

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	26 November 2008
Subject:	Pinner Road area parking review and possible controlled parking zone –Results of local consultation and proposals for implementation
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	John Edwards - Divisional Director Environmental Services
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Susan Hall- Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	<p>Appendix A – Notes of stakeholders meeting</p> <p>Appendix B – Consultation areas for parking review</p> <p>Appendix C – Scope of parking proposals</p> <p>Appendix D – Sample consultation documents</p> <p>Appendix E – Detailed plans used in consultations</p> <p>Appendix F - Response to consultation on double yellow lines and controlled parking</p> <p>Appendix G – Notes of meeting with Pinner Road small business group representative</p> <p>Appendix H – Area of proposed controlled parking zone recommended for statutory consultation</p>

## SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out the findings of public consultation on a possible new controlled parking zone (CPZ) west of Harrow town centre, associated parking restrictions on Pinner Road and at junctions in Headstone South ward and seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to implement these proposals

## **Recommendations :**

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Environment and Community Safety Portfolio Holder that she make the following decisions:

- (a) (i) that officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design of the parking controls in accordance with Appendices F & H and take all necessary steps under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders, the details of which will be delegated to officers and to implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections for which the detailed recommendations are as specified in (b) to (g) below;  
(ii) that the Traffic and Highway Network Manager be authorised to determine any objections to the scheme received as a result of the statutory consultation or otherwise in consultation with the Portfolio Holder;
- (b) that double yellow line restrictions be introduced at the junctions/locations shown at Appendices E and H, but their extent be modified in line with consultation feedback and site geometry;
- (c) that a new CPZ be formed adjoining the central Harrow zone D to include Devonshire Road, Dorset Road, Oxford Road, Harrow, the eastern sections of Pinner Road and Sussex Road, southern ends of Rutland Road, Bedford Road and Pinner View and part of Neptune Road, to operate Monday to Friday 11am to 12 noon, as shown at Appendices F and H;
- (d) that in addition to the permit parking bays within these roads, that bays be introduced at the southern ends of Devonshire Road, Oxford Road, Rutland Road, Bedford Road and Pinner View to provide short term pay and display parking as shown at Appendix H;
- (e) that the existing waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road be changed as shown at Appendix E;
- (f) that the feasibility of loading facilities at the southern end of the county roads be further considered to address need for servicing when loading restrictions apply on Pinner Road;
- (g) that officers carry out further discussions with businesses from Neptune Road as to the restrictions in the roadway parallel to the railway: and
- (h) that re-consultation / further consultation be carried out in roads or sections of roads the zone in (c) above, but confirmed by parking surveys, to gauge the level of support for further extension of the permit parking and CPZ to these roads, approximately 6 months after recommendation (c) above has been implemented, subject to the availability of funding.

**REASON:** To control parking in the Pinner Road area as detailed in the report.

## **SECTION 2 - REPORT**

### **2.1.1 Background**

- 2.1.1.1 The existing Harrow town centre CPZ was initially introduced in the early 1980's. It was split into separate zones with the introduction of permit parking in the late 1990's. There have been a number of extensions and new zones added to form the current extent of the central Harrow zones but, except for the addition of Roxborough Road to zone D, the western boundary near Pinner Road has remained unchanged since the early 1980's.

- 2.1.1.2 Residents and businesses across a wide area stretching from North Harrow to Bessborough Road were consulted on a possible CPZ around 2000 but support was patchy and no scheme was eventually introduced. There have remained continued complaints about parking problems in the “county roads” to the north of Pinner Road particularly to the east of Pinner View.
- 2.1.1.3 A petition calling for relaxation in the waiting restrictions on the north-east side of Pinner Road outside the shops was received by Council in February 2005 and referred to this Panel in March 2005. This issue was to be considered as part of a review of the central Harrow CPZ which was considering this area. A stakeholders meeting in June 2005 was attended by a representative from the shopping parade. Waiting restrictions currently apply Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm. Prior to the meeting officers investigated the possibilities for customer parking for the shopping parade and presented these to the meeting. The notes of the stakeholder meeting are at Appendix A.
- 2.1.1.4 Relaxation of the waiting restrictions on the northeast side of the current carriageway is not possible due to inadequate visibility if emerging from the side roads, the busy nature of Pinner Road which is part of London’s strategic route network (SRN) and the London Cycle Network Plus cycle lanes. The businesses and freeholders of the premises on the Pinner Road parade were therefore consulted on whether they were prepared to dedicate part of the private forecourt areas as highway. This was to test the feasibility of parking within lay-bys in front of the shops the construction of which would have required the footway to be moved closer to the shops. Despite reminders, there was at best indifference to the creation of these lay-bys at four of the five potential sites. Even in the most promising location it was unclear whether the unanimous support of the necessary parties (freeholders and tenants) was present for the necessary dedications. The necessary legal processes even with unequivocal support would be lengthy and expensive. The construction costs would inevitably be high due to the need to divert or protect buried services within the current footway area. The actual benefit of the maximum seven parking spaces created would not appear to justify the costs involved. By comparison some 25 spaces could be provided on the carriageway in the side roads before the start of the residential frontage.
- 2.1.1.5 The stakeholder meeting discussed the respective needs of residents and businesses within the area together with safety and amenity of users of Pinner Road including bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians. The nearest location for customer parking was in the first section of the side roads. Officers explained to the stakeholders the council’s obligations to review restrictions especially on the SRN to address safety and congestion. The extent of consultation on a possible permit parking scheme and the approach of placing double yellow lines at road junctions was agreed. It was clear a series of proposals to address the respective needs was necessary. The geographical areas for respective consultations are shown at Appendix B.
- 2.1.1.6 A reduction in the budget for the CPZ programme and completion of reviews elsewhere caused a delay in the general public consultation until the current financial year. The Transport for London funded local safety scheme programme had identified separate measures to address accidents on Pinner Road. A similar TfL funded programme for LCN+ routes which includes Pinner

Road has proposals for entry treatments on the side roads. It proved possible to combine consultation on these separate proposals to provide people with an overall picture and to achieve some cost savings. The results of the other consultations on safety scheme and cycle scheme proposals are reported separately.

- 2.1.1.7 Consultation took place between 8 and 26 September 2008 by means of separate consultation documents delivered with questionnaires depending on the proposals in the vicinity of the address concerned. An exhibition was held at St George's Church, Pinner View on 16 and 17 September. The consultation was also available online via the council's "traffic consultations" web address.

## **2.2 Options considered**

- 2.2.1 The scope of the proposals and reasons for them is outlined in Appendix C.
- 2.2.2 The option as to how to proceed, based on the response to the parking consultations, is included within 2.3 Consultation section.

## **2.3 Consultation**

- 2.3.1 Ward councillors were consulted about the proposed parking review and possible new controlled parking zone through the stakeholder meetings (see notes of stakeholder meeting at Appendix A). All Ward Councillors were sent draft consultation materials for comments prior to finalising the leaflets.
- 2.3.2 **Consultation Documents and Issues**
  - 2.3.2.1 Five separate consultation documents were produced so the information and consultation questions could be tailored to be most relevant to the addresses of the people being consulted. A key plan is at Appendix B. The colour coding appears as a broad strip at the top of the consultation document and corresponds to the area or section of road or circles on the plan.
  - 2.3.2.2 Consultation on a possible new CPZ was undertaken as part of the parking review in September 2008, with approximately 500 leaflets being distributed to residential and business addresses within the green (striped) area and 315 leaflets to yellow section of Pinner Road (between Roxborough bridge and Cornwall Road). The green area document also proposed double yellow lines on the junctions whilst the yellow area document proposed changes to waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road and parking bays where customers/visitors could pay and display. Businesses in Neptune Road were sent further information and asked for their views on parking controls within much of Neptune Road where no restrictions have been proposed to date.
  - 2.3.2.3 Occupiers of properties in the orange section of Pinner Road, from Cornwall Road to Station Road, were just consulted on proposed changes to waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road (200 leaflets). Occupiers of properties close to the blue circled junctions on the plan were sent a separate consultation relating the proposed double yellow lines at these junctions (445 leaflets).

2.3.2.4 Sample consultation documents are at Appendix D. The colour strip on the front of the respective consultation documents corresponds to area or section of Pinner Road or junction circles on the plan at Appendix B. Due to the particular issues raised by businesses from Pinner Road they received further information in their consultation leaflet. The residential addresses received the green / yellow consultation but both were asked to respond to the same questions. In each consultation there was a detailed plan relevant to the address of the property. A key plan showing the respective plan areas is at Appendix E together with the detailed plans.

2.3.2.5 Sample consultation documents and the consultation responses have been placed on the members library.

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

**Table 1 – Consultations and Response Rates**

Consultation	What being consulted upon	Approximate number of leaflets delivered	Responses received
1a Green area (county roads)	Possible new CPZ including permit bays. Junction double yellow lines (also for passing places on Devonshire Road)	445	150 (33.7%)
1b Green area (Neptune Road & The Gardens)	Possible new CPZ including permit bays. Double yellow lines at junctions and sharp bends to facilitate HGV access.	53	10 (18.9%)
2 Yellow section of Pinner Road	Possible new CPZ including permit bays. Proposed pay and display in first section of side roads. Proposed changes to waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road	315	40 (12.7%)
3 Orange section of Pinner Road	Proposed changes to waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road	200	18 (9.0%)
4 Blue circled junctions	Junction double yellow lines	445	106 (23.8%)
Overall		1438	324 (22.5%)

2.3.4 In order to improve response rates from CPZ consultations a colour booklet was produced explaining the advantages, limitations and costs of CPZs and permit parking schemes. This booklet was delivered along with the specific consultation material but outside of the envelope in an attempt to engage the interest of those consulted. The response rate from the county roads where the permit bays were proposed at 33.7% is slightly higher than other recent

similar consultations which have usually been in the 25 to 30% range. The response from residents living on Pinner Road, both to the CPZ consultation and to the restriction proposals for Pinner Road itself, was disappointing at 9%. The low figure is typical for main roads and probably reflects that residents largely do not park on Pinner Road even when the restrictions do not apply nor perhaps in the county roads, therefore they are ambivalent about the proposed changes.

2.3.5 Consultation plans were displayed on the Middlesex floor at the Civic Centre by the main lifts and staircase during the consultation period. There were manned exhibitions of the parking and safety scheme proposals in St George's Church, Pinner View on Tuesday 16 September between 10.30am & 2pm and Wednesday 17 September between 5pm & 8pm. Approximately fifty people attended. The subject of concern to most people who attended appeared to be the one way safety scheme proposals. A number of businesses complained about aspects of the parking proposals in similar terms to the consultation responses. Residents similarly expressed views generally in line with those in responses. A common comment was that parking was at its worst in the evenings and probably caused by residents own vehicles.

### 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 are shown in table 2 below. The overall figures for those consulted on the creation of a new CPZ are shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 2 - Overall Responses - Junction and other double yellow line restrictions**

Consultation	In favour as proposed	Against or want modifications
1a – Green, striped area, county roads	72	74
1b – Green, striped area, south of Pinner Road	3	2
2* - Yellow, Pinner Road east of Cornwall Road	12	26
3* - Orange, Pinner Road west of Pinner Road	9	6
4 – Blue, Isolated junction proposals	61	45
Overall	163	162

\* Consultation of Pinner Road addresses asked whether person supported double yellow lines and other waiting restriction.

**Table 3 Overall Responses – Proposal to create a new CPZ in the Pinner Road area**

Consultation	In favour	Against	No opinion
County Roads (1a)	50 (33%)	89 (59%)	11 (7%)
Pinner Road (2)	7 (18%)	30 (75%)	3 (8%)
Neptune Road &	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0

The Gardens (1b)			
Overall	60 (30%)	126 (63%)	14 (7%)

2.3.6.2 Overall, there is majority support for the double yellow lines but a very clear majority against creating a new CPZ. 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) and 2.3.9 (possible creation of a new CPZ) 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 possible new CPZ. This area covers most of Headstone South council ward. The location of the proposals coincides with directions in the Highway Code – Rule 242 which states “You MUST NOT leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road and Rule 243 which states “DO NOT stop or park anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services...opposite or 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. In practice limited Police resources and other demands on Police time precludes their effective enforcement in these situations, whereas the council is able to respond. It is clear from the responses and from observation in the early evening that there is such shortage of parking space in some sections of roads that some residents feel it is justified to park around the junctions or jutting out into the carriageway. This is particularly the case in the county roads area to the north of Pinner Road. The same also occurs during the day at some, at present unrestricted, junctions near to Pinner Road. However there are more spaces available further down the roads away from Pinner Road. Double yellow lines have proved successful at similar locations as they apply at all times when visibility and emergency service access may be an issue. It is important for pedestrians, especially those with disabilities or with young children that the dropped crossings at junctions are kept clear of obstructive parking. Double yellow lines appear to enjoy greater respect than single yellow line restrictions even during the period when technically they equally apply.

2.3.7.2 The response to the proposed double yellow lines is shown on a road by road basis in Table 4 at Appendix F. The responses for the isolated junction proposals at the blue circled junctions are grouped by plan.

2.3.7.3 At the suggestion of local councillors double yellow lines were proposed for gaps in the permit bays in Devonshire Road to facilitate two way traffic but these do not appear to be supported by the responses from that road which are 19:12 against some aspect of the double yellow line proposal. In comparison support for a CPZ is strongest from this road. It is likely some gaps in parking will occur naturally during the day and clearly residents feel too much parking is being removed for the evenings and weekends. It is

recommended that the double yellow lines at passing places be downgraded to single yellow lines operating to zone time restrictions, if a zone is introduced, or removed if no zone materialises.

- 2.3.7.4 With the exception of Devonshire Road and Bedford Road the support for double yellow lines at junctions is reasonably good considering the parking pressures. The consideration of the responses from addresses in Pinner Road where a different question was asked is made at 2.3.8 below
- 2.3.7.5 Observations in the evenings indicate significant parking pressure especially within the county roads area. This is supported by the response comments to the green area consultation and the blue circled junction further to the west. At present parking often occurs right up to these junctions that prejudices access and safety. Significant improvements in some instances may still be achievable even if the double yellow lines do not extend the full 10 metres from the junction. The addresses of all responses from this consultation that ask for change in the double yellow lines have been plotted. 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 E, 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 and other significant factors.

### **2.3.8 Proposed waiting and loading restriction changes on Pinner Road**

- 2.3.8.1 As part of the review of parking restrictions in the area, the restrictions on Pinner Road were particularly examined in relation to the bus services and London Cycle Network plus route which use this section of Pinner Road. London Buses (part of TfL) advised that longer periods for both waiting and loading restrictions would help to improve bus schedule reliability on this type of road part of London's strategic route network (SRN). In particular it was noted the road remained busier for longer periods and throughout both Saturday and Sunday which was not the case a few years ago.
- 2.3.8.2 Residential and non-residential addresses on Pinner Road east of its junction with Station Road Harrow were consulted on proposed changes to waiting and loading restrictions. The proposals are shown on layouts 10, 8, 2 and 12 at Appendix E. The existing, long standing, waiting restrictions are generally no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm except there are sections of double yellow lines on both sides of the road approaching its junctions with Station Road, North Harrow and Greenhill Way (eastern end) and opposite part of the shopping parade where the restrictions only apply Monday to Friday 8-9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm.
- 2.3.8.3 The logic to the existing lesser restriction opposite the shops was probably to permit some parking for the shops (between 9.30am and 4.30pm) but is located opposite as parking outside the shops compromises visibility for vehicles leaving the side road (county roads). There is at present little useable parking on the south-western side of the road due the number of accesses to off-street parking for the residential properties. Complaints have come from residents of their accesses being blocked albeit usually temporarily by customers to the shops. Vehicles also illegally mount the footway to get out of the traffic flow as shown in the picture on the front of the orange consultation



document at Appendix D. The feasibility of transferring this parking provision onto the shops (north-eastern) side of was fully explored as described in 2.1.4 to 2.1.6 above. The proposals provided for short-term parking on the first section of the side roads to replace the theoretical provision opposite the shops. This should be both safer and more convenient for customer as they would not need to cross the busy road.

- 2.3.8.4 In the consultation 12 of the 13 business responses from the parade opposed both the changes in waiting restrictions and the introduction of pay and display parking. From the comments it is clear the businesses believe carriageway parking on the north-east (shops) side can and should be provided, perhaps because a significant amount of illegal parking does currently occur.
- 2.3.8.5 A representation has subsequently been submitted by the Pinner Road Small Business Group in the following terms: Not enough consideration has been given to the practicality of the proposed changes and when questions have been put to the respective contacts for the CPZ proposal and road safety proposal answers have not been forthcoming. Hence the business group along with local residents and customers of all the businesses on Pinner Road reject the proposals. This assertion is backed by two petitions containing 356 and 322 signatures. The first petition is simply headed: "A petition to save our small businesses on Pinner Road" whilst the other "Save the Pinner Road Shopping Parade," goes on to state: that they are concerned about the future of the Pinner Road Shopping Parade and request the council to provide parking for shoppers, parking bay facilities and parking along the pavement in front of the shops. There is also a response prepared from a meeting of the Pinner Road Small Business Group of 15 September which states: that the present situation seems to be working and the council is trying to fix something that is not broken.
- 2.3.8.6 Legitimising this on carriageway parking could only safely be achieved by reducing the carriageway width by 2 to 2.5 metres by constructing "buildouts" at the side road junctions. This would provide the needed visibility but such a carriageway reduction completely contradicts the purpose of this main road, part of London's strategic route network and would be rejected by Transport for London's Network Assurance Team who would need to approve any change on this road and have the final decision on the subject.. A reduction of carriageway width from the present 9.7 to 10 metres to 7.4 to 7.7 metres width would be detrimental to freight and bus transport in particular. It would also necessitate the removal of the cycle lanes on a London Cycle Network plus route.
- 2.3.8.7 The impracticality of parking in front of the shops has been explained to the businesses both when the feasibility of lay-by parking was being tested (see 2.1.5 above) and during the current consultation (see Customer parking section). A meeting with representatives of the small business group from the shopping parade to discuss possible ways forward in relation to customer parking and business servicing took place on 28 October 2008.
- 2.3.8.8 The meeting was attended by one trader from the shopping parade representing the Pinner Road Small Business Group, a ward member and the

Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety. Notes of the main points raised are at Appendix G.

- 2.3.8.9 It is understood that parking free of charge was being requested in the 2005 petition and more recent petition. Clearly a pay and display facility is going to involve some cost for customers to use. The location of the proposed parking, round the corner in the side roads, and its cost of use are negative aspects which are unlikely to be welcome by the businesses. Most of the businesses are not open in the evening so this lengthening of waiting restriction beyond 6.30pm (and before 8am) would theoretically not affect customers. Double yellow lines however appear to enjoy more respect than single yellow lines so enable better compliance throughout the day. The removal of parked vehicles is likely to make loading / servicing the businesses easier and safer. At present HGVs are often being unloaded from the other side of the road due to no available kerbside space on the shops side of the road. This additionally constricts the carriageway width and renders the cycle lanes useless and has safety implications.
- 2.3.8.10 The response from residential addresses in this section of Pinner Road shows equal support and opposition (10:10) to the proposed waiting and loading restrictions.
- 2.3.8.11 The responses largely from residents living on the orange section of Pinner Road (between Cornwall Road and Station Road) is however supportive (9:6) of the waiting and loading restriction proposals on their section of Pinner Road. The proposals here are for the waiting restriction period to be extended from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday, to 7am to 8pm seven days a week. Double yellow lines being proposed at the side road junctions and on the approaches to pedestrian refuge islands. There is quite a poor response rate at 9%, which although disappointing appears to be the norm when consulting residents on main roads on similar issues.
- 2.3.8.12 The waiting restrictions on Pinner Road will need to be appropriate with regard to any restrictions introduced by way of pay and display or controlled parking, otherwise parking could transfer onto the main road. Any such eventuality would be opposed by NAT who have powers to reject proposals which would adversely affect traffic flow or safety on the SRN.
- 2.3.8.13 It is therefore recommended **that for traffic management and road safety reasons the waiting restrictions along Pinner Road as proposed in the consultation be taken forward to the statutory consultation stage despite the opposition of the businesses** and that means to make parking in the side roads more attractive to customers should be explored. This is discussed further in section 2.3.10 below.
- 2.3.8.14 The existing loading restrictions except at the approaches to the junctions with Station Road, North Harrow and Greenhill Way apply Monday to Friday 8-9.30am 4.30-6.30pm. The proposed loading restrictions in the consultation were Monday to Friday 7-10am & 3-8pm and Saturday & Sunday 8am to 6.30pm. An at any time loading restriction already applies on the section of Pinner Road approaching its junction with Greenhill Way and no change is proposed. Restrictions from 7am to 8pm 7 days a week restrictions are proposed on the approach to the junction with Station Road, North Harrow

where all day restrictions already apply. As with the waiting restrictions there is majority support from the residential addresses along the road but almost complete opposition from the businesses. In comments from and in conversations with the businesses, in particular within the shopping parade, they are concerned at reduced periods for servicing and point out that they are not always able to specify when deliveries are made. Loading restrictions are of rather less significance to residents.

2.3.8.15 As with the waiting restrictions there is a conflict in the needs of the businesses and those of the wider community using Pinner Road. It is recommended **that for traffic management and, to some extent, road safety reasons the loading restrictions along Pinner Road as proposed in the consultation be taken forward to the statutory consultation stage despite the opposition of the businesses** but that these restrictions stop in line with the back of footway. Also means of achieving loading facilities, in the first sections of the side roads, especially when loading is restricted on Pinner Road, should be further explored.

### 2.3.9 Possible new controlled parking zone and permit parking scheme

2.3.9.1 Overall the response to the creation of a new CPZ was not in favour. Residents in some of the surrounding roads have complained about not having been consulted. 11 responses were posted online mainly from Cornwall Road opposing the creation of a controlled parking zone as far as Pinner View. The main reason given was that it would displace parking problems onto their road. The community in this area oppose a CPZ and a popular course of action overall would be not to introduce one. It has however been the approach with CPZ consultations in the past to examine the results in more detail so that occupiers in each street have a say on what happens in their road, or section of road. This has resulted in roads choosing to remain outside of a CPZ even when overall there was a majority in favour. This approach was agreed with ward councillors prior to the consultation being carried out and is explained in the consultation documents.

2.3.9.2 Two questions were asked about the CPZ issue to occupiers where there was potential for permit parking bays. (Occupiers of addresses on Pinner Road were only asked the first question.) The questions being:-

1. Do you support the creation of a CPZ and permit parking scheme?
2. If a CPZ was introduced in other streets (nearby), would you like your section of road to be included?

The responses to these questions on a road by road basis and where appropriate by section of road is given in Appendix F but is summarised in Table 4 below.

Road	Response Rate	Do you support a CPZ and permit parking?		If a CPZ is introduced should you be included?	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Devonshire Road	41%	20	12	21	11
Dorset Road	17%	3	1	3	1
Oxford Road	30%	11	10	13	8
Rutland Road	45%	4	21	7	19
Bedford Road	35%	3	17	7	14

Pinner View (2-36 Evens)	26%	1	4	4	2
Sussex Road	37%	8	23	11	17
Pinner Road (up to 275 odds 224 evens)	12%	7	29		
Neptune Road	18%	3	6	5	3
The Gardens	33%	0	1	0	1

**Table 4 – Response to Questions regarding a possible controlled parking zone**

- 2.3.9.3 Clearly support for a CPZ is strongest in Devonshire Road where the majority of complaints about parking have come from. The response rate from Dorset Road is quite low but also in favour. There is a marginal majority (11:10) in favour of a CPZ in Oxford Road. There are strong majorities against a CPZ in Rutland Road, Bedford Road and Pinner View. There is however a clearer majority of people from Oxford Road who wish to be included if a CPZ is introduced in an adjacent road. It would appear there is a consistent and viable area from these 3 roads to form a CPZ. Closer examination of the responses Sussex Road shows support for inclusion in a CPZ for the eastern end up to 21 and 32. Responses from the southern ends of Rutland Road, Bedford Road and Pinner View indicate a desire to be included if a CPZ proceeds. This is perhaps not surprising as daytime parking problems diminish going away from Pinner Road. The same gradation in support is not so evident in Oxford or Devonshire Roads. All 19 responses from businesses on Pinner Road opposed the CPZ. Of the few responses from residents of Pinner Road 7 supported a CPZ whilst 8 opposed.
- 2.3.9.4 There are two groups of residential properties in Neptune Road, which is otherwise made up of warehouse unit. Residents living in the western arm of Neptune Road were 2:1 against a CPZ but 2:1 supporting inclusion in a CPZ should one occur in other adjacent roads. Only one response was received from the 28 flats of Sheridan and Maybury Courts which straddle the entrance from Pinner Road. The low response rate is probably due to dedicated parking areas to the south of both blocks. The business units in Neptune Road were also consulted on the restriction and permit parking proposals. The proposals mainly sought to address access issues and did not include restriction proposals for the majority of the roadway which runs parallel to the railway. Although most responses did not support a CPZ they indicate they wished to be included if one was introduced. The businesses also advised they wished some parking control on the roadway by the railway. For the western part of the industrial estate this provides the only provision for servicing/loading and unloading. Parked vehicles here cause difficulties especially for HGV servicing. In the eastern part of the estate, although there is a separate private servicing area there is demand for some dedicated parking. It is suggested a separate meeting be held with the businesses to explore what is practical here.
- 2.3.9.5 A petition from residents from three of the county roads was received on 23 October 2008 raising objection to the proposals to introduce a CPZ and to the one way system, which was part of the safety scheme proposals. The petition consists of 96 signatures from 73 addresses in Rutland Road, Sussex Road and Cornwall Road. All except 6 signatures from 6 addresses come from

addresses which are either beyond the consultation area or from parts of Rutland Road and Sussex Road where residents had indicated they did not want to be included if a CPZ scheme was introduced. Three signatures came from addresses which had also said they did not wish to be included in a CPZ although a majority of their neighbours had said they would. One was from a resident who did not support the CPZ but wanted to be included if one was introduced. Two signatures came from addresses who had not responded to the consultation. The petition thus only really shows opposition which had been revealed in the consultation and has resulted in the recommended boundary of CPZ scheme to be taken forward described in 2.3.9.6. Comments from a number of signatories indicate they do support the junction double yellow line proposals.

- 2.3.9.6 Based on the distribution of responses as analysed above and Appendix F a **CPZ and permit parking scheme is recommended covering Devonshire Road, Oxford Road, Dorset Road and sections of Sussex Road, Rutland Road, Bedford Road, Pinner View and Neptune Road. It is recommended that although not supporting the scheme that residents and businesses of Pinner Road be allowed to purchase permits** as no parking bays are currently feasible on Pinner Road. The area of a new CPZ suggested for statutory consultation is shown at Appendix H.
- 2.3.9.7 A number of residents living to the west of Pinner View and especially from Cornwall Road expressed concern that they had not been included in the consultation. Although following the approach agreed by this Panel in September 2007 those outside of the proposals area were not consulted at this stage, residents were advised that they would be given the opportunity of joining a CPZ should one be introduced in an adjacent road. Ten responses were submitted online from addresses in Cornwall Road. These responses whilst opposing the current CPZ proposals had a majority wishing to be included should a CPZ materialise. Should a permit parking scheme be introduced the parking patterns in adjacent roads will be monitored and a further consultation about joining such a CPZ be undertaken to an appropriate extent. As a minimum, due to the concerns of residents, Cornwall Road should be consulted should the scheme extend to Pinner View. Such further consultation will also need to be coordinated with the review shortly to start in the adjacent West Harrow Station area.
- 2.3.10 **Pay and Display parking in the first section of the County Roads**
- 2.3.10.1 The first sections of the side roads on the northern side of Pinner Road, from Devonshire Road to Pinner View, runs along the flanks of Pinner Road properties. Parking bays proposed here were to be available by either displaying a permit or by pay and display (see layout 8 at Appendix E). As mentioned in 2.3.8.4 almost all the businesses did not support the introduction of pay and display parking. Six responses from residents supported the P&D as opposed to eight against. Clearly this would be the most convenient place for parking from Pinner Road.
- 2.3.10.2 As described in section 2.3.8 above the necessity of properly controlling parking on Pinner Road is central to the council's traffic management duties. The pay and display facility although clearly not popular is a key element of

providing for the parking needs of premises on Pinner Road. Unrestricted parking at these locations would not encourage short-term customer parking as spaces would tend to be occupied by the same vehicles throughout the day. There are significant enforcement difficulties associated with time limited free-bays. Pay and display with an initial free period has been used elsewhere to support local business communities but none currently exist. It is suggested that a low initial tariff be set to encourage short term parking from business customers. A significantly higher rate could apply for periods greater than say one hour.

2.3.10.3 A slightly different approach is suggested for the facilities in Devonshire Road and Pinner View where there are a health centre (in Devonshire House) and a doctors surgery. Both these locations are slightly further away from the main shopping parade. Appointment times and the needs of visiting professional might suggest slightly longer stay parking might be needed.

2.3.11 In summary it is recommended that a overall majority view be overruled for reasons given in table 7 below.

Recommendation	Reason for overruling majority view
2.3.7 Double yellow lines at junctions	Proposal supports highway legislation and the Highway Code. Consultation feedback will be used to review extent of the restrictions
2.3.8 Waiting restriction changes on Pinner Road	The strong opposition is from businesses. Proposed restriction changes apply to periods beyond the normal working day when most businesses are not operating but when this main road is still busy. The restriction changes are expected to enjoy better respect from drivers who are currently parking illegally outside the shops on the present restrictions. The proposals were designed in pursuance of the council's obligations under the traffic management act, to improve road safety and in consultation with TfL. Short term parking provision for customers is being provided in the side roads. Where there currently is an absence of waiting restriction opposite to shops between the morning and afternoon peaks there is little practical parking due to the number of accesses to parking areas in front of residential properties. Better observance of the waiting restrictions will facilitate legitimate, safe loading outside the shops.
2.3.8 Loading restriction changes in Pinner Road	As with waiting restriction proposals, restrictions are needed for longer periods due to the road being busier for longer periods than when the present restrictions was introduced some 30 years ago. The proposals were designed in pursuance of the council's obligations under the traffic management act, to improve road safety and in consultation with TfL. Proposed waiting restrictions in the very first section of the side roads should facilitate loading especially during the peak periods.
2.3.9 Controlled parking zone and permit parking scheme	The proposals recommended are where there was majority support for a controlled parking zone or where a majority wanted to be included in a CPZ if one was being introduced in other roads nearby. It reflects the streets where people feel they have sufficient parking problems to justify its costs. People in adjacent

	roads will be given an opportunity to join any CPZ should one be introduced. People are only being given opportunity to affect the decision on proposals in the road in which they are located at this stage. Contrary to the business position stated, as the CPZ would only apply for one hour Monday to Friday, would be likely to provide more free parking for customers for most periods of the day.
2.3.10 Proposed pay and display parking	This is provided to ensure a turnover of parking for customers.

**Table 7 – Reasons for pursuing proposals against majority opposition**

## **2.4 Financial Implications**

- 2.4.1 There is £30,000 available from the Harrow CPZ Capital budget for the current financial year (2008/09) which was intended to cover consultation and advertising cost. A further £80,000 is budgeted in 2009/10 for implementing the scheme.
- 2.4.2 Delay in the consultation has resulted in consultation results being reported later than programmed. Other order making commitments now make advertising the traffic orders before the end of the financial year less likely. There have however been increased printing costs and extra design cost resulting from the response to the consultation. This results in anticipated expenditure of £25,000 for 2008/09 without advertisement costs.
- 2.4.3 The advertisement of the scheme is now expected in Spring 2009. The recommended scheme is more complicated than initially envisaged, albeit covering a slightly small area. There is therefore an increased budget requirement of £105,000 to cover advertisement and implementation in 2009/10.
- 2.4.4 The response from some surrounding streets means that a further consultation on other people joining the CPZ is more likely and probably more extensive than envisaged. This however will not affect costs until 2010/11.
- 2.4.5 The revised estimated costs from 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 will be reported in the annual CPZ review to this panel in February 2009.

## **2.5 Legal Implications**

- 2.5.1 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions can be implemented pursuant to Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## **2.6 Performance Issues**

- 2.6.1 There are no Best Value performance indicators relating to CPZs.
- 2.6.2 Although no funding is provided by Transport for London, CPZs form part of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, West London Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the Council's LIP.

- 2.6.3 The provision of CPZs meets the following priorities in Mayor of London's LIP:
- Priority IV Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
  - Priority V Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network
- 2.6.4 This proposal supports the Harrow Vision and Corporate Priorities as follows:
- Priority 1) Deliver cleaner streets, better environmental services and keep crime low
  - Priority 5) Improve the way we work for our residents

## 2.7 Risk Management Implications

- 2.7.1 This project is not included on the Directorate risk register.
- 2.7.2 When approved for implementation, however, it will have its own generic risk register as part of the project management process.

## 2.8 Equalities Impact

- 2.8.1 The introduction of CPZs increases overall accessibility and social inclusion by the provision of additional parking for disabled people.

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

- 2.9.1 These recommended proposals will have a neutral impact on crime and disorder.

## SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Chief Finance Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Sheela Thakrar
Date: .....13/11/2008.....		
On behalf of the Monitoring Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Rachel Jones
Date: ... 14/11/2008.....		

## SECTION 4 - PERFORMANCE OFFICER CLEARANCE

Performance Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Anu Singh
Date: .....13/11/2008.....		



## **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 26 February 2007  
Agenda Item 9 – Controlled parking zone/Residents parking scheme  
Annual review (2008).
- 2 Consultation responses.
- 3 Petition from Pinner Road Small Business Group
- 4 Petition from residents of Rutland Road and surrounding roads

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

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