

Report for

## **Portfolio Holder Decision**

---

**Subject:**

**CANTERBURY ROAD AREA PARKING REVIEW  
RESULTS OF PUBLIC 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:**

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

<http://modern.gov/documents/s153716/031%20Part%204D%20Executive%20Procedure%20Rules.pdf>

Page 37 onwards, Part 4D of the Constitution.

**Exempt:**

No

**Wards affected:**

Hatch End

**Enclosures:**

**Appendix A** – Consultation leaflet.

**Appendix B** – Comments and officer response

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

This report sets out the results of the recent public consultation undertaken in October 2021 with residents and businesses in Canterbury Road Area.

Recommendations:

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

1. Note the results of the consultation and approve that the proposed introduction of a new Controlled Parking Zone (“CPZ”) in Canterbury Road is not taken forward to implementation.
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 public 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**

### **Introductory paragraph**

This report provides details of the responses received to the recent public consultation undertaken in September 2021 with residents and businesses in the area.

### **Options considered**

Residents were asked whether they would support the uncontrolled section of Canterbury Road between Durham Road and Pinner View being included in the existing CPZ (NH1) operational Monday to Friday 10 - 11am and 2 – 3pm.

### **Background**

In January 2020 the council received a petition signed by 47 residents from Canterbury Road, requesting the council “to extend the existing CPZ (NH1) to include all of Canterbury Avenue to help address the problem of non-resident parking in the area.”

In response to the petition, in March 2021 TARSAP agreed to include Canterbury Road in the councils parking programme for 2021-22.

Initial public consultation was carried out in September 2021 asking residents if they would support the extension of Zone (NH1) to include all of Canterbury

Road between Durham Road and Pinner View. A copy of the consultation material is attached in Appendix A.

### Responses from the consultation area.

100 leaflets were delivered to households within the consultation area.

We received 67 responses. 8 households submitted multiple responses these have been redacted and only 1 from each household has been included. One response was received from a property outside the consultation area, this response has not been included. This gives 54 responses and a response rate of 54%, this is considered to be an extremely good level of response for a consultation of this type and is a firm basis from which to take a decision.

The responses are tabulated below:

Q2. Do you or your visitors find it difficult to find a convenient parking space nearby?		Q3 Would you support the uncontrolled section of Canterbury Road between Durham Road and Pinner View being included in the existing CPZ (NH1) operational Monday to Friday 10 - 11am and 2 – 3pm)	
Yes	No	Yes	No
27	27	21	33

It should be noted that of the original 47 petitioners, 23 responded to the consultation. In response to Question 3: 14 voted “Yes” and 9 voted “No”.

The results indicate that 50% residents who responded (27/54) find it difficult to find a place to park nearby.

However, 61% of residents who responded (33/54) do not support the uncontrolled section of Canterbury Road between Durham Road and Pinner View being included in the existing CPZ (NH1) operational Monday to Friday 10 - 11am and 2 – 3pm).

35 respondents included comments with their replies. The main comments are summarised below. A copy of all the comments and officer response is included in Appendix B.

Summary of comment	Officer Response
The proposed CPZ would cut down the number of available parking space for all hours. I would not be able to park in front of my own drive at any time.	Within a CPZ all kerbside space is controlled either by a parking bay or by waiting restrictions. It is usual to introduce zone time single yellow lines across driveways. Some authorities introduce parking bays across driveways, but this has proved counterproductive as anyone with a valid permit would be eligible to park there and this has led to instances of householders not being able to access or exit their property by being blocked in or out by lawfully parked vehicles. The restrictions would be time limited, outside the operational hours parking can occur as it

	<p>does at present, except on any new “at any time” double yellow lines. 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>We live on the road and have not experienced parking issues. Proposed plan really not required</p>	<p>The proposal was initiated by a residents’ petition. The purpose of the public consultation is to gain an understanding of residents’ preference for a course of action. As with any consultation there will be respondents who have conflicting opinions. When offered a choice of options the option that receives a majority of support will be recommended to be taken forward. Officers assess the responses and report these to the ward councillors and portfolio-holder who decides as to the way forward. The consultation is not a compulsory public vote as officers can only determine the wider view based on the answers of residents who responded to the consultation. but they (nor the portfolio holder) can infer any intention from those who elected not to respond other than that they are indifferent as to the result.)</p>
<p>Parking for residents has become increasingly difficult over the past few years residents from neighbouring roads which are CPZ’s and the resident would rather park for free in Canterbury Road rather than pay for a permit.</p>	<p>The introduction of the proposals would bring this section of Canterbury Road in line with the rest of the CPZ. This would allow residents to park in a wider area during the operational hours and reduce the number of non-residents accessing the area looking for parking spaces.</p>

## Conclusion and recommendations

The results clearly indicate that residents do not support the uncontrolled section of Canterbury Road between Durham Road and Pinner View being included in the existing CPZ (NH1) operational Monday to Friday 10 - 11am and 2 – 3pm),

Quite a few of the negative responses seem to be on the grounds of convenience (not being able to park across drives) or opposed to paying for a permit. However, there are also responses highlighting safety concerns, obstructive parking and inability for visitors to park which will not be addressed if the scheme is not taken forward as a result of the negative responses.

In conclusion as the large majority of consultation results are against the proposal it is suggested that this result should be reported to the PH with the recommendation that the scheme is not taken forward.

### **Ward councillors' comments**

Ward councillors were invited to a TEAMs meeting in February 2022 to discuss the results of the consultation.

The ward Councillors who responded commented that a number of residents had expressed that they wanted the CPZ.

It was explained that the purpose of the public consultation is to gain an understanding of residents' preference for a course of action. However, as with any consultation there will be respondents who have conflicting opinions.

When offered a choice of options the option that receives a majority of support will be recommended to be taken forward. Officers assess the responses and report these to the ward councillors and portfolio-holder who decides as to the way forward.

The consultation is not a compulsory public vote officers can only assess based on the answers of residents who responded to the consultation. We cannot infer any intention from those who elected not to respond.

Individual responses have been received from properties all along Canterbury Road and therefore it is a good base from which to make a decision.

Experience indicates that many residents when canvassed at the door may express support for a course of action but when offered the opportunity to complete a questionnaire in private about that same issue they may opt to respond differently. This can be seen in the results, that of the original 47 petitioners, only 23 responded to the consultation, and in response to question 3 (Would you support the uncontrolled section of Canterbury Road between Durham Road and Pinner View being included in the existing CPZ (NH1)): 14 voted "yes" and 9 voted "No". So, 20% of the original petitioners changed their minds.

It was agreed that the results clearly indicate that residents do not want to be included in an extended CPZ. Therefore, it is recommended by officers the scheme should not be taken forward, and that this recommendation should be reported to the PH for approval.

### **Performance issues**

The proposal supports the wider aims, objectives and targets as outlined in the council 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**

Subject to statutory consultation requirements, the legislative framework within which the Council may exercise powers to introduce, implement and modify CPZs is the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA 1984") and associated subsidiary legislation.

In particular, there is a general duty placed on local authorities under RTRA 1984 Section 122 to exercise their powers with a view to securing expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and maintaining the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway having regard to:

- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
- (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected;
- (c) national air quality strategy;
- (d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
- (e) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.

### **Financial Implications**

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

A sub-allocation of £24k for the statutory consultation and implementation of this review was agreed by TARSAP in February 2021. Therefore, the cost of

not implementing the scheme can be reallocated to fund other schemes in the programme.

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

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 groups with protected characteristics. In addition, all CPZs tend to have a positive impact for those with mobility difficulties as more spaces will be allocated for disabled parking. Furthermore, as a consequence of painting double yellow lines at junctions, there will be protection of dropped crossings and prevention of dangerous/obstructive parking to assist those with mobility difficulties. Typical beneficial outcomes are as follows:

<b>Protected characteristic</b>	<b>Benefit</b>
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 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: Jessie Mann**

Signed on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

**Date: 23-03-22**

**Statutory Officer: Kevin Breslin**

Signed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

**Date: 25 March 2022**

## Section 3 - Procurement Officer Clearance

**Statutory Officer: Nimesh Mehta**

Signed by the Head of Procurement

**Date: 22-03-22**

## Section 3 – Corporate Director Clearance

**Statutory Officer:**

Signed on behalf of the Corporate Director

Tony Galloway

**Date: 09-06-22**

## 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

## Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

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

[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:

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: 08 August 2022

## **Call-in waived by the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

*(for completion by Democratic Services staff only)*

**YES/ NO / NOT APPLICABLE\***