

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	23 November 2015
<b>Subject:</b>	Whitmore Road area Parking Review - Statutory Consultation Results
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Venetia Reid-Baptiste Divisional Director Commissioning Services
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Graham Henson 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>	Harrow on the Hill
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> Whitmore Road area Parking Review - Statutory Consultation Document <b>Appendix B</b> Copy petition statement <b>Appendix C</b> Consideration of individual formal objections and other representations <b>Appendix D</b> Whitmore Road Area Parking Review - Recommended proposals for implementation

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides results of the statutory notification exercise carried out in the wider Whitmore Road area between 17 September and 7 October 2015 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 :

- a) That the traffic regulation orders be amended as shown in **Appendix D** to address the formal objections for the Whitmore Road area parking review proposals, that the objectors (along with other residents) be informed and that officers proceed with the order making and implementation of the scheme,
- b) Introduce a new controlled parking zone (CPZ) operating Monday to Friday, 10am - 1pm in the following streets with permit eligibility restricted to the following addresses:
  - Whitmore Road (Nos. 71 to 81 odds and 2 to 72 evens)
  - Bessborough Road (Nos. 102 – 128 and 1 & 2 Roxeth Farm)
  - Treve Avenue
  - Porlock Avenue (Millook, Field End, School House & Jarvis Cottage)
- c) Make minor changes to the permit bay layout outside Nos 71 to 77 Whitmore Road including the addition of two permit parking bays as advertised;
- d) Introduce 3 Shared Used bays ("pay & display" and permit holders) in Whitmore Road adjacent to the playing fields as advertised with an unlimited maximum period of stay,
- e) Pay and Display parking bay be installed in Porlock Avenue along playing fields in current unrestricted section as advertised,
- f) Amend the proposed waiting restrictions as follows:
  - the proposed waiting restrictions on the north side of Whitmore Road (Nos. 80 to 92) be implemented operating Monday to Friday, 8-10am and 4-6.30pm;
  - the proposed waiting restrictions on the north side of Whitmore Road (Nos. 2 to 70) be implemented operating Monday to Friday, 10am to 1pm,
  - the proposed waiting restrictions on the east side of Bessborough Road be abandoned.
- g) That the CPZ proposals in Whitmore Road west of the junction with Treve

Avenue / Porlock Avenue are not implemented.

**REASON:** To regulate parking in the wider Whitmore Road area as detailed in the report. The measures are in direct response to resident's 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 notification exercise agreed by the Panel on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2015 for roads in the Whitmore Road 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 information distributed to local people gave details of the proposals developed by the Council and invited comments where individuals may be materially affected by the proposals.
- 2.3 The area included both the western and eastern sides of Whitmore Road and the adjacent sections of Treve Avenue and Porlock Avenue due to concerns over parking displacing.
- 2.4 It should be noted that whilst there were a range of views received from the statutory notification 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.
- 2.5 Consideration for possible revision to the geographical extent of the proposed CPZ and the proposed hours of operation is included within the "Analysis of results in proposed areas" section below.

### **Background**

- 2.6 The eastern section of Whitmore Road in particular has suffered from parking pressures over a number of years. The area has been subject to both public consultation and statutory notification on controlled parking schemes previously during the period from 2010 to 2012. These consultations were reported to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP), however, only very localised proposals consisting of double yellow lines were actually implemented due to objections and petitions from residents not wishing to have a wider parking control scheme at that time.

- 2.7 During the redevelopment of Whitmore High School there were parking issues in the western section of Whitmore Road but since that work was completed the pressures in this location have reduced.
- 2.8 The implementation of parking controls in Charles Crescent and Lascelles Avenue and adjoining streets at the beginning of 2013, however, resulted in a significant increase in parking in the eastern section of Whitmore Road. This section of this road is typically full of parked vehicles during week days on both sides except during school holidays. A more limited amount of parking occurs in the section of Whitmore Road between the junctions with Treve Avenue and Drury Road which has caused congestion issues and problems with the H11 bus service which uses this part of Whitmore Road.
- 2.9 A 40 signature petition asking for a CPZ to be introduced in Whitmore Road was submitted to the October 2013 Cabinet and subsequently reported to this Panel in February 2014. Another similar petition with 43 signatures sought "Clarification of times of operation of previously requested CPZ" and was reported to this Panel in July 2014. This led to the Panel agreeing to prioritise proposals for Whitmore Road in the 2015/16 parking management programme of works at TARSAP in February this year.

### **Statutory Notification**

- 2.10 In September 2015 leaflets were distributed to a total of 215 addresses. The leaflets explained the proposals for a controlled parking scheme, the statutory notification process and detailed instructions on how to make a formal objection if desired. This included all of Whitmore Road, Treve Avenue, the northeast section of Porlock Avenue and a section of Bessborough Road between Whitmore Road and Andrews Close. A copy of the statutory notification leaflet is shown in **Appendix A**.
- 2.11 The traffic regulation order was advertised on 17 September 2015 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 notification ended on the 7 October 2015.

### **Statutory Notification results**

- 2.12 During the statutory notification period, officers received a total of 68 responses of which 66 were statutory objections. Two of these statutory objections concerned residents living just outside the proposed CPZ and a further ten from people who live further afield but currently park where the restrictions are proposed. A petition with 104 signatures from 60 residential addresses in the western section of Whitmore Road, stating objection to the CPZ, was received at the end of the statutory period and can be seen in **Appendix B**. This petition is also reported separately on the agenda to this Panel and was considered in conjunction with the other responses received.
- 2.13 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. The reasons for each objection are summarised together with officer's comments in **Appendix C**.

- 2.14 The most common types of responses received during the consultation are summarised below:

Whitmore Road – western section

- There is no parking problem or necessity for a CPZ in this section of the road and that controlling parking would increase traffic speeds.

Whitmore Road – eastern section

- Waiting restrictions should only apply for the period of the proposed CPZ (Monday – Friday, 10am-1pm).
- Residents in Bessborough Road north of Whitmore Road should not be eligible to purchase permits.
- People who work locally would be required to pay and believe the proposed parking controls are unnecessary.

- 2.15 Meetings were held with the ward councillors on 29 October 2015, in accordance with standard practice, to discuss the issues raised and distribution of responses to the statutory consultation. This meeting also considered how the proposals might be modified to address the representations.

**Analysis of statutory consultation results**

Whitmore Road – eastern section (Bessborough Road to Treve Avenue)

- 2.16 There were 31 representations received from residents in the eastern section of Whitmore Road (Bessborough Road to Treve Avenue) and a further 8 objections from individuals and a company on behalf of its employees who live further away but currently park in this part of Whitmore Road. Of these 23 representations state their support for the CPZ in principle but raise objections mainly to two key issues. The first relates to the operational hours of the proposed single yellow line on the northern side of Whitmore Road and the second to the extent of the area which will have eligibility for permits.
- 2.17 Only seven residents raised objections to the CPZ proposals in principle and of those four come from the same address. One representation expressed a preference of different hours of control but is regarded as a comment rather than a formal objection.
- 2.18 The majority of the representations from residents of the eastern section are in support of a CPZ being introduced representing very strong community support for the CPZ proposals.
- 2.19 In the western section of Whitmore Road (Shaftesbury Avenue to Treve Avenue) there are 20 representations/objections including one from Treve Avenue in addition to the petition mentioned earlier in the report which objects to the proposals in Whitmore Road.

- 2.20 Overall there is strong community support demonstrated for the controlled parking zone CPZ within the eastern section of Whitmore Road including the Monday to Friday 10am-1pm operational hours. This support outweighs the objections raised particularly when giving greater weight to the opinions of people actually living in the area directly affected by the proposals. It is therefore recommended that the CPZ be implemented in the eastern section of Whitmore Road.
- 2.21 In the proposed scheme the section of waiting restriction (single yellow line) on the north side of Whitmore Road (Bessborough Road to Treve Avenue) was to operate Monday – Friday, 8am – 6:30pm. A key objection raised by almost all residents from this section of Whitmore Road, with the exception of 2 who stated support, were against the proposed single yellow line. The intention of the original design was to have the same operational hours as the proposed shared use bays in order to improve visibility for drivers emerging from residential driveways (a common cause of complaint). It was judged that there would still be sufficient parking provision during week days on the south side of the road and that the yellow lines would allow any loading and unloading to take place. It is clear from the consultation results that residents consider the availability of parking to be more important than the additional safety offered by the waiting restriction. It is therefore recommended that the waiting restriction operational hours be reduced to Monday to Friday, 10am to 1pm, the same as the proposed CPZ operational hours, as requested by residents.
- 2.22 Another key objection raised by many residents in the eastern part of Whitmore Road was to exclude residents of Bessborough Road from being eligible to purchase permits in the proposed CPZ (except the corner property at 128 Bessborough Road). There were 32 addresses in Bessborough Road (Whitmore Road to Andrews Close) included within the consultation.
- 2.23 Properties in Bessborough Road within the consultation area are already restricted by a combination of “at any time” (double yellow line) and Monday Saturday, 8am – 6:30pm (single yellow line) waiting restrictions and there is very little on-street parking available to them during week days. Observations on site make it difficult to establish how many vehicles from addresses in Bessborough Road currently park in Whitmore Road, however, there is little on street parking observed in Whitmore Road in evenings, weekends or school holidays and the level of parking is probably quite low. Therefore parking from residents of Bessborough Road is not likely to create any significant additional pressure on parking demand in Whitmore Road and there is no need to deny these residents eligibility to parking permits. A CPZ is designed to provide all local residents within the affected area a preferential parking opportunity and this does not need to be exclusive to an individual road. It is therefore recommended that this objection be set aside and the scheme remain unchanged.
- 2.24 Three residents in the section of nos. 71-77 Whitmore Road raised objections to the proposed waiting restriction (Monday – Friday, 10am – 1pm) outside their properties stating that there should be further permit bays provided instead. Two of these objectors also complain about the close proximity of the proposed permit bay to a driveway access. It is possible to include two additional permit bays between the driveway accesses without affecting the

scheme. The standard practice within CPZ schemes is for permit bays to have 1.5 metres clearance from the driveway. In addition the residents are also requesting at least a car length of clearance from the proposed permit bay which is considered unrealistic in an urban setting , however, a smaller adjustment can be accommodated.

- 2.25 Seven individual responses and one company representation was made objecting to the introduction of the proposed CPZ and consequent removal of free parking space for people working in Harrow. The cheapest available all day parking is quoted as £4.20 per day. The council as highway authority has no legal obligation to provide any parking on the public highway for anyone. It is policy is to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport rather than private cars. The shared use bays proposed in Whitmore Road allow people to pay and display at 30p per hour but with a maximum stay of 4 hours. This does not allow for all day parking. Removing the maximum stay period would be one way of partially addressing these objections and the needs of the wider community such as the playing fields and the school. It is considered as there are still unrestricted streets comparatively close to Harrow town centre that this concession to park for say 8hours at a cost of £2.40 would not be taken up by many people so not significantly disadvantage residents. It is recommended that the 4hour maximum stay period be removed.

#### Treve Avenue and Porlock Avenue

- 2.26 Treve Avenue and Porlock Avenue form an intersection with Whitmore Road and serve three bus routes including the 140 service. Two permit parking bays are proposed for Treve Avenue and a single “pay and display” bay for Porlock Avenue each to replace currently unrestricted sections of road used for parking.
- 2.27 Four representations have been received from Treve Avenue and one from Porlock Avenue. Only one of the representations from Treve Avenue might be seen as an objection to the CPZ in principle. Two representations are specifically supportive of the CPZ but believe the CPZ restrictions should also apply to Saturdays. The last representation from Treve Avenue objects to the close proximity of the permit bay to their driveway access. The Porlock Avenue representation states that proposed “pay and display” parking in that road should be replaced by a parking restriction as parking in that location leads to delays.
- 2.28 There is significantly more support in the representations received for the proposals than objections by a factor of 4 to 1. There may be some justification for a Monday to Saturday restriction rather than the Monday to Friday proposed based on the busy nature of these roads. However permit parking bays with different periods of operation are generally not used in the same CPZ and separating these roads from the proposed CPZ in Whitmore Road is seen as impractical. Introducing permit parking or “pay and display” is likely to reduce the amount of parking and improve the situation. It is recommended that the proposals for Treve Avenue and Porlock Avenue be implemented as advertised.

### Whitmore Road – western section (Shaftesbury Avenue to Treve Avenue)

- 2.29 The western section of Whitmore Road currently has less on street parking than the eastern section. Most of the on street parking occurs to the east of the junction with Drury Road where some obstruction has been reported by the operators of the H11 bus service. In previous consultation there has been less support for a CPZ in this section of Whitmore Road, however, there is concern that if a CPZ is only introduced in the eastern section that non-resident parking will just displace to the western section if left unrestricted. For this reason the CPZ proposals advertised included all of Whitmore Road. Additionally a Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm single yellow line restriction was proposed on the north side of Whitmore Road to the east of Drury Road opposite the bus stop to address concerns by bus operators about the problems caused by on-street parking.
- 2.30 In contrast to the eastern section 14 of the 19 individual representations are objections to the CPZ being introduced in the western section of Whitmore Road with only two generally in support of the CPZ proposals. Seven objections concerned other aspects of the proposals. Additionally there was an objection from a resident of Drury road living just outside the proposed CPZ boundary to the CPZ.
- 2.31 There was also a 104 signature petition from 60 of the 97 addresses in this section of Whitmore Road objecting to the parking restriction proposals in Whitmore Road and the adjacent sections of Treve Avenue and Porlock Avenue which is stated as excessive to the parking problems. Their primary concern is that the proposals will lead to increased traffic speeds. The petition statement can be seen in **Appendix B**.
- 2.32 The two representations in partial support of the CPZ proposals were both from the section of road east of Drury Road. There are however two representations who formally object to the proposals and another who is strongly opposed to the proposed CPZ. The petition was signed by people from nine addresses in this section of Whitmore Road. The grounds of objection mainly focus on the fear of increased traffic speeds and that there is not a problem with parking on their section of Whitmore Road.
- 2.33 Based on the majority of responses and petition received against a CPZ it is not recommended that the western section be included in the scheme.
- 2.34 There are also three specific objections to the proposed single yellow line outside nos. 78 – 92 Whitmore Road. This restriction proposed Monday to Friday, 8am to 6.30pm to allow traffic to flow unimpeded. There is a need of for some waiting restrictions to address congestion. It is therefore recommended the waiting restriction be reduced to operational hours of Monday to Friday 8-10am and 4-6.30pm to cover the busiest traffic periods. This restriction should prevent the north side of this section of road being used by commuters.

### Bessborough Road

- 2.35 A Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm waiting restriction was proposed on the east side of Bessborough Road just to the north of its junction with Whitmore



Road. This was to prevent parking displacing from Whitmore Road onto the main road which is part of the strategic road network. This restriction attracted one objection from a resident who lives in Bessborough Road north of the junction with Kingsfield Road where the road is also currently unrestricted. This area is currently used by residents and workers for parking.

- 2.36 Bessborough Road is relatively wide at this point so that parking of cars does not impede traffic flow. It is therefore recommended that the proposed waiting restriction be abandoned.

### **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.37 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No. Separate risk register in place? No.
- 2.38 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**

- 2.39 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**

- 2.40 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 £40k for implementation of the Whitmore Road area parking review was recommended by the Panel in February 2015 and subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.41 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**

- 2.42 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.
- 2.43 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 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.

- 2.44 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

- 2.45 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</p>

	lessening the impact on the local environment.
Making a difference for the vulnerable Making a difference for families	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.

- 2.46 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: Ajay Thakerar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 11/11/15		

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

## **Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

Contact: Stephen Freeman- Project Engineer – Traffic, Highways and Asset Management  
020 8424 1437

### **Background Papers:**

Previous TARSAP reports – February 2014 / July 2014  
Consultation responses