

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	17 June 2009
Subject:	West Harrow area parking review and possible controlled parking zone –Results of local consultation and proposals for implementation
Key Decision:	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:	<p>Appendix A – Plan of original study area for parking review</p> <p>Appendix B – Notes of stakeholders meeting and agreed consultation area 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 controlled parking and double yellow lines</p> <p>Appendix G – Results of Snapshot Parking Survey</p> <p>Appendix H – Area of proposed controlled parking zone recommended for statutory consultation</p> <p>Appendix I - Copy of leaflet produced by West Harrow Action</p>

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out the findings of public consultation on a possible new controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the West Harrow area and associated parking restrictions at junctions in West Harrow ward and seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to proceed with the recommended proposals.

Recommendations :

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

- (a) 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, the elements of which are as specified in (c) to (e) below;
- (b) that people at addresses within the proposed new controlled parking zone, described in (d) below, be advised of the CPZ details and asked to confirm their support or opposition to the CPZ as advertised, such process to take place in co-ordination with the required statutory consultation,;
- (c) that double yellow line restrictions be introduced at the junctions/locations shown at Appendices E and H, but their extent be modified where possible in line with consultation feedback and site geometry;
- (d) that the new CPZ adjoins the central Harrow zone E and the proposed Pinner Road area CPZ, to include Badgers Close, Butler Avenue, Heath Road, The Gardens, Wilson Gardens, Vaughan Road, the eastern and western sections of Butler Road, almost all of Colbeck Road, the section of Drury Road north of Colbeck Road, the western section of Bouverie Road and the western side of Bessborough Road north of Lascelles Avenue, to operate Monday to Friday 10am to 11 am, as shown at Appendices F and H;
- (e) that in addition to the permit parking bays within these roads, that bays be introduced in **The Gardens, Colbeck Road and Vaughan Road near its eastern junction with Bouverie Road to provide short term pay and display parking (tariff 20p per half hour maximum 2 hours) and longer-term pay and display at the western end of Bouverie Road (tariff £3.50 per day)** as shown at Appendix H;
- (f) that a report on the results of statutory consultation and the re-consultation referred to in (b) above, be considered by a future meeting of this Panel prior to a final decision on what scheme proposal should actually be implemented;
- (g) that the waiting and loading restrictions on Bessborough Road south of its junction with Lascelles Avenue, Andrews Close (serving the Honeybun Centre), Treve Avenue and its junction with Whitmore Road/Pollack Avenue be the subject of further local consultation ;
- (h) that re-consultation / further consultation be carried out in roads or sections of roads outside the zone described in (d) above to gauge the level of support for further extension of the permit parking and CPZ to these roads, approximately 6 months after recommendation (d) above has been implemented, subject to the availability of funding.

REASON: To control parking in the West Harrow area as detailed in the report.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1 Background

- 2.2 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 Kingsfield Road to zone E, the south western boundary on Bessborough Road has remained unchanged since the early 1980's.
- 2.3 Residents and businesses across a wide area stretching from North Harrow to Bessborough Road were consulted on a possible CPZ around 2000. Support was patchy and across the area as a whole there was a majority against. Despite this certain areas where parking was most congested had majorities in support of a CPZ but no scheme was eventually introduced. There have remained continued complaints about parking problems especially from the Harrow end of Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue and from around West Harrow London Underground station.
- 2.4 A petition from the residents of North Avenue, calling for double yellow lines in North Avenue to protect access down this narrow cul de sac including the turning head was sent to the council in March 2001 and considered by the Panel in June 2001. At the time there were not the resources to consult and introduce the controls.
- 2.5 A 115 signature petition requesting a residents' parking scheme was sent to the council and reported to this Panel in November 2007. The petition was mainly signed by those living close to West Harrow station. This petition and the continued complaints about parking from the area closest to the town centre led to separate West Harrow (station) area and Bessborough Road area reviews being given priority in the February 2008 annual CPZ review. The Bessborough Road area was regarded as the second stage of a review of the central Harrow CPZ. The West Harrow station area was regarded as a separate independent area to address slightly different parking issues.
- 2.6 Whilst the benefits of smaller more focused parking reviews were explained in the 2008 Annual CPZ review, it was also appreciated that carrying out two such reviews in close proximity might create particular displacement problems for those living in between. The people in this area might not currently suffer the degree of day-time parking problem to even justify consultation on a CPZ. The approach taken in recent reviews has been to propose double yellow lines on junctions, bends and narrow section of road on an area wide basis to address actual and potential obstructive parking issues. These are usually proposed rather more widely than the CPZ proposals. A study area covering the eastern part of West Harrow ward and a small part of Harrow on the Hill ward was identified for discussion at a stakeholders meeting. A plan of this study area is at **Appendix A**.

- 2.7 Stakeholder meetings are arranged at the start of parking reviews to identify the main issues to be covered in the review and the geographical extent of the consultation. They enable officers to hear about the parking and safety issues as experienced by people (both residents and businesses) of the area. In this instance despite an individual approach to the businesses, which form small clusters in the area, there was no representation at the meeting. The NW London Chamber of Commerce (who represent businesses), Harrow Public Transport Users Association and Vaughan School were also unable to attend the meeting. There were however representatives from London Underground and a doctor's practice in the area. Other than officers and councillors, the remaining attendees were residents who had raised issues concerning parking problems recently and in particular the organisers of the petition for residents parking.
- 2.8 The stakeholders meeting in December 2008 examined the parking problems across the study area and agreed that during the day these were worst near West Harrow station and towards Bessborough Road. It proved difficult to find a natural boundary or an extent for the CPZ consultation. The study area was reduced at its southern boundary to Lascelles Avenue, Treve Avenue and a small section of Whitmore Road but it was decided to consult the whole area about both double yellow lines and a possible CPZ. This way the consultees would determine the boundary of any CPZ. In taking this approach it was fully appreciated that people living towards the southern and eastern boundaries might well decide parking in their vicinity did not justify a CPZ and that numbers overall might be against the introduction of a CPZ. This has occurred in several consultations recently. It has however been agreed that people should be able to decide on the CPZ issue for their immediate vicinity, providing a sensible boundary can be achieved. Although most people at the stakeholders meeting agreed a one hour operational period would provide the best balance of addressing the commuter parking problem whilst maintaining maximum flexibility for residents and their visitors some people were concerned this would not adequately address parking problems caused by Harrow town centre shoppers. It was therefore agreed to consult on whether additional hours of restriction were wanted in the afternoon and/or at weekends. The notes of the stakeholder meeting together with the agreed consultation area are at **Appendix B**.
- 2.9 In producing the detailed plans for consultation purposes the need for customer/visitor parking near to shops and other business premises was addressed by proposing pay and display facilities either on their own or shared use which additionally allows use by permit holders. Loading bays were proposed in Blenheim Road and near the station to compensate for loading restrictions at the junctions. The design sought to maximise the on-street parking but was limited by several factors. These included narrow road widths which limited parking to one side of the road or, in roads below 4.8 metres wide, to restrict parking on both sides and at locations with inadequate width for passing traffic which necessitated passing spaces if no such spaces were created at vehicular crossovers. Double yellow lines were proposed opposite parking bays where there was inadequate road width for parking to occur on both sides of the road. 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**.
- 2.10 The Transport for London funded walking programme had identified pedestrian crossing safety improvements at a junction just to the south of West Harrow

station and extension of the 20 mile per hour zone. It proved possible to combine consultation on these separate proposals to provide people with an overall picture of proposal in that area and to achieve some cost savings. The results of the other consultation accessibility/20mph zone proposals are considered separately following a report to the Portfolio Holder.

- 2.11 Consultation took place between 27 April and 18 May 2008 by means of common consultation documents but with address specific detailed plans delivered with questionnaires. An exhibition was held at St Peter's Church, Sumner Road on 2nd, 5th and 8th May. The consultation was also available online via the council's "traffic consultations" web address.

2.12 Options considered

- 2.13 The scope of the proposals and reasons for them is outlined in **Appendix C**.

- 2.14 The option as to how to proceed, based on the response to the parking consultations, is included within paras. 2.17 and following.

2.15 Consultation

- 2.16 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 B**). All Ward Councillors were sent the consultation materials prior to distribution.

2.17 Consultation Documents and Issues

- 2.18 A common West Harrow area consultation document and questionnaire were produced so that everyone consulted was provided with the same general information. An accompanying information booklet explained the main principles of a CPZ and other associated proposals, the potential benefits, limitations and costs associated with CPZs, together with a series of frequently asked questions (FAQ). An A3 plan showing the detailed proposals relating to the individual address was also provided. A key plan together with the nine detailed plans is at **Appendix E**.

- 2.19 Sample consultation documents are at **Appendix D**. Consultation documents were distributed to approximately 1900 addresses during the 25/26 April weekend preceding the consultation period. Consultation documents were individually addressed and posted to all the known businesses in the area and to those on the east side of Bessborough Road.

- 2.20 Sample consultation documents and the consultation responses have been placed on the Members library.

- 2.21 A night and day parking survey was carried out to provide a snapshot of parking patterns. A matching exercise on vehicle registration plates was carried out to see how many of the vehicles parked during the day had been parked during the previous night. This provides an estimate of the number of residents' vehicles parked. A comparison was also made with the parking bay spaces provided in the proposals. The results on a street by street basis are given at **Appendix G**.

They show across the whole consultation area slightly less than 60% of the daytime parked vehicles belonged to residents. A significant reduction of the 40% of daytime non-residents' vehicles parked clearly should make parking significantly easier for residents.

- 2.22 666 responses were received by the end of 22 May 2009 of which 114 were submitted on line. This represents a response rate of 37% which is slightly higher than respective figures for similar recent consultations. 96% came from residential addresses 3% from businesses and other organisations together with 1% who were both residential and business premises.
- 2.23 In order to improve response rates from CPZ consultations an A5 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.
- 2.24 There were staffed exhibitions of the parking and safety scheme proposals in St Peter's Church, Sumner Road on Saturday 2 May between noon & 5pm, Tuesday 5 May between 5.30pm & 8.30pm and Friday 8 May between 2.30pm & 7pm. Approximately a hundred people attended. It is a matter of regret that due to technical reasons the full display materials were not available on display on Saturday 2 May but all the information was available albeit on smaller scale plans. There were quite a number of residents, generally living away from the areas with the worst daytime parking problems, who were angry about a consultation taking place at all. Some voicing the opinion that there was not any parking problem in the area at all, whilst others felt a problem might develop as a result of the proposals. There were others who were very supportive of the scheme proposals who stated they experienced great parking problems at present and that a scheme was long overdue. Most people had opinions somewhere in between these two extremes.
- 2.25 Another commonly raised issue was the extent of double yellow lines within relatively narrow roads. It was explained these were linked to the permit bay proposals and were generally only necessary if these went ahead in that road. Many people came to seek clarification on some aspect of the proposals as they might affect them, whilst others made detailed comments which would be useful in refining the design if the proposals were taken forward in that area.
- 2.26 It became evident during the consultation period that an organised residents' group were seeking to mobilise opinion against the CPZ proposals. A meeting was organised by this group on 13th May and held at St Peters Church Sumner Road. This meeting was attended by four councillors including two ward councillors. They reported a rather hostile meeting attended by more than 150 people. The mood at the meeting appeared to be that the council were trying to impose a CPZ for revenue generation, where none was needed or wanted by people. Attempted reassurance that the consultation was to find out what people wanted and that a CPZ would only be introduced where there was majority support did not appear to be accepted.

2.27 A common comment was that parking was at its worst in the evenings and probably caused by residents own vehicles.

2.28 General Responses

2.29 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 1 below. The overall figures for those consulted on the creation of a new CPZ are shown in Table 2 below. The groupings of roads in each table are based on geographical location and similar road widths and parking circumstances.

Table 1 - Overall Responses - Junction and other double yellow line restrictions (Question 8 on the questionnaire)

	In favour as proposed	Against or want modifications
Overall	264	319
1) Beaumont Avenue, Bladon Gardens (private), Dorchester Avenue, Grosvenor Avenue, North Avenue & Sandhurst Avenue	20	80
2) Badgers Close, Bouverie Road, Butler Avenue, Butler Road, Drury Road, Heath Road, The Gardens, Vaughan Road & Wilson Gardens	180	128
3) Bessborough Road, Lascelles Avenue, Treve Avenue & Whitmore Road	14	6
4) Bowen Road, Colbeck Road, Lance Road, Merivale Road & Sumner Road	41	62
5) Ford Close, Hawkins Close, Marshall Close & Spring Way	9	43

Table 2 Responses to Questions on inclusion in a proposed CPZ on a road basis

				Question 3			Questions 3&4		
	Number of Addresses	Number of Responses	Response Rate	Do you support the residents parking proposal in your street?			Do you support a CPZ or if a CPZ is to be introduced in the road near to yours, would you then wish your road to be included?		
				Yes	No	Don't Know/No opinion	Yes	No	Don't Know/No opinion
1) Butler Avenue, The Gardens, Vaughan Road & Wilson Gardens	489	170	35%	100	62	8	111	51	20
2) Badgers Close, Bouverie Road, Butler Road, Drury Road & Heath Road	466	180	39%	68	105	5	86	78	25
3) Beaumont Avenue, Bladon Gardens (priv), Blenheim Road, Dorchester Avenue, North Avenue & Sandhurst Avenue	307	109	36%	22	86	3	30	82	8

4) Bowen Road, Ford Close, Hawkins Close, Lance Road, Lascelles Avenue, Treve Avenue, Marshall Close, Merivale Close, Spring Way & Sumner Road	429	176	41%	25	141	11	41	120	20
5) Bessborough Road, Colbeck Road & Whitmore Road	71	24	34%	6	14	4	10	10	4
Overall	1762	659	37%	221	408	31	278	341	77

The above figures represent the responses received by 22nd May and the preparation of this report. Any responses received after this date will be reported orally at the Panel meeting.

- 2.30 Overall, there is significant majority either against or wanting modifications to the double yellow line proposals. Also when considering the results from the whole consultation area there is a very clear majority against creating a new CPZ across the whole area. This is to be expected when, as already explained, the consultation area is larger than the area from which the main complaints about parking have come from. As can be seen, for each of these consultations there are significant variations in responses throughout the areas concerned.

2.31 Double yellow line proposals

- 2.32 Double yellow line proposals were made for junctions throughout the agreed consultation area for the possible new CPZ. This area covers nearly half of West Harrow 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 with) another parked vehicle or 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.

- 2.33 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 Butler Road/Avenue and Vaughan Road. The same also occurs during the day at some, at present unrestricted junctions, especially near West Harrow station and the junction between Butler Avenue and Butler 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/electric mobility scooters or with young children and or pushchairs that the junctions are kept clear of obstructive parking and dropped crossings, where provided, are kept clear. Double yellow lines appear to enjoy greater respect than single yellow line restrictions even during the period when technically they equally apply.

- 2.34 Apart from at junctions and sharp bends, double yellow lines were also proposed in conjunction with the permit bays as part of the proposed CPZ especially in the roads leading from, and to the south of Blenheim Road. It was envisaged most of these double yellow lines would only be required if the CPZ proceeded in these roads.
- 2.35 The response to the proposed double yellow lines is shown on a road by road basis at **Appendix F**, but have been grouped in Table 1 above to offer explanation of the variation in response and suggest how the proposals should be modified in the light of the views expressed.
- 2.36 The roads in group “1” of Table 1 lie to the west of The Gardens. With the exception of Blenheim Road their narrow carriageway widths resulted in double yellow lines being proposed either opposite the proposed permit bays or in some instances on both sides of particularly narrow roads. Even on Blenheim Road the road width was inadequate for 2 way traffic flow and some double yellow lines were proposed opposite the small parade. Responses from each of these roads neither supported a CPZ nor wanted inclusion if one was introduced. From the comments made both the double yellow lines and the permit bays were unpopular as they were seen as providing insufficient space for residents to park. The residents consider the present parking problems are not sufficient to justify these measures. As the CPZ /permit parking proposals are not recommended for these roads (see paras. 2.44 – 2.50 below) much of the length of double yellow line away from junctions and bends becomes unnecessary. It is recommended that this is removed unless the carriageway widths are so narrow to justify them in order to protect access.
- 2.37 The roads in group “2” run away from West Harrow station and up towards Bessborough Road. These roads are on the whole wider but being closer to either West Harrow station or Harrow town centre appear to suffer the worst parking problems. There is both the strongest support for a CPZ and majority support for the double yellow line proposals in each of these roads. The exception is Wilson Gardens where the two side arms are narrow. People requested that the layout be re-examined to see if the permit parking space could be increased and the extent of double yellow lines decreased.
- 2.38 The roads in group “3” are main roads at the periphery of the consultation area mainly with existing restriction. In each road there is majority support for the double yellow line proposals.
- 2.39 The roads in group “4” mainly are of similar width to those in group “2” but lie further from the station and the town centre. Bowen Road however has two sections of different character, that part near to Marshalls Close is again narrower and requiring double yellow lines to accompany permit bays should these proceed. Merivale Road is the only other road in this group not to have majority support for the double yellow lines. In this road a succession of side turnings produced a significant proportion of double yellow line proposals. The CPZ /permit parking proposals are not recommended for these roads (see paras. 2.44 – 2.50 below).
- 2.40 The final group “5” is very similar to group “1” in having a high proportion of double yellow lines proposed due to narrow road widths. The only difference is

that these roads are on the southern periphery of the consultation area. A very similar approach is proposed to that for group "1" as again the CPZ /permit parking proposals are not recommended for these roads (see paras. 2.44 – 2.50 below).

- 2.41 Observations in the evenings and the night-time parking survey indicate significant parking pressure leading to parking right up to 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 the 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 junction and sharp bend 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.

2.42 Junction Proposals and associated restrictions by West Harrow station

- 2.43 As part of the consultation process proposals for a scheme which included:-

- a raised platform at the junction of The Gardens /Bouverie Road/Wilson Gardens/Vaughan Road to replace the mini roundabout
- Kerb build outs to slow traffic and assist pedestrians
- Extension to the 20mph zone to include the junction, a short length of Vaughan Road and Bouverie Road
- Provision of two compensatory loading bays

and were included in the leaflet and questionnaire and comments were requested. These comments are being considered and will be the subject of a separate traffic report to the Portfolio Holder on Transport for London (TfL) Walking projects

2.44 Possible new controlled parking zone and permit parking scheme

- 2.45 Considering the response to the creation of a new CPZ over the whole consultation area there was not a majority of respondents in favour. There was an active campaign organised against the CPZ which included the circulation of a rather misleading leaflet, copy attached at **Appendix I** and a rather vocal residents' meeting organised by West Harrow Action on 13th May. This meeting occurred after the 3 exhibitions but before the end of the consultation period. What effect this campaign had on the response is difficult to determine. The main reasons the campaigners reported for their opposition was that the area had been consulted and rejected (all day) CPZ proposals in 2000, that the consultation had been initiated by a small unrepresentative group at the Stakeholders meeting (This is incorrect as it was the 115 signature petition and continuing correspondence/communication with residents that caused the area to be put on the programme), that the council had contrived to introduce a scheme perhaps in only one road for one hour only to extended it compulsorily across the whole area and to run throughout the day (This is incorrect as it was made clear in the consultation leaflet that we would only look to take forward CPZ proposals

where people say that is what they want and this may lead to a much smaller zone than that consulted upon). The view held by a wider group living more distant from West Harrow station and Bessborough Road (Harrow town centre) is that daytime parking is not too bad in their streets but the introduction of a CPZ elsewhere might 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 considering the results from the consultation overall there was a majority in favour. This approach was agreed with ward councillors prior to the consultation being carried out and is again explained in the consultation documents.

- 2.46 Two questions were asked about the CPZ issue to occupiers where there was potential for permit parking bays. The questions being:-
1. Do you support the residents parking proposal in your street?
 2. If answer No to above question If a CPZ was introduced in the road near to yours, would you wish your road to be included?
- 2.47 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 2 above.
- 2.48 Clearly support for a CPZ is strongest in The Gardens, Wilson Gardens, Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue (group "1" in Table 2) where the majority of complaints about parking have come from. Bouverie Road is marginally in favour. There is strong opposition to the CPZ (greater than 2:1) in Beaumont Avenue, Blenheim Road, Bowen Road, Dorchester Avenue, Grosvenor Avenue, Hawkins Close, Lance Road, Marshall Close, Merivale Road, Sandhurst Avenue, Spring Way and Sumner Road (groups "3" and "4"). Other roads with clear majorities against a CPZ have majorities wanting to be included if a CPZ is introduced nearby and even Drury Road (32:16 against) and Colbeck Road (8:4 against) become far more marginal on this basis. It would appear there is a consistent and viable area from four roads on the basis of support for the CPZ alone. A further five, Badgers Close, Bouverie Road, Butler Road, Drury Road and Heath Road (group 2) want to be included if a CPZ went ahead. Even those consulted in Whitmore Road wished to be included however they do not add direct to the periphery. Closer examination of the distribution of responses from Colbeck Road, Drury Road, Butler Road and Bouverie Road shows there are sections of roads wishing to be included in a CPZ whilst other sections do not. This is perhaps not surprising as daytime parking problems diminish going away from West Harrow station and Bessborough Road. There is a similar gradation in support but to a lesser extent in Vaughan Road and no clear section in the middle has a majority against.
- 2.49 Based on the distribution of responses as analysed above and **Appendix F** a CPZ and permit parking scheme is recommended covering Badgers Close, Butler Avenue, Heath Road, The Gardens, Wilson Gardens, Vaughan Road, and sections of Butler Road, Colbeck Road, Drury Road, and Bouverie Road. There were no responses received from those properties in Bessborough Road who were consulted. However it is recommended that residents and businesses of

the western side of Bessborough Road north of Lascelles Avenue be allowed to purchase permits as no parking is feasible on this section of Bessborough Road. The area of a new CPZ suggested for statutory consultation is shown at **Appendices F and H.**

2.50 A number of residents living in the western section of Blenheim Road, beyond the consultation area, submitted responses online. This section of road is quite isolated from the recommended CPZ area described in 2.45 above, lying much closer to North Harrow. As the consultations results demonstrate, there is no majority support from the majority of the length of Blenheim Road in the consultation area, together with the roads to the north and south. This will minimise the effect of displacement of parking into this area. The western end of Blenheim Road should form part of a North Harrow review which is currently un-programmed

2.51 Pay and Display Parking

2.52 The proposals which were used for consultation included pay and display facilities to assist local business. These were located at:-

- Blenheim Road outside the shops/businesses/offices
- Bouverie Road nearest West Harrow Station and nearest Vaughan Road-shared use
- Vaughan Road outside the shops between No 130 and No152
- Colbeck Road outside St Peters Church/Medical Centre-shared use
- The Gardens near its junction with Blenheim Road

2.53 The bays are located in areas which appear to suffer from commuter parking and apart from Blenheim Road and one short length in Bouverie Road nearest Vaughan Road they all lie within the revised area of a CPZ where majority support is demonstrated and it is recommended that the proposals be taken forward to statutory consultation.

2.54 Some comments have been made about the provision and location of some of the bays and these will be taken into account in producing the final design that will be, if approved, taken forward to statutory consultation.

2.55 Subject to agreement by the Panel it is proposed that the bays be subject to a 2 hour maximum stay with no return within 3 hours with a charge of 20p per half hour. This would correspond to the tariff structure of the proposed bays in the county roads. The exception being at the station end of Bouverie Road where it is suggested all day parking be allowed at a charge of £3.50 per day similar to Sandridge Close by Harrow and Wealdstone Station.

2.56 Loading Bay Provision

2.57 In addition to the two loading bays associated with the platform and associated proposals at the junction of The Gardens/Bouverie Road/Vaughan Road/Wilson Gardens, loading bays were also proposed at:-

- Blenheim Road outside the shops/business/offices
- Colbeck Road outside the Medical Centre

Both of the latter two sites would be at the extremity of the revised CPZ Zone and therefore, if the scheme does go ahead would be sites that might suffer from displaced parking which would have an impact on the available roadspace for servicing traffic. Clearly it is preferential to have delivery activities taking place in locations that are not prejudicial to traffic flow and road safety

2.58 Financial Implications

2.59 There is £50,000 available from the Harrow CPZ Capital programme for the current financial year (2009/10) which was intended to cover consultation and advertising costs for any traffic orders. A further £110,000 is required in 2010/11 for implementing the scheme as reported to the February meeting of the Panel. A bid will need to be included in the medium term financial strategy for the capital programme and this is subject to approval.

2.60 The actual costs will depend on the outcome of the number of roads agreed to be taken forward and the results of the statutory consultation. The programme for this scheme, if approved by this Panel and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety is:-

Advertise Traffic Orders- Summer 2009

Consider objections by Panel- November 2009

Target Completion- Spring 2010

2.61 At this stage it is considered that there is sufficient money in the 09/10 programme to be able to take the scheme to statutory consultation.

2.62 The revised cost of the scheme will be reported to the February 2010 meeting of the Panel when the annual review of CPZ schemes is considered. The meeting will consider the funds made available for parking schemes from the 2010/11 Harrow Capital programme which would fund implementation of this scheme. However, as highlighted above, the programme will depend on various approvals.

2.63 Legal Implications

2.64 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions, and designated paying parking places, can be implemented pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

2.65 There are minimum requirements for consultation, publication and consideration of objections that must be met before any Traffic Order can be made 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

2.66 **Performance Issues**

2.67 There are no Best Value performance indicators relating to CPZs.

2.68 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 Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

2.69 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

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

Deliver cleaner and safer streets
Build stronger communities

2.71 **Environmental Impact**

2.72 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 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). CPZs and the review of parking restrictions can help 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, especially as residents report occurs from 6.30am, will once the scheme has settled down, lead to a reduction in traffic noise.

2.73 **Equalities Impact**

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

2.75 **Risk Management Implications**

2.76 This project is not included on the Directorate Risk Register

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

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Signature:		
Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 5/6/2009		
Signature:		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<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		

Contact: Stephen Freeman,
Project Engineer, Parking & Sustainable Transport
Tel. No: 020 8424 1437

Background Papers:

- 1 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 11th February 2009
Agenda Item 9 – Controlled parking zones/ parking scheme- Annual review (2009).
- 2 Consultation responses.
- 3 Harrow Council Local Implementation Plan
- 4 Mayors Transport Strategy

IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES/ NO
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / NO

