

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	25 September 2007
Subject:	Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions – Zone C & Zone CA phase 2 – Consultation Results
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Head of Property and Infrastructure
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Susan Hall, Environment Services Portfolio Holder
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	<p>Appendix A – Consultation area – Zone C review</p> <p>Appendix B – Consultation area – Zone CA review</p> <p>Appendix C – Stakeholder meeting notes – zone C</p> <p>Appendix D – Sample consultation documents Zone C review</p> <p>Appendix E – Sample consultation documents possible further zone CA extension</p> <p>Appendix F – Sample consultation documents Zone CA review other issues</p> <p>Appendix G – Detailed plans used in consultation</p> <p>Appendix H – Consultation Responses Zone C review on CPZ</p> <p>Appendix I – Recommended extension of Zone C</p> <p>Appendix J – Consultation Responses Zone CA review on CPZ</p> <p>Appendix K – Revised proposals for Christchurch Avenue</p> <p>Appendix L – Princes Drive Consultation</p> <p>Appendix M – Zone CA review – other consultation responses.</p>

## SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out the findings of public consultation on possible extension of the Wealdstone controlled parking zones C/CA (phase 2) and associated parking restrictions and recommends which proposals should be taken forward.

**Recommendations (for decision by the Environment Services Portfolio Holder):**  
that the Panel recommends:

- (a) that officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design in accordance with Appendices A, B, G and I and take all necessary steps under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders, the details of which be delegated to officers, and implement the scheme, subject to consideration of objections for which the detailed recommendations are as follows:-
- (b) that double yellow line restrictions be introduced at the junctions/locations shown at Appendices A and G, excluding the junction between Harrow View and Headstone Drive, but their extent be modified in line with consultation feedback and site geometry;
- (c) that the existing Harrow & Wealdstone Zone C CPZ be extended to include Badminton Close, Leys Close, Rugby Close, Walton Close, Walton Drive (north-eastern end) Walton Road, and the remaining section of Marlborough Hill as shown at Appendices H and I;
- (d) that the parking bay outside the Princes Drive parade be made permit holders only Monday to Friday 10-11am but be free at other times as shown at Appendix G (zone C review layout 1);
- (e) that the existing Wealdstone Zone CA CPZ be further extended to include the section of Athelstone Road east of Whitefriars Avenue as shown at Appendix B;
- (f) that the parking bay in Cardinal Way be made permit holders only Monday to Friday 10-11am & 2-3pm;
- (g) that the layout of the parking bays in Tudor Road be modified as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 11) and that these bays have a no waiting restriction apply between 8am and 10am Monday to Friday;
- (h) that a no stopping restriction be applied to the existing school keep clear zig-zags outside Elmgrove First and Middle School in Kenmore Avenue;
- (i) that an exemption be made under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974 to allow two wheel footway parking on the west side of Bengarth Drive as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 13);
- (j) that the no waiting restrictions be modified in Christchurch Avenue as shown at Appendix K; and
- (k) that re-consultation / further consultation be carried out in roads or sections of roads, as shown in Appendix I, gauge the level of support for further extension of the permit parking and CPZ to these roads.

**REASON:** To control parking

## **SECTION 2 - REPORT**

### **2.1.1 Background**

- 2.1.2 The existing Wealdstone CPZs were initially introduced in 1996, and extended and split into the present zones C and CA in June 2003. The first phase of local consultation reviewed the area near to the High Street/ High Road corridor and also the area immediately surrounding Zone CA (that lies to the northeast of the railway line) took place in July 2006 and was reported to this Panel on 20 September 2006. This zone operates Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm although it includes pay and display bays and shared use bays which operate 8.00am – 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday in or adjacent to the shopping area.
- 2.1.3 A second phase of local consultation for possible further extension of zone CA, arising from the July 2006 consultation, took place in July 2007. There were also a number of more localized issues which were picked up in this second phase consultation. Local consultation for a review of Zone C, which lies to the southwest of the railway line and at present operates Monday to Friday 10-11am, was undertaken simultaneously.
- 2.1.4 The results of statutory consultation on traffic orders covering the proposals agreed by this Panel in September 2006 are provided in a separate report to this Panel.
- 2.1.5 A meeting of resident, business and other stakeholders in March 2006 discussed and agreed the area for consultation on a possible extension to zone C and also identified a number of further outlying streets where it was believed that residents should be advised of the proposals and given the opportunity of opting into full consultation. In parallel it was agreed to seek views on whether the zone hours needed to be changed as all the signs would carry this time in the future. A series of main road and junction restrictions were also proposed. The consultation area for the zone C review is shown at Appendix A.
- 2.1.6 Occupiers from a number of the peripheral roads in the zone CA July 2006 consultation had requested further consultation on possible further extension of the CPZ. This further consultation area together with the extension agreed from the previous consultation is shown at Appendix B.
- 2.1.7 There were a number of local issues outstanding from or coming from the first phase of consultation of the zone CA review.

### **2.2 Options considered**

See consultation.

### **2.3 Consultation**

- 2.3.1 Ward councillors were consulted about the proposed review and possible extension of Zones C and CA through the stakeholder meetings (see notes of stakeholder meeting for zone C review at Appendix C). All Ward Councillors were sent draft consultation materials for comments prior to finalising the leaflets.

## 2.3.2 Consultation Documents and Issues

### Zone C review

- 2.3.2.1 Consultation as part of the zone C review was undertaken in July 2007, with approximately 1350 leaflets being distributed to residential and business addresses within the area shown at Appendix A.
- 2.3.2.2 Occupiers of properties in roads just outside the existing zone where parking problems had often been reported (orange area) were consulted upon detailed proposals for a permit holder scheme and the hours of operation of the CPZ. A sample consultation (“I”) document is at Appendix D. Occupiers in the streets just beyond were advised of the consultation and asked if they too wished to be sent detail proposals for their road to decide whether it too should be included the scheme. A sample consultation (“II”) document is at Appendix D. Occupiers of both areas were also given details of junction and main road restriction proposals in their immediate area for their comment.
- 2.3.2.3 Occupiers of properties within the existing zone were consulted on whether the operational hours of the zone should remain as 10am to 11am only or whether an additional hour (2pm to 3pm) should be added. A sample consultation (“III”) document is at Appendix D. Occupiers near the parade in Princes Drive and by junctions on Marlborough Hill were additionally consulted about parking bay proposals and double yellow lines. A sample of the Princes Drive supplement is also included at Appendix D.

### Zone CA Review

- 2.3.2.4 Consultation was undertaken in July 2007, with approximately 1500 leaflets being distributed to residential and business addresses within the area shown at Appendix B.
- 2.3.2.5 Occupiers of properties in roads just beyond the area of the extended zone agreed last year, where people had asked for further consultation on a possible further extension of zone CA (three dark green areas), were consulted upon detailed proposals for a permit holder scheme. A sample consultation (“IV”) document is at Appendix E.
- 2.3.2.6 Occupiers of properties in roads listed in Table 1 below were consulted about a variety of local parking issues detailed in that table. Sample consultations (“V” to “XII”) are at Appendix F.

Table 1 – Other Consultations as part of Zone CA review

Consultation Ref.	Subject of Consultation	Streets covered	Number of Addresses consulted
V	Hour which controlled parking should operate in these streets	Masons Avenue, Herga Road, Byron Road (southern end), The Bridge	331
VI (a);(b) and (c)	Further double yellow line restriction proposals	Weald Lane & adjacent High Street; Dobbin Close and near College Hill Road/Kenton Lane junction	46; 79 and 35

VII	Parking controls in bay	Cardinal Way & adjacent Wolseley Road and High Street	51
VIII	Requested relaxation of double yellow lines	Havelock Road (west end) & adjacent Cecil Road	15
IX	Revised parking bays and double yellow lines	Spencer Road by Annette Close and The Cross Way	26
X	Footway parking bays	Bengarth Drive	33
XI	Revisions to "freebays"	Tudor Road & Barratt Way	30
XII	School keep clear enforcement and double yellow lines	Kenmore Avenue (southern end not included in consultation IV)	28

2.3.2.7 A full set of the detailed plans used in the consultations (Layouts 1 and 15) are at Appendix G (Zone CA review).

2.3.2.8 An abbreviated form of the consultation was put on the council's website with an opportunity to respond online.

2.3.3 The response rate for each consultation is set out below: -

Table 2 – Consultations and Response Rates

Consultation	What being consulted upon	Approximate number of leaflets delivered	Responses received
I	Possible extension of Zone C given detailed proposals including junction restrictions	351	88 (25.1%)
II	Whether should be consulted on detail proposals for possible extension of Zone C. Junction and main road restrictions	353	54 (15.3%)
III	Consultation within existing zone on operational hours	583	134 (23.0%)
III (a)	Supplemental Princes Drive shops parking questionnaire and isolated junction restrictions	80	7 (8.7%)
IV	Possible further extension of Zone CA given detailed proposals	812	203 (25.0%)
V	Consultation of occupiers in Masons Avenue and Herga Road on a possible additional hour to parking bays in their roads	331	68 (20.5%)
VI-XII	Consultation on localised parking issues associated with zone CA review	339	89 (26.3%)
Overall		2849	630 (22.1%)

**2.3.4** The response rate for all the consultations except one is considered reasonable for this type of consultation exercise. The responses have been placed in Members' Library.

**2.3.5** During the consultation period plans were displayed in the One Stop Shop at the Civic Centre and in the case of the zone CA review in the Wealdstone Centre. The display in the Wealdstone Centre was manned on two occasions. These periods being:- Thursday 12 July 10am – 4pm and Thursday 19 July 3pm – 8pm Attendance at the manned sessions was poor with less than 10 people visiting.

**2.3.6 General Responses**

2.3.6.1 The consultation sought the views of occupiers about several main issues. The overall figures for the proposed junction double yellow line restrictions is shown in table 3 below.

Table 3 - Overall Responses - Junction and other double yellow line restrictions

Consultation	In favour as proposed	Against or want modifications	No Opinion
I	48	32	N/A
II	29	22	N/A
III	81	31	N/A
III a	4	0	N/A
IV	107	69	N/A
V	41	18	3
VI	25	16	N/A
IX	4	2	N/A
XII	15	2	N/A
Overall	359	192	3

2.3.6.2 Table 4 Overall Responses – Proposal to extend parking scheme and CPZ zones C and CA.

Consultation	In favour	Against	No opinion
<b>I (zone C)</b>	46 (52%)	37 (42%)	6 (7%)
<b>IV (zone CA)</b>	54 (28%)	134 (68%)	8 (4%)

2.3.6.3 Table 5 Overall Responses – Want further consultation on possible extension and to be given detailed proposals to consider (from zone C review)

Consultation	Want further consultation on detailed proposal for CPZ	Further consultation not wanted	No opinion
II	36 (10.2% of those consulted)	9	9

2.3.6.4 Overall, there is majority support for the double yellow lines and an extension to zone C but a very clear majority against a further extension to zone CA. There are however significant variations in responses throughout the areas concerned. More detailed analysis of these results on a road by road basis or similar is

given in 2.3.7 (double yellow lines), 2.3.8 (possible extension to zone C and 2.3.8 (possible further extension to zone CA) below.

### **2.3.7 Double yellow line proposals**

- 2.3.7.1 Double yellow line proposals were made for junctions throughout the study area for the zone C review and for a small number of additional locations from the zone CA review where visibility or access for larger vehicles (emergency services and refuse trucks) was identified as an issue. The location of the proposals coincides with directions in the Highway Code – Rule 217 which states “DO NOT park your vehicle or trailer on the road where it would endanger, inconvenience or obstruct other road users. For example, do not stop ... anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services .... within 10 metres of a junction, except in an authorised parking space .... opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle .... on a bend.” The presence of yellow line waiting restrictions enables the council to enforce whereas without such restrictions enforcement is restricted to the Police.
- 2.3.7.2 Most consultations responses supported double yellow lines even if they opposed other proposed changes. Most responses came in an area wide survey and few of these raised concerns about restrictions at named junctions. There were specific location proposals like Dobbins Close where responses and concerns could be specifically attributed. The question posed asked occupiers whether they agreed with the layout of the double yellow lines proposed. With the “no” option there was a request to say how the proposals should be changed. In only about 50% of cases was any suggested change explained. Of the “no” responses, where comments were made about the double yellow line proposals, 21 responses were supportive of the restrictions or in most instances felt they should extend further than proposed.
- 2.3.7.3 There were however a few locations where the proposals attracted mainly negative responses which justify further consideration and possible modification.
- 2.3.7.4 There were double line proposals at the signalized junction between Harrow View and Headstone Drive in an attempt to improve traffic flow through this junction. Seven responses were against these citing potential damage to the businesses at this location. There are existing no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm restrictions. The majority of businesses do not operate in the evening so the lengthen restrictions should not theoretically affect these businesses. Double yellow lines do however appear to have a greater deterrent effect throughout the day. There are also some businesses which particularly rely on close short term parking in the evening and apparently parking just around the corner on the exit to the junction would be too far for customers. Responses also called on the council to provide parking lay-bys to facilitate parking during the day. This junction has been subject to protracted consideration for improvement to pedestrian crossing facilities, is on the LCN+ route between North Harrow and Wealdstone and has junction capacity problems. Although the double yellow lines proposed could be justified on safety and traffic flow grounds it is recommended that the waiting and loading restrictions and any parking provision nearby be considered as a separate package rather than this area-wide parking review.

2.3.7.5 There are two or three other roads where significant numbers of people were not in favour of the layout of double yellow lines as proposed, although as explained above many responses gave no indication as how they should be changed. It is suggested that the double yellow line proposals be taken forward to the traffic order stage at all the locations shown in the consultation proposals and at Appendix A except for the junction referred to in 2.3.7.4, however the exact extent of the lines proposed be reassessed, on a case by case basis, based on consultation feedback and re-examination of the site geometry.

2.3.7.6 Double yellow line proposals in Weald Lane, Dobbin Close, Masons Avenue and Spencer Road were the subject of specific consultations and are considered in section 2.3.11.

### 2.3.8 Extension of permit parking scheme – zone C

2.3.8.1 The consultation results overall showed support for extending the controlled parking zone. However, responses from residents of Harrow View, Ranmoor Gardens and Walton Drive who were consulted on detailed proposals showed majorities against the CPZ being extended. Ranmoor Close can only be accessed via Ranmoor Gardens so despite a majority in favour from Ranmoor Close taking it together with Ranmoor Gardens gives a small majority against (8:7). The responses from the individual roads is shown in Table 6 at Appendix H. Closer examination of the responses from Walton Drive shows strong support for the proposals from addresses at the north-eastern end of the road where it joins Walton Road where there was a majority in favour.

2.3.8.2 With the exclusion of the responses from the above opposed roads the proportion of support rises to 63% with only 29% opposed, see Appendix H. No permit bays are proposed for Harrow View where waiting restrictions apply Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm. So some people from Harrow View may currently park in the western end of Marlborough Hill. These people might be disadvantaged should all of Marlborough Hill be within the CPZ. It is therefore suggested that residents from the east side of Harrow View between Nos. 81 and 103 (odds) be given entitlement to purchase permits but the highway boundary of the zone be left as the entrance to Marlborough Hill from Harrow View. A similar approach is suggested for the addresses on the south side of Headstone Drive up to No.152, as occupiers may use Walton Road to park in. This approach is in line with other similar locations on main roads. Including the responses from these sections of Harrow View and Headstone Drive modifies support to 60% with 32% against.

2.3.8.3 It is therefore recommended **that the scheme be modified so that the CPZ and parking scheme be extended to include Badminton Close, Leys Close, Rugby Close, Walton Close, Walton Drive (north-eastern end) Walton Road and the remaining section of Marlborough Hill and that occupiers of Nos. 81-103 (odds) Harrow View and up to No.152 (evens) Headstone Drive be entitled to purchase permits as shown at Appendix I;**

2.3.8.4 To extend zone C as detailed in 2.3.8.3 would however leave Ranmoor Gardens and Ranmoor Close as an unrestricted island with zoned roads around. This may lead to worse parking problems in these roads with access difficulties.



There was also only a small majority against joining the zone from these roads. It is recommended that occupiers be re-consulted advising them of the intention to proceed with extension in surrounding roads.

2.3.8.5 A plan showing the area where occupiers were asked if they wanted further consultation upon detailed proposals if the zone were to be extended to nearby roads (Consultation II) is at Appendix A. Overall there was a lower response rate to this consultation, at 15.3%. However there were variations, with a higher response rate, 26% from non-distributor roads. There was also better support for further consultation from these roads (20% of all those consulted). Details are given in Table 7 at Appendix H. Despite this being quite high and greater than the comparable figure for the consultation on detailed proposals, experience from a similar further consultation for zone CA (see para. 2.3.9.1 below) suggests there may well be insufficient support for further extension). The responses received from the western end of Walton Drive further support this view. The consultation did however state “If the responses for your area show demand we will consult you on detailed proposals.” The council is therefore obligated to carry out further consultation.

2.3.8.6 The timing of this further consultation is worth considering. Although people have been alerted to the possibility of displaced parking from an extended zone C the actual impact is difficult to assess until the extension becomes a reality. Previous experience indicates the people living just outside the new zone boundary contact the council, about their new parking problem, in the first few months after the scheme’s implementation. At that stage the next opportunity for residents to join the permit parking scheme is usually at the next (major) review in perhaps 5 years time. The benefits of offering a second phase of further consultation in the zone CA review seem to have been negated as a common response was: “we do not have a parking problem.” The parking problem if there is one has yet to occur. It is only with the benefit of hindsight that people request further measures. This approach had been taken in an attempt to reducing to a minimum the time people faced peripheral parking problems. It is recommended that **the further consultation for the zone C review be held approximately 6 months after any finally agreed scheme is implemented and that for similar reviews elsewhere, automatic further consultation take place within a similar timeframe on outlying roads when a zone is extended, subject to availability of funding.**

2.3.8.7 Occupiers within the existing and proposed extension to zone C were consulted on whether the zone should operate for one hour in the morning, as at present, or whether there should be an additional hour (2-3pm) added. The responses received on this issue are summarised in table 8 below.

Table 8 Consultation on hours of operation of zone C

Area	Mon-Fri 10-11am (as at present)	Mon-Fri 10-11am and 2-3pm	Other suggestion or no opinion
Existing CPZ	70	50	12
Proposed extension as detailed in 2.3.8.3 above	24	25	14
Overall	94	75	26

- 2.3.8.8 From the above it is clear that retaining the present operating hours is the most popular option and it is recommended **no change be made to the zone hours for zone C**. The council has received a number of complaints about obstructive parking after 11am in Kings Way in particular. This has been attributed to users of Harrow and Wealdstone Station. The 2 hour option was the most popular in Kings Way being backed by 18 responses as opposed to 6 for the present restrictions. It is impractical to have different zone hours for this road alone but is recommended local consultation be undertaken to address the parking problem.
- 2.3.9 **Possible further extension of permit parking scheme – zone CA**
- 2.3.9.1 People in the areas consulted had shown significant enthusiasm for further consultation when asked in the July 2006 review. It is perhaps surprising this did not translate into support for the detailed proposals. The request for more consultation was however always intended as just that and not a decision to join the CPZ. Many of the responses in this consultation indicated people did not have (a current) parking problem and therefore nothing a CPZ should address. The prospect of the CPZ being extended and addressing parking problems in nearby streets and where this parking might transfer did not appear to be within people's consideration.
- 2.3.9.2 Despite the overall response not favouring further extension there was significant variations especially in roads closest to the extend zone agreed last year. A road by road breakdown of the consultation responses is given in Table 9 in Appendix J.
- 2.3.9.3 The majority of responses from Christchurch Avenue support an extension of the CPZ and it would theoretically be possible to extend to CPZ to cover this road whilst leaving out Christchurch Gardens and Kenmore Avenue. People's decision from Christchurch Avenue might well have been influenced by parking bay proposals in the side-roads which are not to be taken forward. So in view of the majority opposition from this area as a whole (22:13) it is recommended that the CPZ not be extended here.
- 2.3.9.4 There is a hatched area on the north side of Christchurch Avenue to dissuade parking on the approach to Christchurch Gardens. The revised proposal had daytime restrictions on this section but now, in view of other restrictions proposed in Christchurch Avenue, it is considered necessary that it be kept clear of parking at all time and should have double yellow lines. The proposals included some parking partially on the footway between Christchurch Gardens and Kenmore Avenue to address insufficient carriageway width to allow 6.0 metres for moving traffic on a distributor road with bus services. Although these will no longer be permit bays it recommended that freebays be marked partially on the footway. The revised restriction proposals recommended for statutory consultation are shown at Appendix K.
- 2.3.9.5 Athelstone Road is split into two by Whitefriars Avenue where residents decided to join the CPZ in last year's consultation. Overall the majority of responses from Athelstone Road were not in favour of joining the CPZ. Responses from the short eastern section which forms a cul de sac off Whitefriars Avenue supported joining the CPZ. Residents appear concerned that any additional parking

problems will leave no available parking to them in their short section of road. Inclusion of this section will make a more consistent zone boundary and is recommended.

### 2.3.10 **Other issues within the Zone C review area**

- 2.3.10.1 Consultation took place on the issue of parking outside the parade of shops in Princes Drive. A properly marked out a parking bay layout is necessary here to control parking which currently juts out into the running lane of the carriageway. There was also a proposal to extend the double yellow lines opposite to deter hazardous short-term parking. Both these proposals had majority support. Occupiers were asked what form of parking control should apply to the parking bays. 3 responses favoured permit bays whilst 2 favoured pay and display. The consultation responses are summarised in table 10 at Appendix L. It is recommended that the proposals be taken forward with permit holder only parking bay which will apply Monday to Friday 10am to 11am but will be free to all at other times.
- 2.3.10.2 Occupiers in the vicinity of the Civic Centre were consulted about a range of issues which included revised waiting and loading restrictions on Station Road/Station Approach and the side roads (Marlborough Hill and Milton Road) leading from the main road; and new pay and display bays in Milton Road next to the Civic Centre. Six responses were received to this consultation. Two responses supported the proposals. A resident from Blawith Road objected to double yellow lines on the junction between Milton Road and Poets Way stating this was suitable for residential parking once the current waiting restrictions finish at 6.30pm. The proposals only enable enforcement of the Highway Code Rule 217 as explained in 2.3.7.1 above. A business in Station Approach objected to the proposals for changed loading restrictions outside their premises on the east side of the road. They complained of “recent” changed parking restrictions in Station Approach whereas no actual change has taken place since 1996. They complain that loading restriction to the rear entrance to the building in Marlborough Hill will be detrimental. The proposed change here is to reduce or remove loading restrictions which again have existed for some time. It is unclear whether the business has full access to the rear of the property where loading facilities exist and will be improved. A business on the west side of Station Road objects to increased parking restrictions near their premises. The restrictions in the section of Station Road near the premises are overridden by zag-zag markings for a pelican crossing and the kerbside is not therefore currently available for use. Restrictions in the first section of Milton Road, by the junction, have been increased from Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm to at any time, but additional pay and display facilities in this road are part of the proposals. They also complain at the expensive tariff for P&D parking. A response from the Mosque opposes the proposals stating there should be more pay and display parking due to the opening of the new mosque but then opposes the proposed P&D parking proposed for Milton Road as against “handicapped parking”. The response calls for more peak time only waiting restrictions and dedicated disabled parking. The proposals remove some loading restrictions in side roads off Station Road including opposite the new mosque which could be used for blue badge holder parking for up to 3 hours. Blue badge holders can also use permit holder and P&D bays free of charge.

- 2.3.10.3 Despite the negative remarks from four responses the officer comments in 2.3.10.2 demonstrate this opposition is not well founded having regard for general benefits for highway users or even for the community locally. It is recommended that the proposals be taken forward to the statutory stage unchanged.
- 2.3.10.4 Businesses located at the north-western end of Hailsham Drive were consulted on proposed double yellow lines to keep the lorry turning area clear at all times. Complaints had been made of overnight lorry parking. The only responses was received did not support the proposals. There is an overnight lorry parking ban which applies to this road and existing Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm waiting restrictions so the double yellow lines would theoretically impose little additional restriction for lorries. Double yellow lines are however better understood and appear to be more effective at deterring parking. It is recommended that the proposed double yellow lines in Hailsham Drive be taken forward.
- 2.3.10.5 The only response to the junction double yellow proposals at the junctions of Victor Road and Pinner Park Avenue/Gardens with Harrow View was supportive of the proposals and again taking forward the proposals is recommended.

#### 2.3.11 **Other issues within the Zone CA review area**

- 2.3.11.1 The responses to the consultation about a possible extra zone hour applicable to the permit bays in Masons Avenue and Herga Road favoured keeping the present hours (ie Mon-Sat 10-11am & 2-3pm) with 37 responses for this option; 26 wanting the additional evening hour. The responses from residential addresses were much closer with 26 favouring the additional hour 29 wanting the status quo and a further 2 wanting even longer hours. There is however no particular area where change is significantly more popular than the status quo so no change is recommended. The same consultation backed proposals for a double yellow line at the eastern junction between Herga Road and Masons Avenue. It also supported an additional inter peak shared use bay beneath the flyover. Further details of this consultation are in Table 11 at Appendix M.
- 2.3.11.2 In the consultations of (i) Dobbins Close and (ii) College Hill Road / Kenton Lane regarding proposed additional double yellow lines there were majorities in favour of the proposals and it is recommended the proposals be taken forward along with other double yellow line proposals to the statutory consultation stage. In the case of a similar consultation in (iii) Weald Lane there were more responses who did not support the proposals to further extend the double yellow lines. Despite the proposals not being in the immediate vicinity of the shops at the far eastern end of Weald Lane the nearest two shops were consulted as they were within 25 metres of the nearest proposed double yellow lines and it was appreciated customers might use this section of road for short term parking. It would appear there is connection with another two premises in Weald Lane from whom identical (photocopy) responses have been received. Another response was not against the current additional proposal but other double yellow lines. Yet another was opposed as they wanted double yellow lines elsewhere. A resident suggested a single yellow line, however this would not ensure access. Another resident saw no access problems including in the newly adopted service road. Parking is not practical in both sides of Weald Lane as

the road is only slightly over 5 metres wide. Occasionally parking occurs staggered on one side then the other causing access difficulties especially for larger vehicles. One response called for even more double yellow lines. It is recommended to proceed with the proposals.

- 2.3.11.3 Occupiers of addresses in Cardinal Way and the adjacent sections of Wolseley Road and High Street were consulted about which form of parking control should apply to a parking bay outside of Admiral House, Cardinal Way. All 3 responses favoured a permit parking bay (which would apply for the zone hours). It is recommended the traffic order be amended to add the parking bay in Cardinal Way as a permit holder only bay.
- 2.3.11.4 The council had received complaints about shortage of available parking in Havelock Road especially in the evenings and request to remove the double yellow line protecting the turning area at the end of this closed end of the road. The consultation asked occupiers of the nearest 15 addresses their views on a compromise proposal modifying some of the double yellow lines to allow two car parking spaces apart from zone hours. One response supported the change and one supported the status quo. It is recommended that the restrictions in Havelock Road be left unchanged.
- 2.3.11.5 Parking problems attributed to a branch surgery of a doctor's practice in Spencer Road came to light during the consultation in 2006. In line with the general approach taken to GP surgeries in new CPZ areas bays outside the surgery were proposed as shared use to enable patients to pay and display. Further double yellow lines were proposed where obstructive parking had been a concern and some further permit parking spaces in the first section of The Cross Way. A majority of responses backed the double yellow lines but 4 of the 6 responses did not support the revised bay layout. A continuing cause of complaint from residents appears the understood assurance given by the GP to accommodate parking within the back garden of this corner property, before the practice was established. Planning records however do not record any such condition. Another point made that the parking controls proposed for the bays (in common with other P&D facilities) were Mon-Sat 8am - 6.30pm whereas the surgery was open for 2 to 3 hours on Monday to Friday. Clearly how the surgery hours might change in the future is not within the council's control. GP surgeries however do not generally provide a Saturday surgery and there no retail premises nearby which might be open on Saturday. It is felt important to provide support for community services like GP practices so it is recommended that **the revised bay arrangement in Spencer Road be taken forward but with parking controls in the shared use bay reduced to Monday to Friday only.**
- 2.3.11.6 Residents of Bengarth Drive had requested that the council should allow them to park partially on a wide footway on the western side of the road so as to increase the availability of on-street parking whilst still allowing access for larger vehicles. The council agreed to consult the residents on a footway parking proposal as the road is a cul de sac and the c 3.6 metre wide footway appears, possibly many years ago, to have been constructed with a concrete strip to facilitate parking. Of the 15 responses, 13 supported the proposal. It is recommended that **an exemption be made under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974 to allow two wheel**

**footway parking on the west side of Bengarth Drive as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 13).**

- 2.3.11.7 A business from Tudor Road contacted the council with concerns that the position of a freebay together with their legitimate loading/unloading caused the available width of carriageway for moving traffic to be unduly constricted. The council had also received complaints that rail commuters using Harrow and Wealdstone station were parking in the freebays which then were unavailable to others visiting local premises for the remainder of the day. All 6 consultation responses supported the relocation of the parking bay. 3 responses favoured an early morning waiting restriction while 2 favoured all day pay and display as a means of preventing all day parking from early morning. Only one response supported the status quo. It is recommended that **the layout of the parking bays in Tudor Road be modified as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 11) and that these bays have a no waiting restriction apply between 8am and 10am Monday to Friday.**
- 2.3.11.8 The council received requests for junction double lines to be placed at a number of junctions on the southern section of Kenmore Avenue, especially the junctions with Cullington Close and Daintry Close due to problems caused by parking at either end of the school day. Elmgrove First and Middle School had also requested that the school keep clear markings on the east side of the road be made enforceable. In the consultation of occupiers of the southern end of Kenmore Avenue there was majority support for both the junction double yellow lines and the enforcement of the keep clear markings. It is recommended that **these proposals are taken forward.**

## **2.4 Financial Implications**

- 2.4.1 The estimated overall cost to carry out the traffic order process and implement the scheme recommended within this report is £90,000. £15,000 of this is to amend the permit bay signs to show their hours of operation within the existing zone C and part of zone CA. The replacement of this signage was delayed from last financial year pending the consultation on operating hours.
- 2.4.2 There is a total of £144,000 available from the Harrow CPZ Capital budget for the current financial year (2007/08) which is sufficient to cover completion of the order making and implementation of the scheme proposals of the zone CA phase 1 which is the subject of a separate report to this Panel.
- 2.4.3 There no further funding currently available to take forward the zone C and zone CA phase 2 proposals which are the subject of this report. A bid for this additional Harrow Capital funding in 2008/09 will have to be made to enable this element of the scheme to progress. Further work on these parts of the Wealdstone CPZ review must be deferred until this funding is available.
- 2.4.4 An alternative approach of deferring the implementation of zone CA phase 1 and making progress on the traffic orders for zone C and zone CA phase 2 was considered. However there are considerable expectations of extension of zone CA and associated proposals being completed this year and it is considered this should be given priority.

## 2.5 Legal Implications

2.5.1 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions can be implemented under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. A scheme to allow parking in marked bays partially on the footway in Bengarth Drive and Christchurch Avenue can be introduced with the provisions of Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974.

## 2.6 Equalities Impact

2.6.1 Not applicable.

## 2.7 Community Safety (s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998)

2.7.1 Not applicable

## SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

On behalf of the Chief Finance Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: Sheela Thakar  Date: 13 September 2007
On behalf of the Monitoring Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: Stephen Dorrian  Date: 13 September 2007

## SECTION 4 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

**Contact:** Stephen Freeman,  
Engineer, Traffic Management  
Tel. No: 020 8424 1437

**Background Papers:**

- 1 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 20 September 2006  
Agenda Item 12 - Wealdstone controlled parking zone –  
Review and possible extension of Zone CA and associated  
restrictions.
- 2 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 27 February 2007  
Agenda Item 10 – Controlled parking zone/Residents parking  
scheme - Annual review (2007).
- 3 Consultation responses.

**IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?**

1.	Consultation	YES/ <del>NO</del>
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / <del>NO</del>