

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Committee: | Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel |
| Date: | 17 June 2009 |
| Subject: | <p>INFORMATION REPORT- Petitions Relating to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hibbert Road, Wealdstone - concern from residents about parking near to Belmont School2. Lakeview Edgware-objection to CPZ3. High Street Edgware- objection to CPZ/parking proposals4. County roads off of Pinner Road - objection to CPZ/parking proposals5. Ruskin Gardens, Cowbridge Road and Repton Road- request to improve emergency vehicle access6. Linden Close, Stanmore-request to remove double yellow lines |
| Responsible Officer: | Brendon Hills- Corporate Director Community and Environment |
| Portfolio Holder: | Councillor Susan Hall- Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety |
| Exempt: | No |
| Enclosures: | Appendix A - Plan of parking proposals in Edgware - Zone TB extension |

Section 1- Summary

This report sets out details of the petition that have been received and listed above.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2: Report

2. Petitions

2.1. Hibbert Road, Wealdstone

2.2. A petition was received on 23rd January with 17 signatories from residents in Hibbert Road Wealdstone. The petition although collated by residents was forwarded to the council by a local Police Community Support officer (PCSO)

2.3. The petition is against motorists parking inconsiderately in the vicinity of Belmont First and Middle school and states:-

“The issue is specifically affecting residents in Hibbert Road, who live close to the school. During the mornings and the evenings between 0800 to 0900 and 15.00 to 16.00 respectively motorists who drop off and pick up children at Belmont School are parking their vehicles with little or no consideration to the residents and the other road users on Hibbert Road. This has resulted in

- *Residents not able to use their driveways without being obstructed*
- *Arguments breaking out between residents and motorists*
- *Abusive behaviour from the motorists towards the residents*
- *Emergency services access may be impaired*
- *Accidents due to vehicles parked partially or fully on the pavements*
- *Risk to pedestrians due to point number 5*
- *Following suggestions to resolve this matter has been discussed with the safer neighbourhood police*
- *Parking restrictions close to the school during above mentioned hours.*
- *Issuing parking tickets to the motorist who parks disregarding resident’s liberty, such as blocking the drive-way and parking on the pavement.*

2.4. The petition has been acknowledged and the lead petitioner has been advised that the petition would be reported to this meeting of the Panel.

2.5. A site meeting was arranged with the PCSO in order look at the actual site conditions at first hand and to discuss various options.

2.6. There is an existing school keep clear marking that extends from the double yellow lines at the junction with Locket Road for a distance of metres which operate from 8.30am to 9.30am and 3pm to 4.30pm Monday to Friday. They appear to be reasonably well respected but result in parents parking their vehicles further along Hibbert Road.

- 2.7. There is a sharp bend approximately 50 metres from the end of the school keep clear markings and the presence of intervening driveways and residents parked vehicles results in parents parking on the bend. This causes considerable congestion albeit over a relatively short period.
- 2.8. A number of parents stop to drop off/pick up children and do so opposite driveways which result in the driveways being obstructed albeit for a short time period. It should be remembered that even on yellow lines, single or double, drivers are able to stop to pick up/drop off passengers or goods unless there are loading restrictions in place.
- 2.9. A number of parents were also observed parking on the bend and escorting their children into the school. These parked vehicles coupled with school traffic and traffic accessing the area do cause a problem at school pick up / drop off times and restrict emergency access.
- 2.10. One option requested by residents is to extend the school keep clear marking to include the bend. Unfortunately there is a maximum length for these markings which is laid down in legislation and this proposal would exceed this. There is the added complication that it would also prevent resident's vehicles from parking on street during the control hours. These vehicles if they were displaced when added to the school parked vehicles would be likely to lead to severe congestion elsewhere along Hibbert Road.
- 2.11. Another option requested is for a one way system to be introduced in Hibbert Road. Although frequently requested to deal with congestion at school times it is often the case that at the consultation stage they are found to be unpopular with local residents. This could be the case in Hibbert Road where although the problems are more centred on the length of road nearest the school it would affect all the residents in the road. This proposal is also suggested in the schools' Travel Plan and a request for funding has been made to develop a proposal from the £100k which is available for ad hoc transport projects according to the Mayor for London's transport strategy. A separate report is being presented to this meeting of the Panel.
- 2.12. Notwithstanding this bid it is considered that placing double yellow lines on the acute bend close to the school will help to deter parents from parking at this undesirable location and help to keep the road clear from congestion and protect emergency vehicle access. This road will therefore be included in the 2009/10 batch of streets for the "problem street" programme.
- 2.13. The petitioners, local PCSO and the school will be informed of the decision regarding the request to fund the one way street proposal following this meeting.

2.14. Lake View Edgware

2.15. The CPZ proposals in Lake View were approved by this Panel at the meeting on 26th November 2008. A petition was subsequently received containing 21 pro- forma letters from residents in Lake View during the statutory consultation period opposed to the introduction of a CPZ in their road.

2.16. The petition states:-

"I object to the planned extension of the CPZ to the whole of Lake View for the following reasons:

- There is no parking problem in Lake View that will be fixed by the CPZ*
- The expensive bureaucracy involved in parking in the street or in front of the house: the inconvenience caused by the scheme to residents, their contractors and visitors*
- The unnecessary disfigurement of the Conservation area*
- The likely reduction in Property Values*

I do not object to the proposed double yellow lines in Lake View at the junction with Dukes Avenue and elsewhere.

2.18 At the Panel meeting in November the results of the consultation in Lake View were reported as:-

| No of Properties | No of Replies | % Response Rate | Yes Support CPZ | No Do Not Support CPZ | Don't Know/No response |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 59 | 30 | 50.8% | 22 | 8 | 0 |

2.19 It can be seen that there was good support demonstrated in the responses to the consultation with 73% of respondents supporting the CPZ from a higher percentage of respondents than normally expected.

2.20 In analysing the responses from the petition it can be seen that the majority of people who submitted the pro-forma letter did not respond to the original consultation exercise.

2.21 It is understood that the petition was instigated by one resident who circulated a letter to residents in Lake View in which he expressed his personal views of why he was against the CPZ and provided the pro-forma letter which formed the petition which were made up of the 21 responses.

- 2.22 A further 6 pro-forma letters were received from residents direct of which 5 stated their objection and 1 letter had been modified to state their total support.
- 2.23 If the results of the petition are simply aggregated with the pro forma letter responses then there is no clear majority of residents to support the scheme. Given that the majority of requests received over a number of years for reviewing the parking in the area and request for extending the existing CPZ zone TB came from Lake View it would appear appropriate to re-consult the residents in the road.
- 2.24 By re-consulting all the residents in the road it can be seen that the consultation responses will be based on the same information and is transparent.
- 2.25 It is proposed that the re-consultation take place as soon as staff resources permit.

2.26 High Street Edgware

- 2.27 A petition has been received from employees of offices at High Street Edgware which state that they are opposed to the proposed extension of the Edgware Zone TB Controlled Parking Zone and proposed Pay & Display parking in High Street Edgware. This follows the statutory consultation to the extension of Zone TB that was approved by the Panel in November 2008 and also referred to in the item above.
- 2.28 The petition, which contains 54 signatures, states that the offices are surrounded by existing parking restrictions and the associated car park has limited parking provision. In general terms the petitioners report that each company in the office block is allocated 5 parking spaces but that there are over 20 people in each office and therefore the remaining people have no option but to park in the surrounding streets.
- 2.29 The petitioners state that alternative transport is not an option for several of these employees who can't make use of the office block car park facilities. They also state that they are concerned about the current economic climate and the effect the proposed parking will have on employees.
- 2.30 Clearly the original request from residents in the surrounding area was to consider the extension of the CPZ zone TB, a plan showing the proposed zone extension that was the subject of statutory consultation is shown in **Appendix A**. One of the reasons for the request was to remove "commuter parking" to assist with residents being able to park during the day.

- 2.31 The proposal for pay and display on the High Street consists of a bay outside No 85- 93 which can accommodate 5 vehicles. The reason for proposing this system of control is that currently the bays appear to be occupied for long periods of time yet being adjacent to a shopping/restaurant area there are limited parking facilities for shoppers and visitor so close to the premises.
- 2.32 It was agreed by the Panel in November that the Traffic and Highway Network Manager be authorised to determine any objections to the scheme received as a result of statutory consultation or otherwise in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.33 Normally this process would have taken place by now but, as explained in the previous item above, a petition has been received from residents of Lake View which has put the scheme temporarily on hold.
- 2.34 Once the re-consultation of residents in Lake View has been undertaken and the viability of the whole CPZ extension scheme has been ascertained then the formal objection from occupants of the office block will be determined as quoted in 2.32 above.

2.35 County Roads off Pinner Road, Harrow

- 2.35 A petition has been received from residents of a number of county roads opposing the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone on the county roads. This follows the statutory consultation of proposals agreed at the Panel Meeting in November 2008.
- 2.36 The number of signatures from each road is listed below:-

| Road | No of Signatures |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Devonshire Road | 10 |
| Sussex Road | 29 |
| Rutland Road | 25 |
| Oxford Road | 45 |
| Bedford Road | 40 |
| Dorset Road | 12 |

- 2.37 At the November Panel meeting it was agreed that the results of statutory consultation would be reported to a future Panel meeting. The results of this process are the subject of a separate report to the Panel and the petition is considered in that report later on in the agenda.

2.38 Ruskin Gardens, Cowbridge Road, Repton Road

- 2.39 We have received a copy of a petition from the residents of Ruskin Gardens, Cowbridge Road and Repton Gardens.

2.40 The petition "urges the council to make, as a matter of urgency, the following provision to address the increasing incidents of burglaries and crime in our area and to make our roads accessible for emergency vehicles:

1. CCTV Cameras.

(This matter will be dealt with by Community Safety team in conjunction with the Metropolitan Police.)

2. *Improved Emergency Access: Instruct officers to undertake a feasibility study to determine viability of allowing car parking part on kerb and part on road at Ruskin Gardens, Cowbridge Road and Repton Road to allow easy access for emergency vehicles"*

2.41 The Fire Brigade made the council aware at a recent Traffic Liaison Meeting that there had been a serious fire in a house in Ruskin Gardens. The fire appliance in attendance had been unable to get close to the house in question because of parked vehicles.

2.42 The Fire Brigade had requested that consideration be given to implementing parking controls at key locations in the area to prevent a repeat of the problems that they experienced.

2.43 It was intended that the affected junctions would be included in the 2009/10 problem street programme as this location is high on the priority list of requests for investigation. The prioritisation of sites was explained to the Panel at its meeting in February 2009.

2.44 The petition has only recently been received and therefore it has not been possible to explore the feasibility of footway parking or to look at the effects on the structure of the paving and its ability or not to carry vehicular traffic. Members may be aware that footway parking is not a favoured policy of the council. However it will be considered together the parking proposals that are being developed.

2.45 Any yellow lines that are proposed will be the subject of local and statutory consultation in the normal manner. Once the study has been completed the lead petitioner and ward councillors will be notified of the decision.

2.46 Linden Close Stanmore

2.47 A petition has been received from 5 of the 7 properties in Linden Close requesting that the double yellow lines in the road be removed. The petition states that the residents do not understand the need for the lines.

2.48 The background is that at the original consultation on the review of the Stanmore CPZ zones and associated parking problems from Wembley

Stadium event days in Jan 2008 there was no majority from respondents to the questionnaire.

- 2.49 On the day that the Panel considered the report of the Stanmore consultation results in June 2008 a letter was received stating that the residents wanted to be in the CPZ. This letter was orally reported to the Panel and the Panel agreed to re-consult the residents of Linden Close. Subsequently letters were received from most of the residents requesting inclusion and therefore the road was included in the scheme and proceeded to statutory consultation.
- 2.50 The road is a short cul de sac with a number of driveways and so there is limited provision for providing residents bays although two resident's bays have been provided. Double yellow lines have been provided at the junction with Uxbridge Road which extend 10 metres into Linden Close. The end of Linden Close is terminated with a turning head. In order to maintain a safe area for vehicle to turn it is desirable to keep parked vehicles clear from this area. This is to avoid vehicles having to reverse onto Uxbridge Road, which is a heavily trafficked route and therefore double yellow lines were proposed. The remaining short lengths of road are covered by single yellow lines that operate during the Zone B control hours of Monday to Friday 3pm-4pm.
- 2.51 At the time of statutory consultation in November 2008 a leaflet was delivered to all 4.000 properties originally consulted in which a detailed plan showing the proposals surrounding each property was hand delivered.
- 2.52 The residents of Linden Close would have received the leaflet/plan which would have shown the proposals that have recently been implemented. However there is no record of any comments on the proposals in Linden Close being received.
- 2.53 We have received a letter from one of the residents who did not sign the petition stating that they are happy with the current layout of the double yellow lines.
- 2.54 Because the petition has only recently been received it has not been possible to discuss with the residents to find out exactly what the problems are. It is our intension to carry out a 6 month review of the Stanmore CPZ which should commence in September. Linden Close will be included in this review to see if there is scope to modify the parking restrictions whilst maintaining the road safety benefits that the current yellow line restrictions bring.

Section 3- Further Information

None

Section 4- Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Paul Newman, Senior Engineer, Parking and Sustainable Transport, Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622, E-mail:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Petitions and Reply to lead petitioners