

---

**Report for:** **TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY  
ADVISORY PANEL**

**Date of Meeting:** 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021

**Subject:** **INFORMATION REPORT**  
Petitions

1. Chantry Road and West Chantry - Request for CPZ
2. Remove all LTN`s
3. Fernbrook Drive- Request for address to be included in CPZ to allow to apply for a parking permit
4. Eliot Drive – Request to be included in zone WR

**Key Decision:** No

**Responsible Officer:** Paul Walker – Corporate Director,  
Community

**Portfolio Holder:** Varsha Parmar – Portfolio Holder for  
Environment

**Exempt:** No

**Decision subject to  
Call-in:** No, the report is for information

**Wards affected:** Headstone South, West Harrow,  
Greenhill, Hatch End

**Enclosures:** None

## **Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

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.

### **Recommendations:**

None, the report is for information only.

### **Reason: (For recommendations)**

None, the report is for information only.

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Introduction**

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting of TARSAP and the current status of any investigations and findings undertaken.
- 2.2 No updates on the progress made with previous petitions will be reported because officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any further updates.

### **Options considered**

- 2.3 This report is provided only to update members on the status of petitions received by the Council that are within the terms of reference of TARSAP.

### **Background**

#### **Petition 1 – Chantry Road and West Chantry - Request for controlled parking zone**

- 2.4 A petition containing 40 signatures was received in November 2020. The petition states:

*“We the residents of Chantry Road and West Chantry petition the council to investigate a controlled parking zone in Chantry Road (as is evident in Lechford Terrace, controlled from 10-3). As one of the only two roads available for parking in the near vicinity of the station we are*

*overwhelmed by cars parking during the day. We have builders from all around, commuters, garage visitors etc, All using this one little road. Many residents without off street parking are being penalised. It is extremely difficult to take ones car out during the week and find a parking place on return until after 5 pm. It is near impossible to invite a friend around Monday to Friday as they cannot park anywhere. Workmen for our cottages have no where to park. Letchford Terrace has only six houses without off street parking we have eleven. There are lots of empty spaces in Letchford Terrace during the day and we are crammed full. Either give us the same benefit or remove the restricted parking from nearby areas. It would be beneficial for those with off street parking too as they are often blocked in as parking is so restricted.*

*If the flats are built in unit 5 Chantry Place where the maximum proposed parking spaces were sixteen in the original application this would not be sufficient parking for the possibly sixty-two flats. This will add to the chaos unless we have CPZ.*

*Many of the parking issues come from the garage and they need to be made to manage their parking of customer cars in a more neighbourly way.*

*It has been getting worse over the years just as the council representative predicted when he spoke to us at last review. Some of us are very anxious over the situation and it has a negative effect on our lives.”*

- 2.5 As members will be aware all of the requests for parking schemes or amendments to existing schemes received during the year are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by this Panel. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.
- 2.6 This request has been assessed and is included with the parking management programme report on the agenda for this meeting.

### **Petition 2 – Removal all LTN`s**

- 2.7 A petition signed by 122 residents was presented at cabinet in December regarding the above. The petition states:

*“Petition to remove all low traffic neighbourhoods at Victor Road at Harrow View. Pinner View near Bolton Road, Kingsfield Avenue by Pinner View, Pinner View by Cunningham Park,, Beresford Road by Cunningham Park, Canterbury Road by Station Road, Cumberland Road by Station Road, including the following schemes:*

*LTN – 02 Pinner View area, Headstone South  
LTN – 03 Francis Road area, Greenhill  
LTN - 04 Vaughan Road area, West Harrow  
LTN – 06 Southfield Park area, North Harrow”*

- 2.8 Members will recollect that at the last special meeting of TARSAP on 11<sup>th</sup> January all the low traffic neighbourhood schemes (LTNs) were reviewed and the Panel determined that the schemes will remain in place until the next special meeting of TARSAP (planned for 22<sup>nd</sup> April) when a six-month review of the schemes will consider all matters regarding the LTNs.

**Petition 3 – Fernbrook Drive - Request for parking permit**

- 2.9 A petition containing one signatures was received from a resident in Fernbrook Drive. The petition states:

*“I have lived in, Fernbrook Drive since 1970 and have been discussing my unique situation with the Council since the Parking Review of the Rayners Lane area was undertaken in 2011.*

*Originally the southern end of Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook Drive were excluded from the CPZ and later this was amended to include all of Alfriston Avenue but not Fernbrook Drive. This change was significant as living on a corner plot my front door (and accordingly my address) was in Fernbrook Drive whereas the side of my house, garden and garage is bordered by Alfriston Avenue.*

*I have spent many hours driving around North Harrow and Rayners Lane and cannot find another property in the same situation.*

*A large proportion of the properties in Fernbrook Drive have turned their front gardens into parking areas whereas I for ecological reasons have resisted.*

*Over the years I have corresponded with many Council officials and the MP all to no avail. Whilst, I think, generally they understand my situation the regulations do not permit them to make exceptions.*

*Parking is becoming a problem in Fernbrook Drive, which is a quiet cul de sac, with, for example, nonresidents leaving their cars whilst away on holiday and will be compounded when/if residential planning is given at 265 The Ridgeway. Perhaps now the CPZ should be extended to include Fernbrook Drive.*

*So, whilst Fernbrook Drive is becoming a carpark the parking areas alongside my house are generally unused.*

*I am therefore asking you to consider my position and agree to accepting my application for a parking permit.”*

- 2.10 The resident’s property is not situated within an existing CPZ therefore currently it is not possible to apply for a residents parking permit. This is because this address is not included in the Traffic Management Order which defines the eligible properties for the CPZ. This address can only

be included if a statutory consultation is undertaken on a proposal to amend the boundary and list of eligible addresses for the CPZ.

- 2.11 As members will be aware all of the requests for parking schemes or amendments to existing schemes received during the year are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by this Panel. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.
- 2.12 This request has been assessed and is included with the parking management programme report on the agenda for this meeting.

#### **Petition 4 – Eliot Drive – Request to be included in zone WR**

- 2.13 A petition signed by 4 residents of Eliot Drive was hand delivered to Harrow Council on 9th January 2020 (last year) addressed to the parking permit team. Unfortunately, the Transportation Team were not made aware of the petition until recently when the lead petitioner wrote directly to the Transportation Team attaching a copy of the petition requesting an update. The petition states:

*“ We, the residents of Eliot Drive and Blossom Avenue ( Harrow, HA2, OUP), would like to request and apply to impose WR Parking Zone on at least 7 parking spaces ( if not more) located on the right and left opposite side of 1, 3 and 5 Eliot Drive, HA2 OUP.*

*Since the last two years, all the residents living on, **Eliot Drive**, have been feeling an unbearable pain and deeply annoyed with the parking places opposite to our houses being used by unauthorised businesses who simply dump damaged / accidental cars in the current (**not – controlled**) residence parking zone.*

*This has us to put in a very critical situation to park our own cars over the years.*

*Please find attached signed consent from all the residents who have approved this application to impose WR Parking zone as soon as possible.*

- 2.14 As members will be aware all of the requests for parking schemes or amendments to existing schemes received during the year are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by this Panel. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.
- 2.15 This request has been assessed and is included with the parking management programme report on the agenda for this meeting.

#### **Staffing/workforce**

- 2.16 The review of petitions has been undertaken using existing staff resources within the Traffic, Highways & Asset Management Team supported by technical consultants as required.

### **Ward Councillors' comments**

- 2.17 Ward councillor's comments have not been sought for this report because it is for information only.

### **Performance issues**

- 2.18 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims, objectives and performance targets in the current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and help to deliver Harrow's corporate priorities and in particular building a better Harrow.

### **Environmental Implications**

- 2.19 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims and objectives of the current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The LIP underwent a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the programme of investment.
- 2.20 Key population and human health benefits identified were from reducing casualties, encouraging active travel and improving air quality. The benefits associated with increased active travel and healthy lifestyles are reduced diabetes and obesity levels. No negative environmental issues were identified as part of the SEA.

### **Data Protection Implications**

- 2.21 There are no data protection implications.

### **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.22 The development of any schemes arising from a petition would be subject to separate risk assessments.
- 2.23 There is a requirement to undertake a design risk assessment during scheme development under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations in order to manage any potential health and safety risks.

### **Procurement Implications**

- 2.24 Where needed, consultants and contractors will be procured to investigate, develop and deliver some proposals. This is business as usual. The work will be procured in line with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

### **Legal implications**

- 2.25 There are no particular legal implications to be noted as the report is for information purposes only.
- 2.26 Under Part 3A of the Council's Constitution, the terms of reference of TARSAP is to make recommendations on traffic management, the management and control of parking both on and off-street and the operational aspects of public transport within the Borough but includes other business, such as: petitions, deputations, scheme approval (from existing budgets), including consultation results and authority to make traffic orders and objections to traffic orders.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2.27 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.

### **Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 2.28 The petitions raise issues about issues that affect the traffic and transportation programmes of work as well as identifying new areas of work for investigation. The officer's response to a petition will indicate a suggested way forward in each case.
- 2.29 If members subsequently suggest that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions these will accord with the Council's current Transport Local Implementation Plan which has been subject to a full Equalities Impact Assessment. These Equalities Impact Assessments have been identified as having no negative impact on any protected equality groups and demonstrate positive impacts on the disability and age equality groups.

### **Council Priorities**

- 2.30 Any findings or investigations in response to petitions detailed in the report support the Harrow ambition plan and will contribute to achieving the administration's priorities listed below:
- Improving the environment and addressing climate change
  - Tackling poverty and inequality
  - Building homes and infrastructure
  - Addressing health and social care inequality
  - Thriving economy

## **Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Sharon Daniels**

Signed on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

**Date 16/02/2021**

**Statutory Officer: Jimmy Walsh**

Signed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

**Date: 18/02/2021**

### **Section 3 - Procurement Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Nimesh Mehta**

Signed by the Head of Procurement

**Date: 17/02/2021**

### **Section 3 – Corporate Director Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Paul Walker**

Signed by the Corporate Director - Community

**Date: 17/02/2021**

### **Mandatory Checks**

Ward Councillors notified: **NO, as the report is for information only**

EqlA carried out: **YES**

EqlA cleared by: **Dave Corby, Community - Equality Task Group (DETG) Chair**

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

**Contact:**

Barry Philips – Infrastructure Manager -Transportation

E-mail: [barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:**



None