Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	17 June 2009
Subject:	Headstone South parking review and possible new Pinner Road area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and associated waiting restrictions - Objections to Traffic Regulations Orders.
Key Decision: (Executive-side only)	No
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 - Geographical extent of proposals advertised Appendix B **-** Grounds for objection and officer comments Appendix C - Changes recommended following statutory consultation Appendix D - Geographical distribution of objections received during statutory consultation Appendix E- Plan of revised extent of CPZ

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report considers objections received to the traffic orders for the Headstone South parking review proposals including a new Pinner Road area CPZ and associated parking restrictions.

Recommendations:

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

1) That the traffic orders be amended as detailed in Appendix C to address the formal

objections to the advertised traffic orders for the Headstone South parking review proposals for the reasons given in the report, that further objections be set aside, that the objectors be informed and officers proceed with the order making and implementation of a scheme comprising in summary:

a) a new CPZ including the following addresses Pinner Road 1 to 255 odds and 2 to 204 evens; Bedford Road 1 to 7 odds and 2 to 8 evens; Devonshire Road 1 to 35 odds and 2 to 42 evens; Rutland Road 1 to 9 odds and 2 to 8 evens; Pinner View 2 to 26 evens; and Neptune Road operating; Monday to Friday 11am to noon;

b) parking spaces (and associated waiting restrictions) in the first sections of Devonshire Road, Oxfordshire Road, Rutland Road, Bedford Road and Pinner view leading from Pinner Road, controlled between Monday – Saturday 8am-6.30pm as detailed in the advertised traffic order;

c) revised waiting and loading restrictions on Pinner Road between its junctions with Greenhill Way and Station Road, North Harrow; and

d) Junction double yellow line – no waiting at any time waiting restrictions as detailed in the advertised traffic orders but as amended as shown in Appendix C.

2) That officers be instructed to re-consult people from addresses peripheral to the new CPZ between 6 and 12 months after implementation to assess/reassess support for being part of the CPZ.

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

Section 2 - Report

2.1 Background

2.2 The existing central Harrow CPZ was introduced in early 1980's and zoned permit parking was introduced in the late 1990's. The closest zone to that currently under consideration (Zone D) was reviewed and extended in August 2002 to include Roxborough Road.

2.3 Since the 1990's there have been complaints about parking problems in the County roads from residents. There have been complaints by businesses within the Neptune Road industrial estate regarding obstructive parking, especially affecting goods vehicle access and servicing of the commercial units. There have been two petitions from businesses in Pinner Road calling for customer parking.

2.4 An earlier parking review of North and West Harrow, during 1998 to 2000 failed to produce parking proposals which were acceptable during consultation. Despite this decision complaints about parking have continued to be received from residents and businesses in the area.

2.5 These circumstances led to consultation of the residents and businesses in the area during September 2008 in which a variety of parking controls were proposed. The results of this consultation were reported to this Panel in November 2008.

2.6 This Panel agreed the recommended parking control proposals including a new Pinner Road area CPZ, which was smaller than that originally proposed having been modified to reflect areas where there was majority support. The Panel also

recommended that this revised CPZ and associated restrictions should be taken forward to the statutory consultation of traffic orders.

2.7 A public meeting was arranged on 22 January 2009 to clarify to residents exactly what was being proposed with regard to the County roads and for officers to listen to specific concerns prior to finalising the draft traffic orders for statutory consultation. An update on the proposals was sent to residents in hard copy form and posted on the council's website both prior to the public meeting in January 2009 and the advertisement of the draft traffic orders.

2.8 The statutory consultation period ran from 2 to 22 April 2009. The traffic order changes were placed as advertisements in the London Gazette and Harrow Times to comply with legislation. In addition street notices were posted in affected streets for display during the statutory consultation period and information was available on the councils website. These summarized the general essence of the proposals as relevant to that location, advised where full details of the changes could be found and to whom observations and objections should be made.

2.9 This report describes the results of statutory consultation, including the advertisement of the draft traffic orders. It consists of formal objections received together with officer comments and recommendations as to how these objections should be addressed.

2.10 Traffic orders advertised covered the geographical area shown on the plan at **Appendix A**. The scheme proposals mainly comprised:-

(i) Revised waiting and loading restrictions along Pinner Road between its junctions with Greenhill Way and Station Road, North Harrow;

(ii) A combination of pay and display parking and waiting restrictions to facilitate servicing for the businesses on Pinner Road on the first sections of the side roads between Devonshire Road and Pinner View;

(iii) a new CPZ and permit parking scheme to the extent shown at appendix A, which included permit parking bays in Devonshire Road, Dorset Road, Oxford Road and parts of Sussex Road, Rutland Road, Bedford Road, Pinner View and Neptune Road: and

(iv) junction double yellow lines – no waiting at any time at the junctions throughout Headstone South ward.

2.11 34 letters/emails of objections and a 161 signature petition have been received by the Traffic and Highway Network Manager. A summary of the objections are listed below:-

(i) **Objections related to the CPZ**

(a) **Sussex Road**: There were four letters from residents living within the proposed CPZ area either objecting to the CPZ or to its extent in Sussex Road.

(b) **Oxford Road**: A letter from a resident objecting to the CPZ.

(c) **Bedford Road/Sussex Road**: Two letters from residents living in parts of these roads outside of the area of the proposed CPZ objecting to the CPZ.

(d) **Pinner View**: A letter from a resident within the proposed CPZ objecting to the CPZ.

(e) **Bedford Road**: A letter objecting to the position of proposed permit bay at the rear of the property in Pinner View.

(f) **Pinner Road Parade**: Two letters from businesses both located between the junctions with Rutland Road and Oxford Road, one of whom additionally objected to the proposed double yellow lines on Pinner Road.

(g) **Pinner Road**: A letter from a business, away from the parade, objecting to the limitation on the number of business permits.

(h) **County Roads**: A petition containing 161 signatures representing143 households stating, ”We the undersigned oppose the current proposal to introduce a CPZ on the County Roads.”

(ii) **Objections related to proposed double yellow lines at junctions and other restrictions.**

(a) **Pinner Road Parade**: A letter from a business from the same section of shopping parade as above only objecting to the proposed double yellow lines in Pinner Road.

(b) **Roads North of Headstone Gardens**: Ten proforma letters from people from addresses north of Headstone Gardens. There were three further letters or emails of a similar nature. The grounds for the objection stated was that it would displace parking away from the junctions and make parking more difficult in the remainder of the roads.

(c) **Parkside Way**: A letter from a resident objecting to the extent of double yellow lines at the junction with Headstone Gardens and Pinner View.

(d) **Moat Drive**: A letter and email both from a resident objecting to the extent of the proposed double yellow lines in this road.

(e) **Longley Road**: A letter from a resident objected to the proposed junction restrictions at the two junctions on Cross Road, one of which is with Longley Road.

(f) **Beresford Road**: Two letters of objection were received from residents requesting a reduction in the extent of the proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Chandos Road.

(g) **Pinner View**: A letter from St George’s Church objecting to the extent of double yellow lines on Pinner View by the church.

(h) **Westmorland Road/Cornwall Road**: Two further letters/emails of objection from residents were mainly against the introduction of double yellow lines at junctions in these roads. They also raised objection to the CPZ.

2.12 **Objections related to the CPZ**

2.13 Although normally each objection would be separately reviewed, such a detailed examination is considered unnecessary as the individual objections from Sussex Road and from Oxford Road (in 2.11 (i) (a) & (b) above) have been addressed by modifying the proposed CPZ area, as described below.

2.14 A response has been sent to the residents of Bedford Road (2.11 (i) (e) above) explaining how to apply for authorised access to the public highway as a means of addressing their objection.

2.15 The results of the consultation reported to this Panel in November 2008 showed strongly polarised views on a CPZ. The Panel accepted the recommendation in the officer's report to consider the responses on a street-by-street basis, or even looking at sections of streets, to allow the CPZ proposals to be taken forward where that was the majority view expressed in the consultation responses.

2.16 The 2 letter objections in 2.11 (i) (c) above and 62 signatures from 59 addresses in the petition come from addresses outside of where the CPZ which has been proposed. Whilst respecting these people's right to object to any proposals, it is recommended that preference is given to the views of people whose addresses fall within the area of the proposed CPZ, as these are the people who will be directly affected. There may be some indirect effect due to displaced parking but the people concerned have chosen to be outside of the CPZ in the circumstance of one being introduced. It is not seen as fair that those outside of the CPZ now proposed should have a veto over the choice made by those within the proposed area to address their parking problems.

2.17 There remains 99 signatures representing 84 households objecting to the proposals within the area of the proposed CPZ advertised. In considering how these representations should be considered an analysis of addresses was carried out to compare with the responses from the consultation in September 2008. Some of these people had already voiced their opposition in their responses but other had either previously indicated their support for the CPZ, or did not respond to the consultation.

2.18 **Appendix D** below shows the geographical distribution of objectors from the petition.

2.19 There are several ways these objections could be addressed. It could be argued that as the petition was organised by people who opposed the CPZ, and in seeking signatures, they are providing a one sided approach. This contrasts with the councils consultation where every attempt is made to explain the costs and limitations of a CPZ ,as well as potential benefits. It allows people to ask further questions if they choose and allows people to come to their own decision in privacy away from any potential pressure. At the statutory consultation stage there is no real way of providing an expression for those who are satisfied with the proposals. In this regard it could be argued that the statutory phase should be used only for new arguments or refinement of some technical detail rather than a competing consultation.

2.20 The opposite viewpoint would be to say the petition was well supported and that people should be allowed to change their views, especially as the proposed CPZ boundary is different from that proposed in the consultation. There were parts of the

proposed CPZ where the consultation only showed marginal majority support and where now significantly more people have expressed an opposing view.

2.21 A third approach might be to seek clarification of opinion by a further round of consultation. The problem with this approach is that would cause further delay and increased costs for the scheme proposals. This would be to the detriment of other parts of the CPZ programme and the people facing parking problems in those areas.

2.22 Notwithstanding the reservations expressed above about the validity and equivalence of the petition in comparison to the consultation, it is recommended in this instance that a comparison be made by combining the petition opposition with the original consultation and accepting the last opinion offered. In this way only the petition signature would be counted even if the person had originally supported the CPZ. In taking this approach there will be some people who are likely to be disappointed as their area has been excluded from the scheme without their opportunity to make their case. It will certainly only include areas where there is definite support.

2.23 In taking this approach even Devonshire Road as a whole is marginally opposed. Consideration of the distribution of opinion along Devonshire Road still indicated majority support even on this new basis from the section of Devonshire Road closest to Pinner Road.

2.24 There is no section of Oxford Road or Dorset Road where there is majority support. The sections of Rutland Road and Pinner View maintain their support for being included, there being only one petition signature from here. There is no section of Sussex Road in favour. In Bedford Road there is a short section where there was equal support and opposition, counting the one petition signature.

2.25 It could be argued that the area now proposed for the CPZ (taking into account the comments made at statutory consultation - as shown at **Appendix E**) represents even more of an awkward shape than that advertised. It does represent the area where support was strongest in the consultation and where comparatively few signatures to the petition are located. With the exception of Oxford Road and perhaps Bedford Road the length of permit parking provides a buffer between the pay and display parking, primarily designed to help businesses on Pinner Road, and the largely unrestricted remaining road space. The revised area of CPZ, as now proposed, should offer some degree of protection to uncontrolled parking for residents in the remaining length of the road. It is for that reason that the short section of Bedford Road should be included, as the majority support in the consultation is not actually overturned by any comments made during statutory consultation.

2.26 There was also an objection to the CPZ raised by one of the businesses on Pinner Road along with their objection to the restrictions proposed for Pinner Road itself. The extent of the CPZ in the side roads near that premises was either not particularly great, or has been reduced. Furthermore, the CPZ controls will operate only for one hour each weekday and should have little, if any, detrimental effect on the business or its customers. There are of course other proposals in the first section of the side roads off Pinner Road intended to assist businesses' servicing and customer parking. It is considered this aspect of the objection, which does not have specific grounds, should be set aside.

2.27 Copies of all the objections made have been placed in the Members lounge

2.28 Having taken all the objections and comments into account, it is recommended that a CPZ/permit parking scheme, operating Monday to Friday 11am to 12noon in the area shown at **Appendix E** and to include Neptune Road: (all addresses), Pinner Road: 1 to 255 odds and 2 to 204 evens, the southern ends of Devonshire Road: 1 to 35 odds and 2 to 42 evens, Rutland Road: 1 to 9 odds and 2 to 8 evens and Bedford Road: 1 to 7 odds and 2 to 8 evens.

2.29 The first section of Oxford Road and Dorset Road did have clear majorities in the original public consultation, albeit the opposition expressed in the petition overturned them. The usual practice is to review the surrounding area some six to twelve months after implementation. In this case, due to particular anticipated problems especially in the first section of Oxford Road, it is recommended further consultation takes place about six months after implementation. It is recommended this covers the full extent of the initial consultation area outside the currently proposed CPZ but also include at least Cornwall Road, whose residents expressed the view they should have been consulted initially.

2.30 **Objections related to the proposed double yellow lines at junctions**

2.31 In considering the formal objections raised to the double yellow lines it should be noted that these restrictions were the subject of public consultation in September 2008 of those in the immediate vicinity and objections were reported to this Panel in November 2008. Many of those who responded, who would have these restrictions on their frontage, indicated their support. Where responses indicated opposition the junctions concerned were individually reassessed and where reductions in the extent of the proposed restrictions could be made without prejudice to the purpose of the restrictions, these were made in the draft traffic orders. A plan showing the location of junction restrictions and where these have been reduced as a result of consultation feedback is at **Appendix C**. This plan also shows the number of objections received concerning specific junctions.

2.32 The specific grounds of the various objections along with officer comments are found at Appendix B part 2. There are some general comments in how it is recommended these objections should be addressed.

2.33 Notwithstanding the justification for the generally 10 metre extent of the double yellow lines, a similar exercise in re-examining individual junctions has been carried out to that undertaken following the earlier consultation feedback. A computerised system that simulates the path of a large vehicle (eg refuse truck/fire appliance) is used to see if small reductions can be made without compromising the safety purpose of the restrictions. These were taken into account when preparing the draft traffic orders.

2.34 A photographic survey of parking at all the junctions proposed was undertaken to coincide with likely periods of peak parking in the evenings. Copies of these photographs will be placed in the Members lounge.

2.35 **Financial Implications**

2.36 There is £80,000 in the Harrow Capital Programme allocated to implement this project during the 2009/10 financial year. Given the reduced scale of the scheme now proposed, this is likely to be more than sufficient to implement the scheme if approved by the Panel.

2.37 When this Panel considered the annual review of parking schemes in February 2009, a sum of £20,000 was placed in the programme for 2010/11 to enable the post implementation review of the peripheral areas, which is highlighted in the above report, to be initiated. In addition, £20,000 was placed in the programme for 2011/12 to be able to implement additional parking controls or changes subsequently approved. Both of these will need to be reviewed by the Panel at the next annual review in February 2010 in the light of experience once any scheme is implemented.

2.38 **Legal Implications**

2.39 CPZs can be introduced under powers given in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

2.40 There are minimum requirements for consultation, publication and consideration of objections that must be met before making a Traffic Order and which are set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

2.41 **Performance issues**

2.42 There are no Best Value performance indicators in relation to CPZs.

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

- Priority IV Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
- Priority V Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network

2.44 This proposal supports the following Harrow Vision and Corporate Priorities:

- Deliver cleaner and safer streets
- Build stronger communities

2.45 **Environmental Impact**

2.46 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. CPZs are recognised as a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport polices. 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). CPZs and the review of parking restrictions address traffic congestion and road safety issues. The positive effect of CPZ on traffic and congestion issues will in turn have advantages with regard to air quality and pollution.

2.47 **Equalities Impact**

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

SECTION 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Signature: Name: Sheela Thakrar Date: 5/6/2009	✔	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Signature: Name: Jessica Farmer Date: 5/6/2009	✔	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Signature Name: Anu Singh Date: 5/6/2009	✔	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Signature Name: Andrew Baker Date: 3/6/2009	✔	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Environmental Services)

Section 6 – Contact details and background papers

Contact:

Stephen Freeman, Engineer - Parking and Sustainable Transport.
Tel: 020 8424 1437
E-Mail: stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers*:*

1: TARSAP Nov 2008 Agenda Item 9: Pinner Road area, Harrow

2: TARSAP Feb 2009 Agenda Item 9 Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes- Annual Review

3: Mayors Transport Strategy

4: Draft Traffic Order -London Borough of Harrow
Proposed new Controlled Parking Zone – Pinner Road and County Roads (Zone U) published 2 April 2009

5: Petitions, responses to public and statutory consultation and other correspondence.