

REPORT FOR:

**Traffic And Road
Safety Advisory Panel**

| | |
|--|---|
| Date of Meeting: | 11 February 2016 |
| Subject: | Hatch End Area Parking Review - Public Consultation |
| Key Decision: | No |
| Responsible Officer: | Tom McCourt – Corporate Director, Community |
| Portfolio Holder: | Graham Henson - Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety |
| Exempt: | No |
| Decision subject to Call- in: | Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio Holder |
| Wards affected: | Hatch End |
| Enclosures: | Appendix A Hatch End Area Parking Review - Public Consultation Document Appendix B Consultation responses listed by road and questions |

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report details the results of the public consultation carried out in localised areas previously agreed by TARSAP in the Hatch End area in December 2015 - January 2016 to consider the alteration of existing and the introduction of parking controls in the area. The report asks the Panel to recommend a number changes to the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety and to proceed with statutory consultation.

Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety that the following roads and measures be considered for statutory consultation:

1. Reduce the size of the residents parking bay adjacent to the west side of St Anselm's Church in Westfield Park to improve access to the church entrance.
2. Extend the length of the existing "at any time" double yellow line waiting restrictions in Cedar Drive from the junction with The Avenue on the northern side adjacent to no.12 The Avenue.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To regulate parking in the areas 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 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 concerns reported to the Council regarding transport issues. This report sets out how parking issues raised in the localised areas previously agreed by TARSAP are being addressed in order to support local residents and businesses concerns about parking.

Options considered

- 2.2. The public consultation proposals were developed having taken account of correspondence and petitions received from local residents and businesses. A range of options were presented to the consultees to accept or reject.
- 2.3. It should be noted that there is a wide range of opinion within the consultation area on a road by road basis. Whilst it is not possible to act on

every individual comment the majority view was reflected in the recommendations made.

Background

- 2.4. As part of the Hatch End CPZ review carried out in December 2012, residents were initially consulted about the parking conditions in the area, the results of this consultation review were reported to the February 2013 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) meeting for consideration.
- 2.5. The results of the February 2013 consultation indicated that there were several roads located in and around the vicinity of the station that were affected by commuter parking and residents of these roads supported the introduction of some parking control measures. It was further reported that there was a strong possibility that the streets in the Westfield Park area (Westfield Park, Oakdene Close, Thorndyke Court, Cherry Croft Gardens and St Cuthberts Gardens) would be exposed to parking displacement if a CPZ were taken forward in those streets closest to the station.
- 2.6. To mitigate against these potential adverse consequences it was considered advisable to include these streets within the statutory consultation so that residents in Westfield Park could have a final opportunity to consider this potential impact. The proposal received 59% support and 41% opposition. Officers therefore recommended that the proposals in this area were implemented.
- 2.7. In the Westfield Park area a Controlled Parking Zone operating from Mon-Sat, 10am-11am and 3-4pm was implemented.
- 2.8. The results of the Statutory consultation undertaken in June 2013 consultation indicated no majority support for the introduction of parking controls in Cedar Drive and no further action was taken.
- 2.9. In the period since the introduction of the CPZ a petition from St Anselm's Church has been received regarding the difficulties of parking in Westfield Park for church activities and requesting the council to take action to help local people. The petition requests that the operational hours be reduced to 10am -11am Monday to Saturday and that the length of the permit parking bay alongside the side of the church be reduced to make it easier for vehicles to park near the main door.
- 2.10. In addition, in the period since the introduction of the CPZ some representations have been received from some residents in Cedar Drive regarding the worsening parking problems that have been attributed to displaced parking from the adjacent roads within the CPZ.
- 2.11. As a result of these representations a further localised review of the Hatch End CPZ has been undertaken to find out residents opinions regarding options for addressing the reported problems.

Public consultation

- 2.12. The public consultation for the localised Hatch End area parking review was undertaken December 2015 – January 2016. A copy of the consultation document and questionnaire can be seen in **Appendix A**. The consultation was also made available on the Harrow Council public website and public consultation documents were hand delivered to 278 properties within the consultation area.
- 2.13. All the responses received were analysed and in roads where a majority of responses indicated parking problems and support for the proposed measures these are recommended to be taken forward to the statutory consultation phase of the project.
- 2.14. Where measures that may not necessarily be supported by the residents have greater benefits to the local community on safety and public amenity grounds then these have also been recommended to proceed.
- 2.15. The public consultation proposals were developed having taken account of correspondence and petitions received from local residents and businesses.
- 2.16. In Westfield Park three questions were presented to the consultees to consider:
- Are you happy with the current operational hours of the CPZ?
 - Support hours for the future CPZ Mon-Sat 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm
 - Support hours for the future CPZ Mon-Sat 10am-11am
- 2.17. In Cedar Drive a simple option of whether or not residents wanted to be part of the existing Hatch End CPZ, with the same existing hours of control was asked.

Responses

- 2.18. Of the 278 properties in the wider consultation area 57 responses were received by questionnaire, letter or email. This represented an overall response rate of 20% and is consistent with the expected response rate for this type of consultation. It should be noted that there were some roads that had a much higher individual response rate.
- 2.19. A tabulated summary of responses for each proposal is provided on a road by road basis in **Appendix B**. It should be noted that the totals may not tally as expected due to respondents completing more than the required number of responses on the questionnaire.
- 2.20. At the time of preparing this report a meeting was scheduled to be held with ward councillors, in accordance with standard practice, to discuss the results of consultation and distribution of responses. The recommendations in this report are those that will be presented to councillors at the meeting and so may be subject to change. Any changes from this report will be explained verbally at the meeting.
- 2.21. Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses received .

Analysis of results

- 2.22. Appendix B gives a full breakdown of the responses received on a road by road basis. In this section of the report, roads are analysed in more detail.

Westfield Park

| Westfield Park results | Number |
|--|---|
| Number consulted | 259 |
| Number responses | 47 (48 received but 2 responses from one address.) |
| [Q2] Are you happy with the current operational hours of the CPZ? - | |
| Yes | 30 |
| No | 15 |
| No opinion | 2 |
| [Q3a] Do you support hours for the future CPZ Mon-Sat 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm? - | 24 |
| [Q3b] Do you support hours for the future CPZ Mon-Sat 10am-11am? | 19 |
| No response to Q3a or Q3b | 5 |

- 2.23. In Westfield Park overall there was an 18% response rate (47no.). It should be noted that not all respondents gave an answer to all the questions, one respondent ticked both Q3a and Q3b, and 2 responses were received from one address. From the responses received, there is no clear indication of significant support to change the hours of operation of the existing CPZ.
- 2.24. Thirty respondents have indicated that they are happy with the current operational hours of the CPZ. However, not every respondent who replied yes to this question went on to support the future hours of the CPZ being retained as 10am-11am and 3pm-4pm.
- 2.25. Similarly, whilst 15 respondents have responded that they were not happy with the current operational hours of the CPZ, 19 respondents ticked to support hours for future CPZ changing to Monday to Saturday 10am-11am. 3 of these responses came from people who were happy with the current operational hours and 1 response was from someone who expressed “no opinion”.
- 2.26. The responses to Question 2 “Are you happy with the current operational hours of the CPZ?” appear to give a clear indication (30:15) that residents do not wish to see any changes to the existing operational hours of the CPZ. However, responses to question 3 are less clear with 24 respondents opting to retain the existing operational hours and 19 respondents in favour of reducing the operational hours to Monday to Saturday 10am-11am.
- 2.27. In the light of the ambiguity of the responses, albeit with a majority in favour of maintaining the existing operational hours of the CPZ, it is recommended

that no further action is taken with respect to any change in the operational hours of the existing CPZ in Westfield Park.

- 2.28. With regard to the concerns of St Anselm’s Church as set out in the petition considered by TARSAP, following a review of the on-street permit bays layout, it is considered that a reduction in the length of the existing permit bay adjacent to the western side of the church in Westfield Park will assist with activity around the church entrance. A reduction of two vehicle parking spaces would be sufficient to provide additional space. It is recommended that this is taken forward.

Cedar Drive

| Cedar Drive results | Number |
|--|--------|
| Number consulted | 19 |
| Number responses | 10 |
| [Q3] Should the council introduce a parking control scheme to improve the situation? - Yes | 5 |
| [Q3] Should the council introduce a parking control scheme to improve the situation? - No | 5 |

- 2.29. In Cedar Drive there was a 53% response rate (10no.). It should be noted that 2 responses were received from addresses not in Cedar Drive. Five of the respondents stated that they are experiencing parking problems, 50% of respondents think that the Council should introduce a parking control scheme to improve the situation (5no.) and 50% of respondents think that the council should not introduce a parking control scheme.
- 2.30. Given the responses in Cedar Drive are split 50/50, it is recommended that no further action is taken with respect the introduction of parking controls in Cedar Drive.
- 2.31. A specific request was received to extend the existing “at any time” double yellow line waiting restrictions in Cedar Drive from the junction of The Avenue along the north side. This will provide more space for vehicle manoeuvres at the junction which will improve safety and facilitate sufficient space for loading / unloading activity adjacent to no. 12 the Avenue. It is recommended that this is taken forward.

Summary

- 2.32. Overall the response rate is an average of 20%. This is considered good for a consultation of this type.
- 2.33. The results of the consultation tend to indicate a lack of overall support for the introduction of either an extension to the existing CPZ to include Cedar Drive, or any changes to the operational times of the CPZ in Westfield Park.
- 2.34. Due to indeterminate nature of the responses in Westfield Park no alterations to the operational hours of the existing Controlled Parking Zone are recommended at this time. However, the size and location of the residents parking bay adjacent to the west side of St Anselm’s Church in Westfield Park should be amended to address some of the access problems highlighted by the church.

- 2.35. Given the responses in Cedar Drive are split 50/50, it is recommended that no further action is taken with respect the introduction of parking controls in Cedar Drive. However, it is recommended that the existing “at any time” double yellow line waiting restrictions at the junction of Cedar Drive with The Avenue be extended to address obstructive parking issues.

Risk management Implications

- 2.36. There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. This would include the schemes detailed in the proposed programme in this report.

Legal implications

- 2.37. The Traffic Management Act 2004 places an obligation on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements as they consider appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing the duty.
- 2.38. This report is recommending that the CPZ proposals be taken forward to a statutory consultation. Statutory consultation is the legal 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 and The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996
- 2.39. The principal traffic and management powers given to local authorities are contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and traffic regulation orders made by the Council are governed mainly under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996
- 2.40. The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 stipulates that 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 that 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

- 2.41. 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 £20k for the Hatch End CPZ localised review was recommended by TARSAP in February 2015.
- 2.42. Any proposals recommended in this report can be undertaken within the limits of the allocated budget.

Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.43. 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.
- 2.44. 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:

| Protected characteristic | 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. |

- 2.45. 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

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

| Corporate priority | Impact |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Making a difference for communities | Parking controls make streets easier to clean by reducing the number of vehicles on-street during the day, giving better access to the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>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> |
| <p>Making a difference for local businesses</p> | <p>The changes to parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to give more customers parking access to shops.</p> |

2.47. 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

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Name: Jessie Man</p> <p>Date: 27/01/16</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer</p> |
| <p>Name: Dorothy Butcher</p> <p>Date: 26/01/16</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>on behalf of the Monitoring Officer</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>Ward Councillors notified:</p> | <p>YES</p> |
| <p>EqIA carried out:</p> | <p>NO</p> |

EqlA cleared by:

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: Andrew Leitch - Project Engineer, Parking and Sustainable Transport
020 8424 1888

Background Papers: None