

Committee:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	17 June 2009
Subject:	Burnt Oak Broadway Proposed Parking Controls – Consultation results
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director Community & Environment
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Susan Hall – Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix A – Notes of the stakeholders meeting Appendix B – Plan of consultation area Appendix C – Consultation documents Appendix D – Detailed consultation plans Appendix E – Consultation results Appendix F – Plan of revised CPZ zone to go forward to Statutory Consultation

Section 1 – Summary

This report sets out the findings of public consultation on a possible new controlled parking zone in Burnt Oak Broadway, together with associated parking and loading restrictions, proposed pay and display bays, shared use pay and display bays, loading bays, one way working in Park Way.

Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety for approval the following:

- a) a new controlled parking zone is proposed in Argyll Gardens, Bacon Lane, Berridge Green (consecutive numbers 9 to 14), Burnt Oak Broadway (odd Nos. 53 to 319), Camrose Avenue (odd Nos 75 to 67), Columbia Avenue, Gordon Gardens, Kenmore Gardens, Northolme Gardens, Oakleigh Avenue (between Burnt Oak

Broadway and The Chase), Park Way, Penylan Place (consecutive Nos 5 to10), Stag Lane (even No. 2 to 26), Strathmore Gardens, The Chase (between Bacon Lane and Columbia Avenue), The Highlands, Vancouver Road, as shown on the CPZ zone plan at Appendix F;

- b) short-term pay and display parking bays be introduced in Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, access road between 195 to199 Burnt Oak Broadway, Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as detailed on plans 2, 4 and 5 at Appendix D, The proposed operational hours are 8.am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive for a maximum stay of 2 hours with no return with in 4 hours. The proposed parking charges are 50p per half hour or part half hour;**
- c) short term shared use pay and display parking bays be introduced in Bacon Lane, and Vancouver Road as detailed on plans 2 and 4 at Appendix D with the same operational times and charges as in item b) above;**
- d) long term shared use pay and display parking bays be introduced in Bacon Lane, The Chase, Northolme Gardens and Columbia Avenue as detailed on plans 2 and 4 at Appendix D The proposed operational hours are 8.am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive for a maximum stay of 4 hours with no return within 5 hours. The proposed parking charges are 50p per half hour or part half hour;**
- e) loading bays be introduced in Oakleigh Avenue, The Highlands and in Burnt Oak Broadway service road as detailed on plans 4 and 5 at Appendix D;**
- f) one-way working be introduced in Park Way as detail on plan 5 at Appendix D;**
- g) loading restrictions be introduced at the following junctions: Bacon Lane with Burnt Oak Broadway, Selwyn Court and Vancouver Road; Columbia Avenue with Burnt Oak Broadway and Vancouver Road; Burnt Oak Broadway with access road between Nos. 237 to 239 Burnt Oak Broadway; Oakleigh Avenue with Park Way and Vancouver Road; The Highlands with Park Way; Stag Lane with Park Way; the entire north east side of Burnt Oak Broadway service road; north east side of Park Way and service road at the rear of 129 to 149 Burnt Oak Broadway all as detailed on plans 2, 4 and 5 at Appendix D;**
- h) no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) be introduced at all locations within the consultation area including those roads within the recommended CPZ area and those outside this area as detailed on the plans 1 to 5 inclusive at Appendix D and;**

i) (i) that officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design of the parking controls in accordance with Appendices D, and F, and take all necessary steps under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders, and to implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections; and

(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

REASON: To control parking in roads as set out in the report

SECTION 2- Report

2.1. Background

- 2.2. Parking in Burnt Oak Broadway has become more difficult in recent years. A previous consultation in The Highlands and surrounding streets was carried out during 2006 concerning traffic and parking problems. Residents told us that commuter parking was their main concern. However, no parking scheme was progressed.
- 2.3. Currently Barnet Council is considering parking restrictions within their borough, centred on Burnt Oak underground station which is located close to Burnt Oak Broadway. Their suggested proposals are for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to operate from Monday to Friday between 10am -11am and 2pm - 3pm. These proposals are still to be finalised, however, should their scheme be implemented, it is likely that commuter parking would be transferred into streets on the Harrow side of the borough boundary.
- 2.4. As a result of Barnet's proposals this Panel recommended at the February 2008 meeting that the consultation on Burnt Oak Broadway parking proposals should be brought forward and a stakeholders meeting should start this process.
- 2.5. The stakeholder meeting was held in September 2008. Representatives from local residents and business owners, ward councillors, police and other representative of local groups were invited. Parking problems in the area were discussed together with possible solutions. This meeting established the basis for the extent of the area that residents and businesses should be consulted on and what types of parking proposals should be put forward. Notes on the Stakeholders meeting are at **Appendix A** and the consultation area is shown at **Appendix B**.

2.6. Consultation

- 2.7. Ward Councillors were sent consultation documents prior to distribution to residents and businesses in order that any comments received could be taken on board.
- 2.8. Consultation took place between 1st April and 27th April 2009. 1,109 documents were hand delivered to residential addresses whilst 145 businesses were sent documents through the post. Consultation documents and questionnaires were also available on the council's web site. One resident requested a translation of the document in Arabic, which was provided and sent through the post. The consultation documents are shown at **Appendix C**.
- 2.9. Detailed plan(s) were included with the consultation documents showing the parking measures proposed for individual roads. The detailed consultation plans 1 to 5 are shown at **Appendix D**.
- 2.10. A separate A5 coloured booklet entitled ***Parking – Have your views heard*** was also delivered with the consultation leaflet but outside the document envelope with the aim to engage interest with those consulted. The booklet is designed to give more information about how parking controls operate together with answers to frequently asked questions regarding controlled parking zone schemes.
- 2.11. Detailed plans were also available for inspection during the consultation period at Harrow Council, Civic Centre, Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XA where officers were available to answer questions and / or discuss the proposals.

2.12. Public Exhibitions

- 2.13. Residents and businesses were invited to public exhibitions which were advertised in the consultation leaflet and held locally in the Burnt Oak Christian Fellowship Hall on:

Wednesday	15 th April 2009	10am to 5pm
Thursday	16 th April 2009	2pm to 8pm
Saturday	18 th April 2009	1pm to 5pm

Officers were on hand to answer questions and discuss the scheme proposals. The exhibitions were well attended with some 80 individuals attending over the three days.

2.14. Consultation responses

- 2.15. A total of 441 responses were received; 418 from residents, 18 from businesses and 5 who were both business/resident representing a overall response rate of 32.6% which is average for recent consultations. The full responses for all streets consulted are included at **Appendix E**.
- 2.16. Sample consultation documents have been placed in the Members library together with consultation responses and comments from the public received at the Public exhibitions.

2.17. Responses to CPZ proposal

2.18. When considering the results of the consultation there is no overall support for a controlled parking zone in the whole area which we consulted. However certain roads showed that there is support for a CPZ as indicated to the response in question 3. These are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

				Question 3		
				Do you support the residents parking proposal in your street?		
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know
32.0%	147	47	Vancouver Road	26	19	2
28.4%	81	23	Bacon Lane	17	5	1
40.4%	47	19	Northolme Gardens	9	8	2
35.3%	17	6	Kenmore Gardens	5	1	0
16.7%	24	4	Argyll Gardens	2	1	1
33.3%	6	2	Berridge Green	2	0	0
50.0%	6	3	Penylan Place	2	1	0
11.1%	9	1	Gordon Gardens	1	0	0

2.19. There is a high degree of support from Vancouver Road and Bacon Lane and from the properties whose rear access is from Bacon Lane namely Berridge Green and Penlan Place. No responses were received from properties in Camrose Avenue whose rear access backed onto Bacon Lane.

2.20. Argyll Gardens, Kenmore Gardens and Gordon Gardens are cul-de-sacs, accessed from The Highlands and all showed majority support together with Northolme Gardens.

2.21. Question 4 which asked individuals who answered no to question 3, '*should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would they then support the resident parking proposals*'. The analysis of question 4 for those roads who would then wish their road to be included in the proposals is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

				Question 3 + 4			
				Analysis of Question 4, (If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you residents parking proposals?)			
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
29.5%	78	23	The Highlands	12	6	4	1
44.7%	47	21	Greencourt Avenue	11	9	0	1
50.0%	10	5	Strathmore Gardens	4	1	0	0
33.3%	15	5	Parkway	3	1	0	1

- 2.22. The Highlands, Parkway and Strathmore Gardens are adjacent to Argyll Gardens, Kenmore Gardens and Gordon Gardens and given the responses recorded in Table 2, it is therefore considered that these roads should be included in the CPZ proposals.
- 2.23. Although Greencourt Avenue shows a majority in favour as detailed in Table 2 it is isolated from any of the other roads recommended to be included in the scheme and therefore it is not recommended to be included in the scheme proposals.
- 2.24. Additional analysis of the CPZ responses.**
- 2.25. Whilst The Chase and Oakleigh Avenue did not show overall support for the scheme, these roads are adjacent to roads recommended to be included in the scheme. (i.e. Bacon Lane and Vancouver Road respectively). A detailed analysis has been carried out for The Chase and Oakleigh Avenue to establish if there is any polarisation of responses supporting the scheme.
- 2.26. The analysis of The Chase indicates that there is a section of the road located between Columbia Road and Bacon Lane showing support for the CPZ proposals properties. Of the 13 results from this section of road 7 are in favour to 6 against. Therefore, since this section of road is adjacent to roads already recommended to be included, it is recommended that the section of The Chase between Bacon Lane and Columbia Avenue is included in the scheme. There will be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.
- 2.27. Likewise in Oakleigh Avenue there where 16 responses received between Burnt Oak Broadway and The Chase, of which 10 are in favour and 6 against. Since this road is adjacent to Vancouver Road and Park Way, which are already recommended to be included in the scheme, it is recommended that the section of Oakleigh Avenue between Burnt Oak Broadway and the Chase is also included in the proposed CPZ.
- 2.28. There will be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.
- 2.29. Other Roads considered for inclusion in the CPZ**
- 2.30. ***Columbia Avenue***
- 2.31. The responses from Columbia Avenue were 3 in favour and 3 against. This road, which is adjacent to Vancouver Road, consists of 9 residential properties, 16 flats (Mayna Court accessed from Columbia Road) and Mill House industrial estate. Repeated requests for parking controls have been received from the Mill House industrial estate due to obstructive parking preventing HGV's gaining access to the premises. Some parking controls to prevent obstructive parking will be necessary in this road. This will limit the amount of parking spaces available thus putting greater pressure on residents to find parking spaces should they not be included in the scheme. Whilst there is no overall support from the responses 3 for and 3 against the scheme, we recommend that this road should be included in the scheme. This will provide an opportunity to

provide parking controls for the benefit of residents and businesses. Should this road be left uncontrolled it is likely that commuter parking will continue to take place in this location.

- 2.32. Similarly to the roads listed in 2.25 to 2.27 there will be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.
- 2.33. **Burnt Oak Broadway**
- 2.34. Burnt Oak Broadway is a borough boundary road and is classed as a major strategic route. Existing peak hour waiting restrictions of 8am to 9.30am and 4.30pm to 6.30pm Monday to Fridays inclusive front most residential properties with some additional waiting restrictions of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturdays and no waiting restrictions at any time at junctions. Consequently many of the residents who own vehicles choose to park them in adjacent roads during these periods.
- 2.35. Burnt Oak Broadway is a major shopping area with a busy vibrant mixture of retail shopping including a bank and building societies, professional services and a street trader, all of which attract a high demand for short term parking.
- 2.36. No residents parking is proposed in Burnt Oak Broadway, however residents in this road were asked whether they wished to be included in a residents parking scheme.
- 2.37. The analysis of the 32 responses for this road includes 17 responses from residents, 13 from businesses and 2 from both business and residents. The split between residents and businesses for the response to question 3 "Do you support parking proposals in your street?" is shown at Table 3.

Table 3

Question 3

Burnt Oak Broadway responses	Do you support the residents parking proposal in your street?			
	total	Yes	No	Don't know
Residents	17	6	11	0
Businesses	13	6	7	0
Both	2	0	2	0
total	32	12	20	0

- 2.38. There is no overall support from businesses and residents for Burnt Oak Broadway to be included in a CPZ scheme. However the pay and display proposals for the Burnt Oak Broadway service road and the inclusion of the adjacent roads (i.e. The Highlands, Oakleigh Avenue and Vancouver) in the CPZ will disadvantage those residents and businesses unable to purchase parking permits if they are not included within the CPZ.
- 2.39. It is therefore recommended for the above reasons that Burnt Oak Broadway odd numbers 53 to 319 be included in the scheme in order that they are eligible to purchase resident and business permits for the CPZ zone. Once again there will

be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.

2.40. Stag Lane

2.41. Similar to Burnt Oak Broadway, Stag Lane is a borough boundary road. The proposals include extending the existing waiting restrictions between No. 14 to 26 Stag Lane. This proposal is designed to protect the existing driveway accesses which currently suffer obstructive parking from customers visiting the shops in Burnt Oak Broadway.

2.42. The responses from Stag Lane show 1 in favour and 1 against. Similarly to Burnt Oak Broadway, as no residents parking is available in this road, these properties should be eligible to purchase resident and business permits for the CPZ zone.

2.43. It is therefore recommended for the above reasons that Stag Lane even Nos. 2 to 26 be included in the scheme in order that they are eligible to purchase parking permits for the CPZ zone. There will be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.

2.44. Recommendation of roads to be included in CPZ

2.45. From the above analysis the following roads are recommended to be include in a new CPZ:

Argyll Gardens, Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, Gordon Gardens, Kenmore Gardens, Northolme Gardens, part Oakleigh Avenue (between Burnt Oak Broadway and The Chase), Park Way, Strathmore Gardens, part The Chase (between Bacon Lane and Columbia Avenue), The Highlands and Vancouver Road.

2.46. The following addresses should also be included in order that residents and business are eligible to purchase parking permits:

Berridge Green consecutive Nos. 9 to 14, Burnt Oak Broadway odd Nos. 53 to 319, Camrose Avenue Odd Nos. 67 to 75, and Penylan Place consecutive Nos. 5 to10 and Stag Lane even Nos. 2 to 26

2.47. Response to Q5 – CPZ hours

2.48. At the Stakeholders meeting it was proposed that the controlled hours for the Burnt Oak Broadway scheme should be the same as those proposed by Barnet in order to negate possible transfer of parking between zones should the zone times be different. Whist this proposal was accepted there were concerns that some residents would prefer alternative controlled hours for the proposed zone. Therefore Question 5 gave individuals the opportunity to state their preference for the controlled periods for the zone and comment on their preference.

2.49. The responses to question 5 from roads recommended to be included in the CPZ are listed in Table 4.

Table 4**Question 5**

				If you answered yes to either Q3 or Q4 do you support the parking control hours of 10 to 11am and 2 -3pm (as proposed by Barnet)			
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
16.7%	24	4	Argyll Gardens	1	0	1	2
28.4%	81	23	Bacon Lane	16	2	1	4
33.3%	6	2	Berridge Green	2	0	0	0
16.4%	195	32	Burnt Oak Broadway	11	9	1	11
0.0%	6	0	Camrose Avenue	0	0	0	0
18.8%	32	6	Columbia Avenue	3	1	0	2
11.1%	9	1	Gordon Gardens	1	0	0	0
35.3%	17	6	Kenmore Gardens	4	2	0	0
40.4%	47	19	Northolme Gardens	4	4	3	8
41.4%	111	46	Oakleigh Avenue	17	16	2	11
33.3%	15	5	Parkway	3	1	0	1
50.0%	6	3	Penylan Place	2	0	1	0
50.0%	10	5	Strathmore Gardens	4	0	0	1
36.3%	124	45	The Chase	15	11	5	14
29.5%	78	23	The Highlands	7	7	3	6
32.0%	147	47	Vancouver Road	26	6	1	14
				116	59	18	74

Since the majority of the respondents have requested the same operational hours as Barnet's proposals by 2 to 1 it is therefore recommended that the controlled hours should be 10 am to 11 am and 2 pm to 3 pm Monday to Friday inclusive as originally proposed.

2.50. Response to Q6 – support for P&D proposals

2.51. There are three separate areas where controlled short term parking is desirable to serve businesses and residents :

- Commercial businesses and a doctor's surgery located in Bacon Lane
- Commercial businesses located in Columbia Avenue and access road between 195 and 199 Burnt Oak Broadway
- Commercial businesses and retail shops in Burnt Oak Broadway located between Stag Lane and Oakleigh Avenue.

2.52. The pay and display and shared use parking bays, both short term and long term parking, have been chosen to best serve businesses and residents These are proposed at the following locations:

Bacon Lane area including The Chase and Northolme Gardens; (see Plan 2 at **Appendix D**)

Columbia Avenue including access between Nos. 195 and 199 of Burnt Oak Broadway (see Plan 4 at **Appendix D**)

Burnt Oak Broadway area including the Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Oakleigh Avenue, Vancouver Road and The Highlands (see Plans 4 and 5 at **Appendix D**)

- 2.53. The results of the consultation show that there is no overall support for the introduction for the pay and display proposals as listed above. The responses for the roads where pay and display are proposed are listed in table 5 below.

Table 5

				Question 6			
				Do you support pay and Display parking proposals in Bacon Lane, The Chase, Columbia Ave, Oakleigh Ave, The Highland and Burnt Oak Broadway?			
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
28.4%	81	23	Bacon Lane	10	8	1	4
40.4%	47	19	Northolme Gardens	6	5	5	3
18.8%	32	6	Columbia Avenue	2	3	1	0
16.4%	195	32	Burnt Oak Broadway	10	19	2	1
41.4%	111	46	Oakleigh Avenue	18	27	1	0
36.3%	124	45	The Chase	14	27	1	3
29.5%	78	23	The Highlands	12	11	0	0
				72	100	11	11

- 2.54. There is support for the pay and display proposals in Bacon Lane and Northolme Gardens. This area has particular problems with competing demand from staff and visitors to the Edgware Community Hospital; businesses located in Burnt Oak Broadway and Bacon Lane, patients using the Bacon Lane Surgery and local residents. The proposals in this area include short term pay and display parking, and both short term and long term shared used pay and display parking.
- 2.55. There is no overall support for the pay and display proposals for Columbia Avenue. This area is chiefly subject to commuter parking. From the comments received local businesses object to having to pay for parking whilst some residents perceive that pay and display parking will reduce the number of parking spaces available to them. As discussed above in Para 2.32, there are problems of obstructive parking in Columbia Avenue which causes difficulties for HGV's requiring access to the Mill House commercial estate. The pay and display proposals would improve parking in this area. For the above reason it is recommended to include the pay and display parking proposals in Columbia Avenue and the access road located between Nos.195 and 199 Burnt Oak Broadway which also has access problems.
- 2.56. Similarly, there is no support for the pay and display proposals for the Burnt Oak Broadway shopping area. Comments from some businesses in this area indicated that they would be in favour of the pay and display parking, providing customers would be allowed to park free for the first hour. The existing parking restrictions in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road allows unrestricted parking between 9.30am and 4.30pm Monday to Friday inclusive and all day Saturday

and Sunday. Parking surveys indicated that a significant number of vehicles were parked for the majority of the unrestricted periods. The pay and display proposals, though not popular, are a key element in providing short term parking with a greater turnover of vehicles, which would be beneficial to businesses and customers. For this reason it is recommended to introduce the pay and display proposals in this area as detailed above.

2.57. The proposed operational hours for all the above three pay and display parking locations is 8.am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive for a maximum of 2 hours with no return within 4 hours for short term parking and for a maximum of 4 hours with no return within 5 hours for long term parking. The proposed parking charges are 50p per half hour or part half hour, which is the same charge for pay and display in Stanmore town centre.

2.58. Response to Q7 - Support for loading bays

2.59. In order to assist businesses within the proposed CPZ, it is desirable to provide designated loading bays solely for the purpose of loading and unloading. Three separate locations have been selected as the most convenient for accessibility for HGV`s and businesses, with 2 bays located in Burnt Oak Broadway service road together with loading bays for single vehicles located in Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as detailed on plan 5 at **Appendix D**.

2.60. Whilst there is no overall support from the roads where loading bays are proposed, there is support for the loading bays from adjoining roads in particular Vancouver Road (see consultation results **Appendix E**). For the above reasons it is recommended to include the above loading bays in the scheme. The responses for the proposed loading bays are listed in table 6.

Table 6

Question 7

				Do you support the introduction of loading bays in Oakleigh Ave, The Highlands and Burnt Oak Broadway service road?			
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
16.4%	195	32	Burnt Oak Broadway	11	17	3	1
41.4%	111	46	Oakleigh Avenue	16	21	9	0
29.5%	78	23	The Highlands	10	9	4	0
				37	47	16	1

2.61. Response to Q8 – Support for extending Loading restrictions

2.62. Additional loading restrictions have been proposed at locations where existing double yellow lines do not prevent loading and unloading of vehicles and where it is not appropriate for Blue Badge holders to park without causing obstruction. The responses for the roads where loading restrictions are proposed are listed in table 7 below:

Table 7**Question 8**

				Do you support extending the loading restrictions in Bacon Lane, Vancouver Rd, Columbia Ave, Oakleigh Ave, Park Way, The highland, and Burnt Oak Broadway service Rd?			
% response	No. of properties	No. of responses	Road Name	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
28.4%	81	23	Bacon Lane	13	4	3	3
16.4%	195	32	Burnt Oak Broadway	9	19	3	1
18.8%	32	6	Columbia Avenue	2	4	0	0
41.4%	111	46	Oakleigh Avenue	16	19	11	0
33.3%	15	5	Parkway	3	1	0	1
29.5%	78	23	The Highlands	12	6	4	1
32.0%	147	47	Vancouver Road	19	21	5	2
9.1%	22	2	Stag Lane	1	0	1	0
				75	74	27	8

- 2.63. When considering all the responses from across the consultation area there is marginal support for the loading restrictions proposed. However Bacon Lane, Park Way and the Highlands show significant support for the proposals. In order to enable enforcement to prevent obstructive parking it is recommended that loading restrictions at any time be introduced at the following junctions and roads as shown on Detailed plans 2, 4 and 5 at **Appendix D**:

Bacon Lane at junction of Burnt Oak Broadway and Selwyn Court,
 Bacon Lane at junction of Vancouver Road,
 Columbia Avenue at junction of Burnt Oak Broadway, Vancouver Road,
 Burnt Oak Broadway and access road 237 to 239 Burnt Oak Broadway,
 Oakleigh Avenue at junction of Burnt Oak Broadway, Park Way and Vancouver Road,
 The Highlands at junction with Park Way,
 Stag Lane at junction with Park Way,
 North east side of Burnt Oak Broadway service road, and
 North east side of Park Way and service road at rear of 129 to 149 Burnt Oak Broadway

2.64. Response to Q9 – Support for one-way working in Park Way

- 2.65. The response for the one-way working proposal from premises in Park Way is evenly split with 2 in favour and 2 against. The overall response from other roads shows that there is substantial support for this proposal. This is a narrow road which is unable to support parking unless vehicles are parked on the footway. The waiting and loading restrictions proposed in this road are designed to improve access for delivery and emergency vehicles to the rear accesses for shops located in Burnt Oak Broadway. This proposal would also circumvent a rat run to avoid the traffic signals at the junction of Stag Lane and Burnt Oak Broadway. For the above reasons it is recommended to introduce a one way scheme in Park way as detailed on Plan 5 at **Appendix D**. There will be a further opportunity for residents and businesses to comment or object at the statutory consultation stage.

2.66. Proposed waiting restrictions 'At any time' (double yellow lines)

- 2.67. Double yellow lines are proposed for junctions throughout the consultation area and at locations where there is inadequate road width for parking to occur safely on both sides of the road. This area extends from Bacon Lane to Stag Lane and Brunt Oak Broadway to Broomgrove Gardens. The location of these proposals are detailed in consultation Plans 1 to 5 inclusive as shown at **Appendix D**
- 2.68. With the increase in car ownership owners who are unable to find a safe parking space now choose to park in or too close to road junctions The Highway Code – Rule 242 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 for the offence of obstruction in these situations (which is not a fixed penalty notice offence and requires the driver to be summoned to court), whereas the council is able to respond.
- 2.69. For the above reason it is recommended that double yellow lines are implemented as detailed in the consultation Plans 1 to 5 inclusive as shown at **Appendix D**.

2.70. Financial Implications

There is £100,000 available from the Harrow CPZ capital budget for the current financial year (2009/2010) to advertise and implement the scheme; however the scheme is subject to statutory consultation and may change. A further £20,000 is required in the 2010/2011 financial year to carry out a review 6 to 12 month following implementation of the scheme. This review will be limited to peripheral areas where residents may experience some displaced parking and raise concerns as a result of the implementation of the recommended scheme. A bid will have to be made for the required funding for 2010/11 in the medium term financial strategy for the capital programme which is subject to Cabinet approval.

- 2.71. The actual costs of implementation will depend on the outcome of the number of roads that agreed to be included in the controlled parking zone and the results of the statutory consultation process. The programme for this scheme, if recommended by this Panel and approved by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety is:-

Advertise Traffic Orders - Summer 2009
Consider objections by Panel - November 2009
Target Completion - Spring 2010

- 2.72. At this stage it is considered that there is sufficient money already allocated in the programme for 09/10 to be able to implement the revised scheme which may yet be modified at the statutory consultation stage

2.73. The Panel meeting in February 2010 will consider the funds made available for parking schemes from the 2010/11 Harrow Capital programme which would fund the 6-12 month review of this scheme. However, as highlighted above, the programme will depend on various approvals.

2.74. Legal Implications

2.75. Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions can be implemented pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

2.76. There are minimum requirements for consultation and publication before making a Traffic Order which is set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

2.77. Performance issues

2.78. There are no National Indicators relating to CPZs.

2.79. Although no funding is provided by Transport for London, CPZs form part of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy and West London Transport Strategy which are an integral part of the Council's Local Implementation Plan.

2.80. The provision of CPZs meets the following priorities in Mayor of London's Transport Strategy:

Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network

2.81. This proposal supports the Harrow Vision and Corporate Priorities as follows:

- Deliver safer and cleaner streets
- Improve support for vulnerable people
- Build stronger communities

2.82. Risk management implications

2.83. This project is not included on the Directorate risk register.

2.84. When approved for implementation, however, it will have its own generic risk register of the project management process.

2.85. Equalities Impact

2.86. There are no equalities implications in relation to this report

2.87. Community Safety (s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998)

2.88. The recommended proposals will have a neutral impact on crime and disorder

2.89. Environmental Impact

2.90. There is no environmental legislation or requirements for formal Environmental Impact Assessment which directly relates to the introduction of a CPZ or other parking controls. CPZ's are however recognised as a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport policies. They do help support traffic reduction and encouragement of consideration of more sustainable alternatives to private car use (i.e. public transport, walking and cycling). CPZ's and the review of parking restrictions address traffic congestion and road safety issues. The positive effect of CPZ's on traffic and congestion issues will in turn have advantages with regard to air quality and pollution. The reduction in "commuter" traffic touring roads looking for parking will, once the scheme has settled down, lead to a reduction in traffic noise.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Signature:		
Name: Sheela Thaker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 5/6/2009		
Signature:		
Name: Rachel Jones	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 5/6/2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Signature		
Name: Anu Singh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)
Date: 5/6/2009		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Signature		
Name: Andrew Baker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 3/6/2009		

Section 6 – Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Owen Northwood, Project Engineer, Parking and Sustainable Transport,
Tel: 020 8424 1677, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: owen.northwood@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Report and Minutes of Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel February 2008
Report and Minutes of Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 26th November 2008
Report and Minutes of Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel February 2009
Harrow Council Local Implementation Plan
Mayors Transport Strategy