

Report for

**Portfolio Holder Decision**

---

**Subject:**

**SEPTEMBER WAY/THE RIDGEWAY AREA  
PARKING REVIEW  
RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

Portfolio Holder:

Anjana Patel

Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community  
Safety

**Key Decision:**

No

**Urgent / Non-Urgent**

Non-urgent

**Responsible Officer:**

Dipti Patel - Corporate Director, Place

**Decision subject to Call-in:**

Yes

**Power to be exercised:**

Paragraph 2(ii) of the Delegated Powers of the  
Portfolio Holders, Appendix to the Executive  
Procedure Rules.

**Exempt:**

No

**Wards affected:**

Hatch End

**Enclosures:**

**Appendix A** – Consultation leaflet.  
**Appendix B** – Objections/Comments and officer  
response  
**Appendix C** – Notes of TEAMs meeting

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the results of the recent statutory consultation undertaken in November 2021 with residents and businesses in September Way/The Ridgeway area.

### Recommendations:

The Portfolio Holder (PH) for Environment is requested to:

1. Consider the results of the statutory consultation and approve the introduction of:
  - A new CPZ, with extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am to 2pm to include those roads currently within CPZ (B), namely:
    - o The Ridgeway from junction with Old Church Lane to the boundary between numbers 9/11 The Ridgeway (i.e. excluding the section not currently within existing CPZ (B))
    - o September Way (excluding Laurimel Close)
    - o Old Church Lane (between Gordon Avenue and property Nos. 59/69 and 1/44)
    - o Elm Park - (between The Ridgeway and property Nos 41/43 and 46/48)
    - o Nelson Road - (between Elm Park and property Nos. 27/29 and 28/30)
    - o Bernays Close including Naresby Fold
  - The Ridgeway – the section not currently within CPZ(B) to remain outside of any CPZ.
  - The Ridgeway – proposals to introduce “At any time “ waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to be withdrawn.
  - Cherry Tree Way – To remain as zone (CTW) but with new extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am – 2pm.
  - Cherry Tree Way – proposals to introduce “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) should be withdrawn.
  - Introduction of “At any time” (double yellow lines) at key locations throughout the consultation area (except in Cherry Tree Way and The Ridgeway) at junctions, bends, turning heads and narrow sections of road to help remove obstructive and dangerous parking, improve access and sightlines and to help re-enforce the rules of the Highway Code.
2. Agree to residents and businesses within the agreed consultation area being advised of the PH’s decision.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To act in accordance with the results of the statutory consultation that was undertaken in direct response to residents and businesses requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area.

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Introduction**

This report provides details of the responses received to the recent statutory consultation undertaken in November 2021 with residents and businesses in September Way/The Ridgeway area.

### **Options considered**

Following on from the initial consultation carried out in 2020, proposals to extend the operational hours and extent of the existing controlled parking zones for CPZ(B) and CTW, were the subject of statutory consultation.

### **Background**

In response to a petition received from the residents of The Ridgeway and September Way, requesting the Council to extend the existing parking controls to deal with the on-going parking issues, an informal public consultation was undertaken in September 2020. The results of the consultation indicated that the local residents and businesses were experiencing parking problems and that they supported the introduction of extended hours of control.

The Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) agreed to include the September Way/Ridgeway area in the 2020/21 parking program. A sub-allocation of £35k for the statutory consultation and implementation of this review was agreed by TARSAP in X February 2021.

Statutory consultation was carried out between 11<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2021. The proposed scheme is detailed below as follows:

A new CPZ, with extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am to 2pm to include:

- The Ridgeway (Including section not currently within CPZ (B))
- September Way
- Old Church Lane (between Gordon Avenue and property Nos. 59/69)
- Elm Park - (between The Ridgeway and property Nos 41/43 and 46/48)
- Nelson Road - (between Elm Park and property Nos. 27/29 and 28/30)
- Bernays Close

Cherry Tree Way – To remain as zone (CTW) but with new extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am – 2pm

Introduction of “At any time” (double yellow lines) at key locations throughout the consultation area at junctions, bends, turning heads and narrow sections of road to help remove obstructive and dangerous parking, improve access and sightlines and to help re-enforce the rules of the Highway Code.

### **Responses from the consultation area.**

Approximately 468 leaflets were delivered to properties within the consultation area. In response to the statutory consultation, we received 55 objections, 3 comments and 10 letters of support. The majority of objections came from residents of The Ridgeway.

|                 | Objections | Support | Comments |
|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|
| The Ridgeway    | 43         | 8       | 0        |
| September Way   | 2          | 2       | 2        |
| Cherry Tree Way | 6          | 0       | 0        |
| Elm Park        | 0          | 0       | 1        |
| Nelson Road     | 0          | 0       | 0        |
| Bernays Close   | 4          | 0       | 0        |
| Old Church Lane | 0          | 0       | 0        |

All the objections and comments have been collated in the table in Appendix. The substance of the objections is summarised below:

| Objection/Comment  | Officer Response  |
|--|---|
| Concerned that the residents of The Ridgeway have not been properly consulted regarding the details of the proposed CPZ. | In response to the initial consultation, 74% (20/27) of respondents supported the proposal that operational hours be extended to Monday to Friday 10am - 2pm.   |
| The current proposal, if implemented, will mean that residents will be in a worse position than we are at present.       | With fewer vehicles parked in the road following the introduction of a CPZ, a reduction is expected in the number of parked vehicles belonging to non-residents freeing up space for residents.   |
| The extended hours of the CPZ, four not one hour   | This is not considered to be a material objection: The new Parking Management Strategy seeks to standardise the operational hours of new parking schemes. In the strategy there are three standard solutions to solve the main types of parking problems encountered. In this instance the reported problem is Commuter / workplace parking – these zones should operate for a minimum of 4 hours in the middle of the working day (e.g., Mon – Fri, 10am – 2pm). |
| The lack of adequate parking bays for residents and their visitors   | This is not considered to be a material objection. Parking bays are only marked where it is safe and appropriate to park. This can sometimes mean that the existing pattern of parking is not replicated. As a result, it is sometimes possible, especially in small side roads, that the number of bays marked might represent a fall in parking capacity.,  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>this fall must be balanced against the reduction in the number of parked vehicles belonging to non-residents.</p>   |
| <p>The introduction of double yellow lines outside more properties and the introduction of single yellow lines across our own dropped kerbs and driveways</p> | <p>A CPZ is an area where all parking on the highway is controlled for most, or part of the day. All kerbside space is marked as a parking bay (where parking is considered to be safe and appropriate) or a yellow line (where parking is considered to be dangerous or obstructive). Yellow lines, operating during the hours when parking controls apply, will be placed in locations such as in front of driveways, at junctions, on bends and where roads narrow and parked vehicles cannot be safely accommodated. The aim is to make more spaces available for residents, businesses, and their visitors.</p> |
| <p>The impact on road safety, due to unsafe positioning of parking bays</p>   | <p>Parking bays are only marked where it is safe and appropriate to park. This can sometimes mean that the existing pattern of parking is not replicated. As a result, it is sometimes possible, especially in small side roads, that the number of bays marked might represent a fall in parking capacity. However, this fall must be balanced against the reduction in the number of parked vehicles belonging to non-residents.</p>   |
| <p>The potential environmental impact that these changes will have as residents find it necessary to convert their front gardens into parking spaces.</p>     | <p>The majority of properties in the area have existing off street parking facilities (most for at least 2 vehicles). The introduction of extended operational hours for the CPZ will reduce the opportunity for non-residents to park freeing up space for residents who do not have off street parking.</p>  |

In addition to responses from the consultation area we received a petition from the Rector of St John's Church in Stanmore. The petition did not contain a specific statement of purpose but consisted of list of names and email addresses with comments. The Rector states that these are a cross-section of church members and users of the church hall.

## Discussion

### The Ridgeway

The original petition was signed by 55 residents. In the initial consultation a large majority of respondents from The Ridgeway supported the proposal. During the statutory consultation objections were received from 43 residents, of these objectors 22 residents signed the original petition. It appears that these petitioners have changed their minds when the full implications of adopting different hours for the CPZ was put to them.

A majority of the objections (31/42) came in the form of a standard letter raising a number of issues, none of which offer material grounds for objection.

### **September Way**

The original petition was signed by 8 residents. During the statutory consultation objections were received from 2 residents neither of whom had signed the original petition.

### **Cherry Tree Way**

The sections of additional double yellow lines are proposed in locations where if a vehicle were to be parked passage along the road would be compromised.

### **Bernays Way**

Two of the objectors were from the same address, one of the respondents had previously supported the proposal in the initial consultation.

### **St Johns Church**

The petition does not make any explicit request and the various comments do not raise any substantive issues regarding parking. It is a fact that many people prefer to use the car when in fact their journeys could as easily be undertaken on foot, cycle, or public transport. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street, but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The growth in car ownership has placed increased pressure on street through a variety of competing demands for space. The method that local authorities have to address this is the introduction of CPZ. The streets in question are already included in a CPZ and the increase in hours during the week should not impact the non-religious functions. Restrictions in roads that are closer to the church are not being changed and visitors will be able to park in these as they do currently.

### **Conclusion**

This is a statutory consultation, the purpose of which is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where an objector can identify strong material grounds, such as a business being prevented from loading close to its premises and causing operational difficulties that would affect its commercial activities. Anyone can object and officers review all of the objections and make a judgement as to whether an objection has a

material impact or not upon the proposed scheme. It should be noted that it is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal.

The correspondence received from St Johns Church appears to be asking that church goers and users associated with various clubs and societies who use the church and the church hall, should be afforded parking on the adjacent residential roads.

In this case the review did not identify that these objections offered any material grounds that would recommend that the scheme should not be taken forward.

### **Recommendations**

It is therefore recommended that the new CPZ, with extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am to 2pm to include those roads currently within CPZ (B), should be taken forward to implementation and as set out below.

### **Ward councillors' comments**

The results of the consultation were discussed with the ward councillors at a TEAMS meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> February. The notes of this meeting are attached in Appendix C.

The consensus of the councillors was that the various objections received regarding The Ridgeway and Cherry Tree Way should be upheld and an amended scheme taken forward to implementation as follows:

- A new CPZ, with extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am to 2pm to include those roads currently within CPZ (B), namely:
  - o The Ridgeway from junction with Old Church Lane to the boundary between numbers 9/11 The Ridgeway (i.e., excluding the section not currently within existing CPZ (B))
  - o September Way (excluding Laurimel Close)
  - o Old Church Lane (between Gordon Avenue and property No's. 59/69 and 1/44)
  - o Elm Park - (between The Ridgeway and property Nos 41/43 and 46/48)
  - o Nelson Road - (between Elm Park and property Nos. 27/29 and 28/30)
  - o Bernays Close including Naresby Fold
- Cherry Tree Way – To remain as zone (CTW) but with new extended hours of control operational Monday to Friday 10am – 2pm.

- Cherry Tree Way – proposals to introduce “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) should be withdrawn.
- Introduction of “At any time” (double yellow lines) at key locations throughout the consultation area (except in Cherry Tree Way and the section of The Ridgeway not currently in CPZ (B)) at junctions, bends, turning heads and narrow sections of road to help remove obstructive and dangerous parking, improve access and sightlines and to help re-enforce the rules of the Highway Code.

### **Performance issues**

The proposal supports the wider aims, objectives and targets as outlined in the Council’s Parking Management and Enforcement Strategy. These have been discussed above and in summary the proposal to introduce sections of waiting restrictions at strategic locations throughout the consultation area will help improve safety, access and sightlines in accordance with the Highway Code and corporate parking objectives.

### **Environmental Impact**

The parking policies are included in the LIP3 which has been subject to extensive engagement and consultation including a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the LIP and the main benefits are in improving air quality and statutory health. No negative environmental issues were identified as part of the SEA.

### **Data Protection Implications**

There are no data protection implications associated with this report.

### **Risk Management Implications**

Risk included on Directorate risk register. No  
Separate risk register in place? Yes

### **Procurement Implications**

There are no procurement implications associated with this report. The scheme will be implemented by the council’s term contractor.

### **Legal Implications**

The Traffic Management Act 2004 places 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.

The Council as the Highway and Traffic Authority, subject to statutory consultation requirements, has powers to introduce, implement and amend

Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and subsidiary regulations made under that Act, such as, The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

Furthermore, section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, provides the general duty under which the Council has a duty to secure expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and maintain the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

Under the Council's Constitution, (Part 3A-Terms of Reference and Allocation of Responsibilities) Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change is responsible for the development and strategic direction of the Council's environment services and climate change, including:  
Road safety, street scene, Major traffic infrastructure and Transportation.

Under Part 4D, Appendix to Executive Procedure Rules dealing with delegated powers of PHs, paragraph 2(ii) provides: Where matters have been fully considered by an Advisory Panel and the Panel has made recommendations to the Executive, the relevant PH may consider the recommendations and take the decision on behalf of the Council. This general power is subject to conditions, including: full consideration being given by the PH to all reports made to the Advisory Panel and to the minutes, reasons given and options rejected and consideration being given by the PH of the need for further consultation or information before taking the decision.

Under Part 4D, paragraph 2(iii) provides that PHs may also take decisions, which have not been the subject of a recommendation from an Advisory Panel or Consultative Forum (i.e. on a report from an officer of the Council) subject to conditions and should note that where the matter is controversial, or potentially controversial, the PH should refer the matter to the full Executive for decision.

### **Financial Implications**

The scheme is part of the 2021/22 Parking Management Programme with a total budget allocation of £300k.

A sub-allocation of £35k for the statutory consultation and implementation of this review has been agreed by TARSAP in February 2021. This scheme is carried forward into 2022/23 with a remaining budget of £27k. Therefore, the cost of implementing the scheme can be funded from within this budget.

### **Equalities implications / Statutory Sector Equality Duty**

The Equality Act 2010 outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equalities Duty and under s.149 it requires Public Bodies as decision makers to have 'due regard' to achieving a number of equality goals, which includes the need to:

- a. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010.
- b. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- c. Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Relevant protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. The broad purpose of this duty is to integrate considerations of equality into day to day business and keep them under review in decision making, the design policies and the delivery of services.

A programme of CPZ schemes was included in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was approved by full Council on XXX. The LIP was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where schemes were identified as having no negative impact on any equality groups. In addition, all CPZs have a positive impact on those with mobility difficulties as more spaces are identified for disabled parking. As a result of double yellow lines at junctions, there is also increased protection at junctions which will protect dropped crossing and prevent dangerous parking at these locations and thereby further assist those with mobility difficulties. Typical 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.<br><br>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.        |

Each scheme that is developed has a design risk assessment undertaken which includes an assessment of the impact on equalities issues. In addition, all statutory consultations are subject to issue of the Council's corporate Equality Monitoring Forms. The returned forms are subject to analysis to ensure that they reflect the local community by comparing them to data held by the Council at the time such as Census and vitality profiles. Any significant differences are used to adapt future consultations and would be reported to the Panel as part of the scheme reports.

### **Council Priorities**

The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with the Council's priorities as follows:

| Corporate priority      | Impact   |
|-------------------------|--|
| Putting residents first | <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 statutory transport and cycling lessening the impact on the local environment.</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> |

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**

**Statutory Officer:**

Signed on \*behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

Jessie Mann

**Date: 13-7-2022**

**Statutory Officer:**

Signed on \*behalf of the Monitoring Officer

Baljit Bhandal

**Date: 8-7-2022**

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

**Statutory Officer:**

Signed by the Head of Procurement

Nimesh Mehta

**Date: 28-06-2022**

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

**[Statutory Officer:**

Signed by the Corporate Director

Tony Galloway

**Date: 9-6-22**

Mandatory Checks

**Ward Councillors notified: YES**

**EqIA carried out: NO**

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 as the Council has also complied with design risk assessment and undertaken Equality Monitoring Forms.

### Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

**Contact:** Bruce Bolton/Sajjad Farid, Project Engineers.

Tel: 0208 424 1484

[Bruce.Bolton@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:Bruce.Bolton@harrow.gov.uk); [Sajjad.Farid@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:Sajjad.Farid@harrow.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:** Results of initial consultation

Signature: Tony Galloway

Position: Director of Environmental Services

Name: (print) TONY GALLOWAY.....

Date:09/06/2022

**For Portfolio Holder**

\* I do agree to the decision proposed

\* I do not agree to the decision proposed

\* *Please delete as appropriate*

Notification of disclosable non-pecuniary and *pecuniary* interests (if any):

[Should you have a *disclosable* pecuniary interest, you should not take this decision.]

Additional comments made by and/or options considered by the Portfolio Holder

Signature: .....  
Portfolio Holder

Date: 5 August 2022

**Call-in waived by the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee**  
*(for completion by Democratic Services staff only)*

**NOT APPLICABLE\***