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## RECOMMENDATION 1 - Controlled Parking Zones - Review of Permits

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which considered the provision of business permits, special care and school parking permits with Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), and considered charges for environmentally friendly cars.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from a representative of a Wealdstone business. The deputee informed the meeting that his business had been located in Wealdstone for nearly five years. The business employed five other staff, including one member of staff from outside the borough, and good parking was essential for successful running of the business. He stated that he expected parking facilities for businesses to be provided in the area, especially as residents parking bays were often empty during the day. He added that he would be interested in obtaining a business permit, but the proposed level of cost was prohibitive.

In response to a question from a Member, the deputee informed the meeting that his business required convenient parking for both staff and visiting clients. He added that the business permits for the local car parks were also too expensive. In response to further questions, he suggested that $£ 100$ was a reasonable amount to pay for a permit, considering residents only paid $£ 40$ a year.
Officers informed the meeting that this report considered permits for businesses, schools and carers. He clarified that business permits were designed for operational use, not all day parking by staff. This was a reflection of local and regional policies and was in line with the policies of other boroughs. As the introduction of business permits was a new policy across many boroughs, there was not yet a consistent method of best practice. The results of the policy would be revisited as part of the annual CPZ review, and adaptations made if necessary.

An Officer reminded the meeting that CPZs were only introduced following extensive consultation with both residents and businesses. Policy within CPZs was to make short stay parking easier and restrict long stay parking, such as commuters.

In response to a question from a Member, Officers informed the meeting that a business permit for the multi-storey car park in Wealdstone was $£ 400$ per year. He added that it was good practice to charge more for on street parking than off street parking. Following further questions, it was confirmed that the proposal was to charge $£ 500$ for an annual business permit to park on the street.

During discussion of the limit of two permits per business, Officers reminded the meeting that the aim of CPZs was to manage parking and prioritise residents. The issuing of more that two permits per business could create problems the parking schemes were designed to solve.

In response to comments from a Member, Officers confirmed that business permits only allowed parking for up to three hours at any one time, unlike permits for the proposed off street car parking. Officers reiterated that this was because there was still too much parking on the street and they were keen to encourage parking in car parks.
A Member commented that Harrow should make greater efforts to accommodate small businesses such as the deputee's, or Harrow would lose out to neighboring boroughs. An Officer commented that on street capacity was often a problem, hence the need for a CPZ in the first place, and it was a question of balance between the needs of businesses and residents and others. Following further discussion, a Member informed
the meeting that the cost of a permit was tax deductible.
A Member of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel, present to speak on this item, stated her support for the deputee and voiced her concern for the effect the high charges would have on Wealdstone. She suggested that there should not be a borough-wide charging policy, instead charges should be bespoke to each area. A Member suggested that the possibility of relating business permit charges to rateable values should be investigated. In response, a Member reminded the Panel that CPZs were put in at the request of local community because of the excessive demands on limited road space.

A Member commented that it acted as a disincentive to use public transport if parking costs were cheaper. Other issues to consider included the environmental impact of car use and the costs of this impact. In conclusion, she suggested that the cost of a permit could be reduced slightly from that proposed.

Following a suggestion from a Member, Officers stated that it was technically possible to issue differing numbers of permits based on the size of applicants' businesses, although it may be difficult to verify the number of employees. He noted that other boroughs did not operate in this way.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association Advisor reminded the Panel that roads were for moving traffic, not for parking. Therefore, it was essential that parking charges encouraged the use of off-street parking over on-street parking. He suggested that charges for off-street parking could be reduced to encourage this.
Members noted their support for the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association Advisor's proposal and suggested that certain Pay and Display bays could be made available to business users. A Member also commented that some small businesses were unable to use public transport, as they required a car for their work.

A Member of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel commented that while she would weicome reduced charges for long stay off-street parking, it was still necessary to make Wealdstone more user-friendly.

Officers informed the meeting that only Harrow town centre, Wealdstone, Pinner and Stanmore had provision for off street parking for business use. Spaces were only offered when capacity allowed and preference was given to short-term use.

Following discussion, Members agreed that charges for both on and off street business parking should be reviewed, and should reflect the need to encourage off-street parking. Members also suggested that the Wealdstone CPZ area could be used in any pilot scheme.

## Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That
(1) Business Parking Permits within the Borough's Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) as described in paragraph 6.12 (with the exception of 6.12 (b) and (f)) of the report and as set out below, be authorised, and officers be authorised to make provision for business permits under the powers provided by Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984,
(a) Business parking should be in shared use (Business/P\&D) bay converted from existing parking spaces
(b) The maximum stay should be limited to 3 hours or that of the associated P\&D, whichever is less.
(c) The maximum size of a vehicle should be 2.3 metres high and 5.5 metres long.
(d) The maximum number of permits per business per year should be two
(2) A further report be prepared considering options for setting charges for business permit parking on and off-street.
(3) The introduction of (1) above be carried out for each zone at their next review
(4) Carers parking permits as described in paragraph 6.19 of the report and as set out below, be introduced
(a) In order to minimise abuse, a carer's permit bearing the resident's road name, is issued to the resident in question in receipt of Disability Benefit or Attendance Allowance for use on any visiting vehicle. The permit be free of charge and renewable annually.
(5) Up to two permits to schools within a CPZ as described in paragraph 6.22 of the report and as set out below, be provided
(a) When designing future zones, and when reviewing existing ones, a small number of free, or pay and display bays be introduced near school entrances, where this will not unreasonably disadvantage residents, and where off-street parking is not available. These would be intended for school visitors. Where it is not possible to introduce these bays, a Head Teacher be allowed to purchase visitors permits provided the school is within a CPZ and has a Green Travel Plan
(b) Where the Head Teacher believes it is essential, for school operational reasons, for staff vehicles to park near to the school, the Head Teacher may apply for up to two "resident's" permits, subject to the following;
(i) There is no, or insufficient, on-sit parking
(ii) The school has a Green Travel Plan
(iii) Such provision will not unreasonably detract from residents parking space

These permits to be charged at the 'first vehicle' rate and to be endorsed with the school name for use by any vehicle authorized by the Head Teacher.
(6) The existing $50 \%$ discount on residents' permits, offered to drivers of environmentally friendly vehicles, as defined in the traffic order, be made free of charge, as described in paragraph 6.24
[REASON: To control Parking]

## RECOMMENDATION 2 - Sudbury Hill Stations Area Controlled Parking ZongFormal Objections to the Advertised Traffic Order

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Trangortation which considered formal objections to the advertised traffic order to introdyce a CPZ in the roads near Sudbury Hill Underground and Overground Stations. Jtroducing the report, the Chair reminded the meeting that the Panel had agreed to the implementation of the scheme at its last meeting, subject to the consideration of forpal objections to the traffic order.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a depltation from residents of Greenford Road. The deputee apologised for the late potice of the deputation and stated there had been some difficulties with commupication. He stated that it was inappropriate for consultation to be carried out during August and suggested that there could have been several further objections if the traffic orders had been published during September. He requested that implementation of the scheme be delayed for reconsultation with residents. There was syoport for residents' parking bays, but the scheme would lead to the loss of 16 parking spaces. The need for enough space for lorries to turn was recognised, but the ngeds of residents should take priority.

The original plans had the existing pedestrian refuge outside 63 Greenford Road positioned further south on Greenford Road, allowing increased residents' parking in this area of the road. Due tg an objection from a builder's merchants, the island had returned to its original location with no consultation with residents. This has resulted in insufficient parking for reopdents of 62-76 Greenford Road. He added that the proposed yellow lines outside 73 Greenford Road would leave the resident with no alternative parking and that regidents of Greenford Road were being unfairly punished. He also suggested that the road was too busy for a cycle lane to be effective and that bus stops had lead to the removal of a further six parking spaces on Greenford Road. He appreciated that the scheme was an attempt to stop commuter parking, but stated that the revised/scheme would ruin the area.

A segond member of the deputation informed the Panel that, with the revised scheme she would not be able to park outside her house because of double yellow lines. This was particularly important as she had a young child. She asked the Panel to consider
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Other Outer London Boroughs
Business Permit Charges

| Barnet | $£ 125$ or $£ 250$ | Probably relates to 1 hour or all day zones |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Enfield | $£ 45$ or $£ 590$ | Enfield town centre ( $£ 590$ ) is an all day zone, others are all <br> 1 hour zones |
| Havering | $£ 45$ |  |
| Hillingdon | $£ 120$ |  |
| Redbridge | $£ 78$ | All day zone, also valid in 2 car parks. |
| Waltham Forest | $£ 225$ | Any worker, not business essential. $£ 275$ from April 2003) |

Based on a survey undertaken in March 2003. Charges relate to 2002/03
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