.59 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

- 2.60 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>Making a difference for the vulnerable</p> <p>Making a difference for families</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.
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.

- 2.61 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: 10/11/15		
Name: Matthew Dineen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 11/11/15		

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

Background Papers:

Annual Parking Review Report, to this Panel February 2015
Consultation responses- copies placed in Members' library