

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

---

**Date of Meeting:** 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**Subject:** **INFORMATION REPORT**  
Petitions relating to:

1. Pinner Road - Request for right to buy parking permits in zone NH1
2. Streamside Walk - Objection to proposed Cycle Greenway scheme
3. Old Church Lane - Request for parking restrictions
4. Wealdstone CPZ - Objection to proposed extended hours because of likely impact on Scout hut
5. Herga Road - Request to change existing CPZ hours
6. Westfield Park - Changes to CPZ hours
7. Eastleigh Avenue - Request to extend double yellow lines
8. Paines Lane - Request for whole road to have CPZ timed single yellow line waiting restrictions
9. Suffolk Road - Request for waiting restrictions
10. Eastleigh Avenue – Request for parking controls

**Responsible Officer :** Tom McCourt – Corporate Director,  
Community

<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Pinner South, Rayners Lane, Headstone South, Belmont, Wealdstone, Hatch End, Roxbourne
<b>Enclosures:</b>	None

## **Section 1 – Summary**

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last TARSAP meeting and provides details of the Council’s investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

### **FOR INFORMATION**

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Petition 1 – Pinner Road – Request for right to buy permits in zone NH1.**

- 2.1 A petition containing 5 signatures was presented to the council at the end of January 2016. The petition states:  
  
*“We the undersigned petition Harrow Council for the right to purchase parking permits within the controlled zone NH1. As the undersigned were in agreement with the initial survey sent to us.”*
- 2.2 The responses from the consultations that took place for the North Harrow parking scheme in September 2013 and July 2014 have been checked to see if any of the petitioners responded during the consultations. No addresses listed in the petition were registered during the public consultation in September and only one address was registered during the statutory consultation in July.
- 2.3 The responses from residents who responded along Pinner Road during the public consultation did clearly show that there was no general support for inclusion in a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and the majority indicated that the council take no action. Therefore it was proposed at the statutory consultation stage not to include Pinner Road in the proposed CPZ for the county roads area.
- 2.4 Unfortunately as the properties listed in the petition are outside the NH1 controlled parking zone area the council cannot issue resident parking permits to these addresses. The principle of zoning is that permits are only issued to properties identified within the zone and the eligible properties are specified in the traffic regulation order.

- 2.5 The lead petitioner has already been notified in writing that if they wish consideration to be given to Pinner Road residents being eligible for permits within the existing NH1 CPZ this would require an amendment to the existing scheme requiring full consultation as done previously and this would require it to be identified as a scheme in the Council's parking management programme. In order to make a stronger case it has been suggested that residents submit another petition to the council demonstrating a substantive level of support from a majority of residents along this section of the Pinner Road.
- 2.6 The request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2017 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for schemes received during the year or already on the list will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in the Pinner Road area can then be reviewed.

### **Petition 2 – Streamside Walk – Objection to proposed Cycle Greenway scheme**

- 2.7 A petition containing 57 signatures was presented to the council in February 2016. The petition states:

*“We the undersigned object to the proposed works to be carried out to the Streamside Walk between Village Way and Church Avenue, Pinner.*

*We feel the proposed path through the Streamside Open Space will detract from the natural look and feel of this space and will not be of benefit to plants or wild life. Furthermore by opening up and widening of the entrances to the space from Village Way and Church Avenue could lead to increased noise, litter and anti-social behaviour which could spoil the space for the benefit of the local residents and dog walkers who use the space.”*

- 2.8 There was a covering letter with the petition requesting a meeting. The meeting took place on 19<sup>th</sup> February between the project officer and seven residents to explain the wider context of the proposals and to listen to residents' concerns. The route of the proposed new gravel path was walked with residents and a similar existing path in Roxbourne Park was also shown to the residents.
- 2.9 It was accepted that some details which had been raised as concerns by residents, in particular, the treatment of entrances at Church Avenue and Village Way, could be modified without compromising the main benefits of the scheme and these were agreed.
- 2.10 Residents were reassured that the proposals had been designed in consultation with environmental and heritage groups and that the paths will blend into the existing surroundings. The waterlogged nature of the existing route was recognised as an issue and providing a surface which

could be used by a variety of users throughout the year would be a benefit and was appreciated.

- 2.11 The Portfolio Holder subsequently met with the Project Officer on 29<sup>th</sup> February and agreed to proceed with the implementation of the scheme, with modified entrance arrangements.

### **Petition 3 - Old Church Lane – Request for parking restrictions**

- 2.12 A petition containing 24 signatures was presented to the council in February 2016. The petition states:

*“We the residents of Old Church Lane (leading to Marsh Lane) in Stanmore, petition that Harrow Council enforce parking restrictions on our road. In the recent months we have found that commuters are parking their cars for the day on the road creating road blocks and congestion.*

*This is causing distress to the residents for a number of reasons.*

- *Access to our driveway has become an issue.*
- *Traffic chaos during the peak*
- *Commuters cars parked on one side of the road, restricts movement and leads to driver disputes about rights of way*
- *Restricted parking space for friends and relatives of residents as these have been taken up with commuters.*

*We request that Harrow Council look into this matter and enforce some restrictions for the benefit of the residents of Old Church Lane.”*

- 2.13 The request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2017 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for schemes received during the year or already on the list will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in the Old Church Lane area can then be reviewed.

### **Petition 4 – Wealdstone CPZ – impact on scout hut**

- 2.14 A petition containing 68 signatures was presented to the council in February 2016. The petition states:

*“We are writing regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Claremont, Ladysmith and Bruce roads.*

*Whilst we realise the residents want somewhere to park near their homes, having restrictions in place from 8am – 12 midnight will have a very detrimental effect on the 19<sup>th</sup> HARROW scout hut.*

*There are several courses of action that would be just as effective for residents, but not have such a detrimental effect on users of the scout hut such as:*

- *Introducing another parking restriction from 10pm – 11pm*
- *Introducing a maximum parking time of 2 or 3 hours for non-residents.*
- *Introducing ticketed parking with a 2-3 hour free period and a maximum stay period for non-residents.*

*By implementing a total ban:-*

- *There will be nowhere to park near the scout hut, deterring parents from not bringing their children.*
- *Scout leaders would not be able to load up for camps and other activities*
- *There will be nowhere for customers to park when they attend classes and so classes will have to close. Livelihoods will be lost, being self-employed, this will have a big effect, many have used this hall for more than fifteen years.*

*This affects all users of the hall. If bookings are lost the fees will go up and at worst the cabin will close, this would mean loads of children with nowhere to go. Additionally several small businesses will suffer and may be forced to close hence more unemployment!!!.*

*These points have obviously not been considered by the person who instigated this poorly thought out idea.*

*We use the hall in the day and the evening. In the day the road is comparatively empty so we see absolutely no need to change the restrictions during the day. Doing so will just cause hardship as explained.*

*We implore you to reconsider this, as it will affect many many people. We look forward to a positive outcome.”*

2.15 The scheme proposed is a response to concerns raised by local residents and ward councillors because of non-residential parking within the existing controlled parking zone area, particularly outside of the operational hours. These proposals were subject to informal public consultation last year and the results of the consultation were reported to the council Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel in November 2015. There was a majority of respondents in favour of the proposals.

2.16 The issue of the scout groups was highlighted during the consultation and identified issues with regard to loading or unloading of equipment for the scout group and for parents dropping off or picking up their children. The Panel should be aware that vehicles are legally permitted to load or unload goods or passengers on all single or double yellow lines and therefore the current proposal will not restrict these activities. As a point

of clarification when loading and unloading activity is carried out enforcement personnel will consider this to be a continuous process and expect that the vehicle is not left unattended for any length of time.

- 2.17 It should also be noted that there are also other streets in close proximity to the Scout hut that will not be affected by the proposed scheme and where there is available parking space in the evenings which may require a short walk to the venue.
- 2.18 It is not considered necessary to make any changes to the scheme.

### **Petition 5 – Herga Road – Request to change existing CPZ hours**

- 2.19 A petition containing 20 signatures was sent to the council in February 2016. The petition states:

*“We the residents of Herga Road feel that the current parking restriction times are out dated.*

*Factors affecting parking on Herga Road and the neighbouring surrounding roads are due to not only one factor but a number of factors. We feel Harrow Council need to review but also make changes as the majority of residents are paying for car parking permits.*

*By making minor changes and compromises, Harrow Council will not only provide a sufficient service to the paying resident but may also improve parking issues we are having in this current climate.*

*We must remember Harrow council should not be profiting from residential permit fees or car parking machines but on the contrary should be improving the residential service, which we the residents feel is not happening.*

*Factors which affect parking on our road (s):*

*The current timings 10 am to 11am & 2pm to 3pm (Monday to Friday), do not reflect the needs of the residence of Herga Road.*

*Commercial trade vehicles are brought back home by non-paying car parking permit residents after 6pm (car parking permit dodgers).*

*Religious places of worship near or on Herga Road which include the local mosque, Hindu temple on Herga Road and the church on the corner of Masons Avenue, tend to frequently have events of some sort during the day or evening and also on weekends which makes parking a major issue for the residents who pay the yearly rising parking permit charge. We feel neglected by Harrow Council.*

*The workers of the pizza factory tend to park their cars on Herga Road. The workers use to park in the leisure centre car park but Harrow Council decided to make it a pay as you go car park. Harrow Council has also restricted and changed the parking restrictions on the neighbouring road*

*(Christchurch Avenue) to zone Y, Monday to Sunday from 7am to midnight. We believe that Herga Road should be treated in the same manner as our road attracts a number of different members of the public who leave their cars on our residential road.*

*Other factors include:*

- The car washing centre – parking customer’s cars on our road.*
- Multiple bikers parking together in bays without permits.*
- Neighbouring car mechanics workshops parking vehicles overnight on Herga Road.*
- Harrow and Wealdstone train station – commuters always tend to park in our road as its very convenient for them to park and take a short walk to the train centre. Sometimes cars are left over the weekend.*
- Harrow Leisure Centre-Harrow Council has transformed the free car parking at the local Harrow leisure centre into a pay as you go service which isn’t beneficial to local residents who find it hard parking on Herga Road.”*

2.20 Members will recall at the TARSAP meeting in February 2016 that this area was included in this year’s parking management programme of work. A review of the operational hours of control for these areas of the existing Wealdstone CPZ, including Herga Road and Masons Avenue, is currently under review and any consultations undertaken will be advised to the Panel.

#### **Petition 6 - Westfield Park – Changes to CPZ hours**

2.21 A petition containing 43 signatures from Westfield Park was sent to the council in March 2016. The petition states:

*“We, the undersigned, confirm our agreement with the St Anslem`s vote in the consultation questionnaire which was returned on our behalf by Father Clive Pearce / Church warden Roger Bessell. We ask that CPZ restrictions are applied just one period of the day from 10 -11am Mon-Sat in Westfield Park. Also that the residents permit holder parking bay is removed from outside the main west doors of the church as requested in our petition presented at 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 TARSAP committee meeting.”*

2.22 A public consultation was undertaken in December 2015 and the results were reported to this panel in February 2016. At the meeting two local ward councillors requested that the decision to proceed to statutory consultation be delayed until further discussions with officers and councillors was undertaken.

2.23 This meeting was subsequently held and an amendment to the proposal agreed by the members and the Portfolio Holder. A Statutory Notification exercise for a CPZ in the Westfield Park area of Hatch End operating Monday to Saturday 10-11am only is now proposed. This approach is contrary to the majority view demonstrated in the public results and the officer recommendations to retain the existing CPZ operational hours.

The change in operational hours within the Hatch End zone will now require the zone to be split into two separate zones each with different operating hours.

- 2.24 The statutory notification exercise is planned to be undertaken in June / July 2016. Any objections and representations to the proposed changes will need to be reviewed by the Portfolio Holder before implementation can proceed. The parking management programme funding allocations for 2016/17 will need to be reviewed by TARSAP before the scheme can be implemented because the cost of implementing these changes will be much greater due to the need to amend all of the traffic signing to separate the existing Hatch End CPZ into two CPZs with different operating times.

### **Petition 7 – Eastleigh Avenue – Request to extend double yellow lines**

- 2.25 A local resident wrote to the Portfolio Holder in March and attached a petition signed by 48 residents in the Eastleigh Avenue area. The letter said

*“ All residents are in full favour of the extension of the double yellow lines, to alleviate the problem we have had with bins not being emptied out, and delivery vehicles having to make U-turns without being able to deliver. Thankfully, we’ve not had an unfortunate emergency situation.”*

- 2.26 This request was assessed under the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP). The assessment criteria for all such requests includes such factors as traffic flows/speeds, pedestrian flows, occurrence of personal injury accidents, the degree to which parking affects access/visibility and the nature of the request.
- 2.27 An assessment of this location has been carried out against the criteria and has reached the threshold score required for intervention. This location will now be batched as a scheme to be undertaken in the programme which will be undertaken in order of priority. This will involve a consultation and the required legal process will then commence. This can take some time to complete especially if there are objections which need to be resolved.

### **Petition 8 – Paines Lane – Request to have CPZ single yellow line waiting restrictions in the whole road**

- 2.28 A petition containing 92 signatures was sent to the council in November 2015. Due to an oversight the petition was unfortunately not reported to the February meeting of TARSAP. The lead petitioner did however receive an acknowledgement at the time.
- 2.29 During the Pinner CPZ review last year it was recommended that the section of Paines Lane by numbers 73 - 83 have a single yellow line installed operating at the same times as the Pinner CPZ (Monday – Friday, 11 am and 12pm).

- 2.30 Following agreement to proceed with this recommendation the council received a petition from local residents living further along Paines Lane about potential parking problems in their part of the road. During the recent area parking review undertaken in Pinner this area did not indicate a desire to have any additional parking controls at that time.
- 2.31 The petition highlights concerns about displaced parking and the increasing distance that commuters and business workers are prepared to walk to the Pinner Station and commercial centre following the introduction of additional parking controls throughout Pinner. This displaced parking can cause some localised areas of congestion in this location.
- 2.32 This issue was reported to the TARSAP meeting in February 2016 as a part of the annual parking management programme review and was given a low priority. Consequently this area was not included in this year's parking management programme.
- 2.33 As no support from the local residents in this area was demonstrated for any controlled parking zone or waiting restrictions, during the area parking review this issue will be reconsidered as a part of the congestion relief programme. This area is currently being monitored.

#### **Petition 9 – Suffolk Road – Request for waiting restrictions**

- 2.34 A petition containing 17 signatures was sent to the council in May 2016. The petition states:
- “We the undersigned:*
- Are concerned by the parking and flow of traffic on Suffolk Road over the last two years and fear a severe accident will occur as it is the main route by the fire Brigade, Ambulances, Police and a Bus Route.*
  - We ask the Portfolio Holder to request a review of the situation in order to apply a ‘No Waiting Order’ between 10— 11 am. Monday to Friday”*
- 2.35 The request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2017 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for schemes received during the year or already on the list will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in the Suffolk Road area can then be reviewed.

## **Petition 10 – Eastleigh Avenue – Request for parking controls and white lines**

2.36 A local resident wrote to the Portfolio Holder in March and attached a petition signed by 20 residents in the Eastleigh Avenue area. The letter states:

*“Parking attendants have started visiting this area to issue parking penalty notices to vehicles parked in the middle of the cul de sac.*

*Vehicle parking is a big problem in our area as you well know.*

*In order to resolve the parking problem, would you be kind enough to sign this petition to ask the Council to:*

- *Draw white parking lines in our cul de sac, for vehicles to park within the lines, and*
- *To implement a “No parking zone “ in the middle of the cul de sac*
- *Designated parking spaces (2) in the centre.”*

2.37 Eastleigh Avenue is a public highway and as the Panel will be aware this type of proposal to introduce parking restrictions using road markings needs to comply with UK legislation and requires statutory consultation. It is not the case that road markings can simply be marked on the highway.

2.38 The request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2017 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for schemes received during the year or already on the list will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in the Eastleigh Avenue area can then be reviewed.

2.39 Members will note that there was is already a separate petition within this report from residents of Eastleigh Avenue requesting an extension of the existing double yellow lines and this has already been agreed to go forward to statutory consultation.

## **Section 3 – Further Information**

3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting. No updates on the progress made with previous petitions will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

## **Section 4 – Financial Implications**

- 4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report that require further investigation would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

## **Section 5 - Equalities implications**

- 5.1 The petitions raise issues about existing schemes in the traffic and transportation works programme as well as new areas for investigation. The officer's response indicates a suggested way forward in each case. An equality impact assessment (EqIA) will be carried out in accordance with the current corporate guidance if members subsequently decide that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions.

## **Section 6 – Council Priorities**

- 6.1 The funds allocated by TfL and Harrow for transport improvements will contribute to achieving the administration's priorities:

- Making a difference for the vulnerable
- Making a difference for communities
- Making a difference for local businesses
- Making a difference for families

## **Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

Name: Jessie Man	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 28/06/16		

<b>Ward Councillors notified:</b>	<b>YES</b>
-----------------------------------	------------

## **Section 8 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

**Contact:**

Barry Philips

Tel: 020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: [barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:**

Previous TARSAP reports

Decision Notices

Public and statutory consultation documents highlighted in the report