

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	25 November 2009
Subject:	West Harrow Area Parking Review and Proposed Controlled Parking Zone – Results of Statutory and Informal Consultation and Proposals for Implementation
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills- Corporate Director, Community and Environment
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Susan Hall- Portfolio Holder for Environment Services and Community Safety
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	<p>Appendix A – Parking capacity assessment</p> <p>Appendix B – Statutory consultation plans</p> <p>Appendix C – Call-In Sub-Committee minutes</p> <p>Appendix D – Sample consultation documents</p> <p>Appendix E – Letter to residents in Heath Road</p> <p>Appendix F – Follow up letter to all consultees</p> <p>Appendix G – Summary of all objections with officers' comments</p> <p>Appendix H – Notes of meeting between Harrow council representatives and West Harrow Residents' Association</p> <p>Appendix J – Summary of consultation comments with officers' responses</p> <p>Appendix K – Petition from Harrow Spiritualist Church</p> <p>Appendix L – Petition from Harrow Learning Disability Team</p> <p>Appendix M – Scheme plans recommended for implementation</p> <p>Appendix N – Revised parking capacity assessment</p> <p>Appendix P – Quality Assurance certificate</p> <p>[Please note that there is not an Appendix I or O]</p>

## **SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This document reports the results of statutory consultation on two proposed new controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the West Harrow area and associated parking restrictions at junctions and bends. This document also seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to proceed with the proposals subject to modifications explained in this report as a result of statutory consultation with the affected residents and businesses.

### **Recommendations:**

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

- (a) that officers be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the proposals shown in Appendix M, subject to all other recommendations of the Panel;
- (b) that all objectors and all people at addresses within the consultation area be informed of this decision;
- (c) that two new Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) be introduced – Zone V (Monday-Saturday 10am-11am and 2pm-3pm) and Zone W (Monday to Friday 10-11am) – at the extents shown in Appendix M, and that people at addresses within the two new CPZs be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
- (d) that two lengths of “zone-time” single yellow line waiting restrictions associated with Zone V be reduced to operate Monday to Friday 2-3pm at the locations shown in Appendix M to provide additional parking for residents who would be able to park across their own dropped accesses and in the spaces between outside of those hours;
- (e) that the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and pinch points be implemented as modified per the recommendations in this report and as shown in Appendix M;
- (f) that the extents of the double yellow line waiting restrictions in Merivale Road, North Avenue and Wilson Gardens be revised as shown in Appendix M to take into account residents' comments and that residents be written to explaining the modifications proposed before the scheme is implemented, with the consideration of any objections being delegated to the Traffic & Highway Network Manger in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment Services & Community Safety;
- (g) that subject to further consultation with the medical practice at 43 Butler Avenue, a Business Permit Bay for Zone V be provided outside their property frontage, with operational hours of Monday to Friday 8.30am-6.30pm and Saturday 8.30am-12.30pm;
- (h) that pay and display parking bays be provided in the unnamed link road between Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue to serve the nearby medical practice with hours of operation amended from the original proposals to Monday to Friday 9.30am-5.30pm and Saturday 9.30am-1.30pm, and that these bays be shared with Zone V Business Permit Holders;
- (i) that pay and display parking bays be provided in Blenheim Road and The Gardens for the benefit of businesses and services, to be shared with Zone W Permit Holders, as

originally advertised;

- (j) that the charges for using the Pay and Display bays in The Gardens and the unnamed link road between Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue be 20 pence per 30 minutes with a maximum stay of 4 hours during the hours of operation;
- (k) that the charges for using the Pay and Display bays in Blenheim Road be 20 pence per 30 minutes with a maximum stay of 2 hours during the hours of operation;
- (l) that officers be instructed to investigate, 6-12 months after any scheme is implemented, the impact of introducing all-day pay and display parking in part of Bouverie Road to be shared with Zone W permit holders and if feasible seek the Portfolio Holder's approval for its introduction;
- (m) that officers be instructed to investigate and carry out consultation on waiting and loading restrictions on Lascelles Avenue, Treve Avenue, Whitmore Road and Porlock Avenue;
- (n) that after a period of 6-12 months from the implementation of recommendation (c) above officers be instructed to consult residents in Andrews Close, Bessborough Road (south of Lascelles Avenue), Charles Crescent, Farmborough Road, Lascelles Avenue, Pool Road, Porlock Avenue (north of Whitmore High School), Treve Avenue and Whitmore Road on a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions, subject to the availability of funding;
- (o) that objections to the proposals be set aside on the basis set out in this report and each objector written to with details of how to obtain a copy of this report that explains where, if possible, amendments to the proposals have been recommended on the basis of their objection;
- (p) that after a period of 6-12 months having elapsed from the implementation of recommendation (c) and (e) a review be carried out, as detailed in the report, in the original consultation area subject to the availability of funding that is considered at the February 2010 meeting of TARSAP;

**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 1980s. It was split into separate zones with the introduction of permit parking in the late 1990s. 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 1980s.
- 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 continued to be complaints about parking problems especially from the town centre 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 their road 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 insufficient resources to consult and introduce parking 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 localised 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 daytime parking problems even to justify consultation on a CPZ. The approach taken in recent reviews has been to propose double yellow lines on junctions, bends and narrow sections of road on an area-wide basis to address actual and potential dangerous and obstructive parking, in particular for emergency service and refuse collection vehicles. These are usually proposed 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 can be found in the report to the Panel on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009.
- 2.7 A stakeholders' meeting is 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. Such a meeting enables officers and councillors 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 majority of businesses, which form small clusters in the area, there was no local business representation at the meeting. The NW London Chamber of Commerce (which represents 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 obvious extent for the CPZ consultation because of the location of the relatively isolated pockets of parking problems. The study area was reduced at its southern boundary to exclude the area within a triangle formed by Lascelles Avenue, Treve Avenue, Whitmore Road (east) and Bessborough Road. It was decided to consult the remaining 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, provided a practical 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 or at weekends or both. The notes of the stakeholder meeting together with the agreed consultation can be found in the report to the Panel on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

2.9 The stakeholders' meeting established a consultation area that was larger than the geographical extents where requests had been received for measures to deal with all-day commuter parking so that as many people as possible had the chance to be consulted.

## **2.10 Parking survey**

2.11 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. The total overnight parking space available to residents was compared to the number of parked vehicles observed overnight. The results on a street-by-street basis within the CPZs proposed, with a figure for the remaining streets combined, are given at **Appendix A**.

2.12 The data included in the TARSAP report of 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009 showed that 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 clearly should make parking significantly easier for residents.

### **2.13 Other considerations**

2.14 In producing the detailed plans for consultation purposes the need for customer and 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 in Vaughan Road to compensate for loading or stopping restrictions at the junctions, and additionally in Colbeck Road to service the St. Peter's medical centre.

2.15 A 48-signature petition was received by the council from some shopkeepers in Blenheim Road and their customers indicating support for Pay and Display parking to prevent the currently uncontrolled kerb space being used by commuters. This petition was presented to TARSAP on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

2.16 The Transport for London (TfL) funded walking programme had identified pedestrian crossing safety improvements at a junction just to the south of West Harrow station and extension of the existing 20 mph Zone. It proved possible to combine consultation on these separate schemes to provide people with an overall picture of proposals in that area and to achieve some cost savings. Pursuant to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety's decision to implement the TfL walking programme, objections to the walking scheme are being dealt with separately.

### **2.17 Initial consultation**

2.18 Initial consultation took place between 27<sup>th</sup> April and 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009 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 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> May. The consultation was also available online via the council's "traffic consultations" web page.

2.19 The results of the initial consultation were reported to TARSAP on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009, and the Panel recommended that statutory consultation be carried out on a revised set of proposals incorporating two controlled parking zones – zones V and W – centred on the eastern end of Vaughan Road and around West Harrow station respectively. The proposed hours of control for each zone are Monday to Saturday 10-11am and 2-3pm in Zone V, and Monday to Friday 10-11am in Zone W. These times of operation reflect the desires expressed by residents during the first round of consultation in spring 2009. The extents of both zones advertised are shown at **Appendix B**.

2.20 The recommendations of TARSAP were ratified by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

2.21 A group of residents initiated a Call-In of that decision, which meant that it was reviewed by a Call-In Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee found that none of

the four counts on which the call-in had been initiated could be upheld. Two of those counts were overturned unanimously, the other two on a majority decision. The report and minutes of the Sub-Committee are attached at **Appendix C**.

2.22 Therefore, the council could continue to proceed with the next stage of consultation – statutory consultation – as recommended in the original decision.

### **2.23 Options considered**

2.24 The proposals considered set out to address two main areas of concern:

- All-day commuter parking leading to residents having difficulties finding parking
- Reported access problems for the council's refuse collection service that are also shared by the emergency services, particularly the Fire Brigade.

2.25 The CPZ is intended to fulfil the requests expressed in a 115-signature petition from people in the area immediately around West Harrow station to deal with all-day parking by commuters.

2.26 There are certain legal considerations that restrict the options the council can pursue to manage parking on-street.

2.27 With the roads in question forming part of the public highway, the council is limited in the solutions it can offer by the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD), that specify the use of certain signs to indicate certain restrictions, and these must also correspond to a Traffic Management Order (TMO).

2.28 TSRGD allows parking to be controlled, amongst other things, with the use of Permit Holder Only bays and signs, which residents or other eligible parties can then use by displaying a valid Permit or Blue Badge.

2.29 Forming a CPZ within a contiguous area is an efficient way of using the signs and markings permitted by TSRGD to establish a level of priority parking for particular users, normally residents. Within a CPZ, individual "zone time" single yellow lines – i.e. waiting restrictions that only apply during the control hours of the CPZ – do not require additional signs, which minimises the negative impact on aesthetics. Only restrictions that differ from the "zone time" require additional signs, as do all permit and other bays within the CPZ. The "zone time" is displayed on signs at the all entry points of the zone.

2.30 A suggested alternative to create additional parking that could be considered include the construction of additional parking, either by removal of highway verge (in The Gardens and Wilson Gardens) or on existing vacant land.

2.31 These alternatives are not practical mainly on the grounds of cost, and that the creation of additional parking in an area would be likely to attract more commuters and more traffic into the area. This would outweigh any benefits to residents.

2.32 The established method of protecting emergency service and refuse vehicle access is by prohibiting waiting (parking) at locations where it would otherwise

cause obstruction. Obstruction of the highway is already a contravention of the Road Traffic Act 1988, however Police enforcement is rare and therefore obstruction is becoming a common occurrence. Local authorities cannot enforce this type of infringement. The advice in the Highway Code backs up the provisions of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in respect of obstructive parking.

- 2.33 A popular alternative to waiting restrictions is the introduction of “ghost capes” – hatched marking in the carriageway to advise against parking – but as these are advisory and unenforceable, they are frequently ignored. The council used to implement ghost capes for access protection reasons, but widespread non-compliance and ignorance of them by the public as led to a cessation of this practice.
- 2.34 Several suggested modifications to the scheme were considered and included at the initial consultation stage in spring 2009. The statutory consultation that is reported in this document also led to amendments to the proposals.

### **2.35 Statutory consultation**

- 2.36 Unless stated, references to “consultation” from here on means statutory consultation as per the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act of 1984, carried out on the recommendation of TARSAP on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009, ratified by the decision of the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2009.
- 2.37 All Councillors in the affected wards were sent the consultation materials prior to distribution.
- 2.38 A number of statutory consultees such as the Police and the Fire Brigade were consulted as part of the statutory requirements.

### **2.39 Consultation Documents and Issues**

- 2.40 A common West Harrow area consultation document and questionnaire were produced so that everyone consulted was provided with the same general information. 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 B**. Consultation material was delivered on a one-per-household and business basis with an explanation that all responses would also be analysed in this way.
- 2.41 Questionnaires were supplied in order to determine where support and opposition to the proposals existed and therefore give sufficient information for the council to make a best fit and tailor the extents of the CPZs where support for them was strongest. This gives the opportunity for consultees to change their minds and comment on the revised proposals.
- 2.42 Whereas the first consultation asked people to respond to a number of questions to enable the proposals to be refined, the questionnaire in the statutory consultation was confined to asking people if they supported the proposals or not.



- 2.43 The consultation document clearly made reference to this round of consultation being part of the statutory process of making the necessary Traffic Management Orders (TMO`s). Consultees were advised about how to object and to do so during the statutory consultation period, i.e. 24<sup>th</sup> September 2009 to 15<sup>th</sup> October 2009.
- 2.44 In addition, as objections only record respondents who are against proposals, the council issued questionnaires and reply-paid envelopes in the consultation packs. This allowed the council to identify those properties who were in favour of the revised proposals.
- 2.45 Residents were also encouraged to submit questionnaires by the deadline, although because they are not part of the statutory process they are not subject to the same rules as objections. Nevertheless, to carry out effective analysis of the consultation, responses received beyond the deadline are not included in this report, but will be reported to Panel members at the meeting.
- 2.46 Sample consultation documents are at **Appendix D**. Consultation documents were distributed to 1767 addresses on 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009 in advance of the start of the statutory objection period on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2009.
- 2.47 Early in the delivery period, a few residents reported that they had not received a questionnaire in their consultation pack. It transpired that the delivery company that had also compiled consultation packs had omitted them, but they delivered questionnaires to circa 600 properties affected on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009. Consultation packs not already delivered upon discovery of the omission were recompiled to include the questionnaire before distribution.
- 2.48 It was also identified that the list of streets in Zone W in the leaflet did not include Heath Road, although both the overall area plan in the leaflet and the individual loose plan supplied did correctly show it and clearly so. A letter clarifying this matter was hand delivered to the 36 properties in Heath Road on the evening of 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009, which was prior to the start of the official consultation period. This letter is attached as **Appendix E**.
- 2.49 Sample consultation documents and the consultation responses – completed questionnaires, objections and letter of support – are available in the Members' Library for inspection by Councillors.
- 2.50 The consultation process was subject to a Quality Assurance (QA) procedure where an external auditor has vetted the recording and analysis of questionnaire responses and statutory objections. This is explained in more detail at paragraphs 2.54-2.57.
- 2.51 In line with the QA procedure, midway during the statutory consultation period a follow up letter was delivered to all address within the consultation area expressing thanks to those who have already responded and reminding those that had not yet returned them to do so before the deadline. This letter is attached as **Appendix F**.
- 2.52 A leaflet produced by opponents of the CPZ was circulated during the consultation, which claimed that "200 families would lose their parking space" as

a result of the proposals. This figure was taken from a table in the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009 TARSAP report that showed that the number of bays in the area – if a CPZ were to cover the entire West Harrow area – would be 198 less than the total observed overnight parking.

- 2.53 The “200 spaces” figure does not take into account the parking spaces available on single yellow lines (including across residents’ own drives), loading bays or other restrictions outside their daytime period of operation. Parking capacity assessments by the council indicate that there is still a net surplus of at least 100 overnight parking spaces across the entire consultation area if the advertised scheme (**Appendix A**) or the revised scheme (**Appendix N**) were to be implemented.

#### **2.54 Quality Assurance procedure**

- 2.55 To ensure the accuracy of the consultation process, a Quality Assurance (QA) procedure has been followed. Consultants from EnterpriseMouchel have verified the collation of questionnaires and objections, and the data presented in the report and appendices.

- 2.56 A certificate of compliance with the QA procedure is attached at **Appendix P**.

- 2.57 Having followed a QA procedure that has been externally vetted, the council is confident this report adequately reflects the responses of the consultation.

#### **2.58 Consultation responses and objections**

- 2.59 A total of 529 valid questionnaire responses were received by the end of 15<sup>th</sup> October of which 66 were submitted on line. Postal responses received on 16<sup>th</sup> October were also accepted on the basis that these may have been received in the post room by the 15<sup>th</sup> but after the post had been distributed internally.

- 2.60 The response rate of 30% is comparable with other similar consultations. Seven questionnaires, and an ethnicity monitoring form used to write a letter of support, were received without sufficient information to make them uniquely identifiable and therefore could not be analysed.

- 2.61 Of the valid questionnaire responses received, 511 came from residential addresses and 6 from businesses. Eight respondents identified themselves as both a resident and a business, and four did not identify themselves either way.

- 2.62 The results from each road are tabulated at **Table 1** in paragraph 2.79 and discussed in paragraphs 2.77 to 2.81 below.

- 2.63 A total of 511 valid objections to the scheme were also received within the consultation deadline of 15<sup>th</sup> October 2009. Postal objections received on 16<sup>th</sup> October were also accepted on the basis that these may have been received in the post room by the 15<sup>th</sup> October but after the post has been distributed internally.

- 2.64 The postal strike has brought concerns to some people about whether residents were able to respond in time. A recent study by the Office for National Statistics

has shown that 80% of households in Harrow have access to the internet and therefore the vast majority of consultees could have completed the questionnaire or submit an objection in time.

- 2.65 A number of residents chose to deliver responses by hand with some also collecting those of their neighbours or friends who could not. A local shop was also collecting questionnaires and objections for delivery to the council by hand.
- 2.66 Therefore, given the alternative delivery methods available, it is considered reasonable that all consultees had an equal chance of submitting their response or objection on time.
- 2.67 The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 that govern the process of highway authorities making Traffic Orders requires the council to analyse all written statutory objections before deciding to proceed with or abandoning or modifying the provisions of that Order.
- 2.68 A summary of all points raised in the objections is included at **Appendix G** with officers' comments against each point. Further discussion of the objections is included at paragraphs 2.82-2.98.
- 2.69 Before preparation of the consultation leaflet and questionnaire and their distribution, the council met with representatives of the West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) at the group's request. The minutes of these meetings are included at **Appendix H**. The group had requested to have an input into the text of the leaflet. The Corporate Director of Community and Environment decided that this would not be possible, as it would compromise the council's neutrality. However, it was still possible to incorporate some of the group's suggestions by making alterations to wording that did not affect the neutrality of the consultation material.
- 2.70 Some residents commented on the questionnaire in that the "Yes" box and the word "No" were quite close together and that residents may have mistakenly ticked "Yes". As the accepted convention is to read from left to right, it is considered that it is clear which box related to which question and there is no significant risk of misunderstanding.
- 2.71 Nevertheless, if there were any doubts in the mind of the person completing the form beforehand they could have discussed this with officers, as contact details were included within the original consultation leaflet. In addition, officers wrote to residents again reminding them of the contact details for queries or for further information. They could have followed this up if they were in any doubt as to which box to tick.
- 2.72 Had this misunderstanding been widespread, the council would have received many more responses than expected with the "business" box ticked as all three boxes were aligned above each other.
- 2.73 The QA process identified that there were five questionnaires where the comments noted suggested the respondent had mistakenly ticked No.

- 2.74 The QA process further identified that these five responses did not have any significant effect on the consultation outcome.
- 2.75 In any location where an objection had been received that contradicted a questionnaire, both were given equal weighting with neither discounted.
- 2.76 It is not unusual in consultations for two conflicting response to be received from the same household.

## 2.77 General responses

- 2.78 The questionnaire asked all consultees – whether in a proposed CPZ or not – if they supported the revised parking proposals. People were also asked if they had comments about the proposed double yellow lines.
- 2.79 The summary figures for the support for revised parking proposals by proposed zone and by street within each zone are shown in **Table 1** below. The comments on all questionnaires are summarized by street at **Appendix J**.

**Table 1 – Do you support the revised parking proposals in your area?**  
(Broken down by street or part-street within the CPZ and non-CPZ areas;  
RR = Response Rate)

	RR	YES	NO	NO OPINION
<b>Zone V as advertised (Overall)</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Badgers Close	16%	1	7	0
2. Bessborough Road (24-60 evens only, inc. Anthony Court)	5%	1	1	0
3. Butler Avenue	29%	9	11	0
4. Butler Road (2-20 and 9-17) <b>Note 1</b>	21%	1	2	0
5. Vaughan Road (1-85 and 2-98)	27%	22	16	3
<b>Zone W as advertised</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Blenheim Road (evens 124-126)	12%	1	1	0
2. Bouverie Road (28-50 and 41-79)	30%	3	7	1
3. Bowen Road (2-10 evens only)	0%	0	0	0
4. Butler Road (123-175 and 122-172)	44%	9	16	0
5. Drury Road (2-52 and 1-9)	42%	7	6	0
6. Heath Road (all)	57%	5	15	1
7. The Gardens (all) <b>Note 2</b>	81%	45	5	0
8. Vaughan Road (133-189 and 148-222)	41%	15	14	1
9. Wilson Gardens (all)	35%	12	8	0

**Note 1** — two conflicting results (1 Yes, 1 No) received from same property in Butler Road, and included in final totals as they do not materially affect the result.

**Note 2** — two conflicting results (1 Yes, 1 No) received from same property in The Gardens, and included in final totals as they do not materially affect the result.

**Table 1 (continued)**

	RR	YES	NO	NO OPINION
<b>Outside CPZ but within consultation area</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Argyle Road (104-106 evens)	50%	0	1	0
2. Beaumont Avenue (all)	35%	1	6	0
3. Bladon Gardens (all)	0%	0	0	0
4. Blenheim Road (71-141 and 70-124A)	14%	4	6	0
5. Bouverie Road (2-26 and 1-39)	24%	1	7	0
6. Bowen Road (11-109 and 12-46) <b>Note 3</b>	41%	3	20	1
7. Butler Road (19-121 and 12-120)	29%	8	30	1
8. Colbeck Road (all)	37%	1	5	1
9. Dorchester Avenue (all)	17%	4	7	0
10. Drury Road (54-120 and 69-127)	40%	1	24	0
11. Ford Close (all)	17%	3	5	2
12. Grosvenor Avenue (all)	23%	2	13	0
13. Hawkins Close (all)	24%	4	13	0
14. Lance Road (all)	48%	3	12	0
15. Lascelles Avenue (2-52 evens only)	15%	1	2	0
16. Marshall Close (all)	31%	0	8	0
17. Merivale Road (all)	42%	3	19	1
18. North Avenue (all)	52%	0	12	0
19. Pinner Road (253-275A odds only)	0%	0	0	0
20. Sandhurst Avenue (all)	44%	1	6	0
21. Springway (all)	24%	0	4	0
22. Sumner Road (all)	24%	1	10	0
23. Treve Avenue (2-44 evens only)	32%	4	2	1
24. Vaughan Road (87-129 and 100-144)	15%	0	12	1
25. Whitmore Road (2-98 evens only)	20%	1	1	1

**Note 3** – one respondent in Bowen Road (outside CPZ) responded ticking both Yes and No.

The above figures represent the responses received by 15<sup>th</sup> October (or 16<sup>th</sup> October if received by post) and the preparation of this report. Any responses received after this date will be reported at the Panel meeting.

2.80 During the consultation period, a letter was received from the Traffic Management Unit of Metropolitan Police, a statutory consultee. It offered no objection to the proposals; however it did communicate the concern of the local Safer Neighbourhoods Team about the possible reduction in parking.

2.81 It is unusual that the Police's Traffic Management Unit responds to consultations in this manner.

## **2.82 Statutory objections**

2.83 Of the 517 valid objections received, 56 came from Zone V as advertised, 83 from Zone W as advertised, 269 from within the consultation area but from addresses not within either of the two proposed zones, and 109 from outside the consultation area entirely.

2.84 Some 234 of the 517 valid objections received were a short standard objection with the same form of words, or very similar with minor amendments or additional paragraphs.

2.85 The standard wording was:

"I object to both CPZ areas and the proposed excessive double yellow lines in the Village of West Harrow.

"My reason for this objection is that the Schemes do not solve the parking issues in the Village of West Harrow.

"There are better solutions to the parking issues which will not involve payments for permits and fines to the Council."

2.86 In response to this objection, it must be noted that the intention of these proposals was never to solve all parking issues in West Harrow. The purposes of the proposals are two fold:

(1) to provide a permit controlled parking scheme for residents in streets or part streets forming a contiguous Zone where the majority who respond wish to remove all day commuter parking from their street, and

(2) to introduce double yellow line waiting restrictions across the consultation area to deal with potential dangerous and obstructive parking that would inhibit emergency service and refuse collection access, and that might compromise the local road safety and the amenity of vulnerable road users; this is consistent with recently implemented or consulted CPZs across Harrow, and the Highway Code and the Road Traffic Act 1988.

2.87 Any daytime CPZ cannot deal with parking issues in the evening as this depends on how many residents in the area choose to own one or more cars without having off street parking.

2.88 Clearly, with some 40% of daytime parking being attributed to non-resident vehicles, substantial removal of commuter parking would assist significantly in

helping residents find spaces in the evening as commuter vehicles would not be occupying spaces as they would no longer be able to park all day.

- 2.89 Furthermore, although a lot of people suggested that residents' vehicles cause more of a problem than commuters', capacity assessments indicate that even after yellow lines are placed at junctions and pinch points, there should remain more on-street capacity than surveys indicated are needed by residents. This assessment is on the basis of residents parking in an effective, efficient and unselfish manner, sometimes across their own driveway. In addition, the sliding scale of permit charges increasing for each additional vehicle is set to dissuade multiple car ownership and therefore manage residential parking too.
- 2.90 CPZs are funded by Harrow capital and generally it can take between 10 and 15 years for the initial capital cost of a CPZ to be paid off. After that, the law requires that any surplus returned must be re-invested in transport, which Harrow currently chooses to spend on highway improvement schemes and subsidy of Freedom Passes for the over-60s. Furthermore, it is not unfair to charge users for a service that gives them an advantage over other road users, i.e. a commuter, who may feel they have an equal entitlement to the parking space they have been deprived.
- 2.91 In law, nobody has a right to park on public highway; however authorities try to allow as much uncontrolled on-street parking as possible where this is not a nuisance or a hazard.
- 2.92 Regrettably, with a continuing rise in vehicle ownership and factors like children living with parents for longer, more and more people are trying to park vehicles in a finite amount of space. In such cases, people ignore the advice of the Highway Code and park in locations that cause an obstruction, particularly to large vehicles as motorists appear to have difficulty assessing the manoeuvring requirements of a vehicle that is not the size of their own.
- 2.93 Clearly, as obstruction is already a contravention of the Road Traffic Act 1988, enforcement may lead to a reduction in the instances of obstructive parking. Unfortunately, however, councils do not have powers to do this and responsibility lies solely with the Police, whose resources are prioritised to other matters.
- 2.94 This lack of enforcement has compounded the situation by not providing an effective deterrent to obstructive parking. Without fearing the penalty of prosecution for obstruction, motorists have no incentive to make the effort and find more responsible, non-obstructive parking locations.
- 2.95 The provision of waiting restrictions in the locations where parking is obstructive is a simple and effective way of ensuring motorists comply with the provisions of the Highway Code.
- 2.96 Keeping the highway clear of obstruction assists in improving the reliability of refuse collections, improves traffic flow, improves visibility, protects pedestrian crossing points – particularly for those with wheelchairs or prams – and, where a collision history exists, can help reduce the number or severity of personal injury accidents.

2.97 Most importantly, the proposed waiting restrictions are designed to keep access clear for emergency services, in particular the Fire Brigade.

2.98 The proposed waiting restrictions are discussed in more detail in paragraphs 2.110-2.120.

## **2.99 Petitions**

2.100 Two petitions were received in respect of the proposals: one from the Harrow Spiritualist Church in Vaughan Road (8 signatures) and the other from staff at the Harrow Learning Disability Team based at the Vaughan Centre, Wilson Gardens (19 signatures).

2.101 The petition from the church expressed the view that the proposals would limit the ability of churchgoers to attend services, specifically their weekly healing service on Monday mornings between 10am and Noon.

2.102 The petition is attached at **Appendix K**.

2.103 The church requested that the council consider the installation of a Disabled Bay to assist their needs because of the severely restricted parking within their own premises.

2.104 It should be noted that Blue Badge holders can park in permit bays without restriction, and for a period of up to 3 hours on yellow lines if there are no loading restrictions at the time. Nevertheless, the council will undertake to investigate the possibility of incorporating their request and this process will be dealt with in the same manner as Disabled Bays provided for community venues with consultation with local residents.

2.105 In view of the church's petition – and residents' concerns summarised in this report – the proposed "zone time" yellow line in the vicinity of the Church could be amended to Monday-Friday 2-3pm as this will allow some morning parking during the week, and also provide a location for residents to park in the evening and at weekends, blocking their own driveways if they choose to do so.

2.106 The petition from the Harrow Learning Disability Team expressed their concern at not being able to park as a result of the CPZ.

2.107 The petition is attached at **Appendix L**.

2.108 Possible mitigation measures that would assist are being discussed with the Policy & Development Manager for Adults and Housing, who oversees the various satellite facilities that provide services for adults in Harrow, and it is likely that the appropriate solution would be to provide the Vaughan Centre with a limited number of Postcode Permits that allow the bearers to park in the permit bays in Wilson Gardens. If this arrangement can be adopted, the council should strictly manage it to ensure residents are not adversely affected.

2.109 The council has a current Green Travel policy that seeks to reduce the reliance of staff on the use of the private car.



## **2.110 Double yellow line proposals**

2.111 Double yellow line proposals were made for junctions throughout the agreed consultation area for the possible new CPZ. This area covers nearly half of the West Harrow ward. The extents of the proposals coincide 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 ... where the kerb has been lowered ... in front of an entrance to a property ... or on a bend ...”

2.112 A number of objectors argued that the provisions of the Highway Code are largely advisory. It is accepted that this is the case but failure to obey rules in the Highway Code can also be used as evidence in court proceedings to establish liability. Nevertheless, in its role as statutory traffic and highway authority, the council must have regard to such advice and guidance when addressing traffic and parking problems.

2.113 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Highway Code, the obstruction of the Highway is a contravention if the Road Traffic Act 1988, Section 22, but currently only enforceable by Police using their discretionary powers. This type of infringement is not subject to the Police's fixed penalty powers and requires the vehicle's registered keeper to be brought before a Magistrate, and the evidence-gathering to support court action can be onerous. In practice, limited Police resources and other demands on Police time precludes their effective enforcement of obstruction in these situations.

2.114 If yellow line waiting restrictions were in force at locations where parking would cause obstruction, the council's Civil Enforcement Officers would be able to issue a Penalty Charge Notice to the vehicle. The double yellow lines provide a strong reminder to drivers that junctions, bends and pinch points should be kept clear. With the rising ownership of cars, where motorists had previously largely respected the advice of the Highway Code and associated Highway laws, laziness or perceived inconvenience and lack of Police enforcement have lead to more and more people ignoring these very valid rules and considerations.

2.115 With ever increasing car ownership, failure to manage the problems of obstruction would lead to more instances of it occurring.

2.116 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 in deterring obstructive parking 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 or with young children and or pushchairs that the junctions are kept clear of obstructive parking and that 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 they apply equally.

- 2.117 Apart from junctions and sharp bends, double yellow lines were also proposed at locations where the road is exceptionally narrow or across shared accesses. The former applies to North Avenue and the very southern section of Grosvenor Avenue, and the latter applies to Hawkins Close (across the emergency access into Springway) at Bouverie Road (across the access to shared service yards behind the shops on Vaughan Road) and on the unnamed link road between Butler Avenue and Vaughan Road (across the access to private garages). Double yellow lines were also proposed at the ends of cul-de-sacs to allow vehicles to turn around without the need to reverse long distances or drive on or over the footway.
- 2.118 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.
- 2.119 The amount of road space required for an emergency service or refuse collection vehicle is determined by simulating its swept path using industry-standard software. Discussions with the council's refuse collection service determined the size of vehicle to test. In three locations – Bouverie Road, Bowen Road and Vaughan Road – it was possible to reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow lines as shown in the initial consultation. Some people had suggested that smaller vehicles could be used for refuse collection, however it is also the size of fire tenders that need to be considered.
- 2.120 Simulation was also carried out to determine if school coaches could access Wilson Gardens for the purpose of bringing children to and from West Harrow recreation ground. This exercise determined the need for the two lengths of Monday to Friday 8.30am-6.30pm waiting restrictions in Wilson Gardens and Butler Road, the latter allowing coaches to turn around if there is insufficient room to do so within the recreation ground.
- 2.121 Proposed new controlled parking zone (permit parking scheme)**
- 2.122 In June 2009, the Panel recommended that all properties in the initial consultation area would be asked at the statutory consultation stage if they supported the revised proposals. The consultation area and the revised proposals are shown at **Appendix B**.
- 2.123 The responses to this consultation and the objections received indicate that – as could be expected – support for the CPZs has reduced at the periphery of the proposed zones.

- 2.124 In Zone V, a significant cause of concern to residents – in particular those in Butler Avenue – is that there would be limited opportunity to park on Saturdays, as these residents presently park across their driveways or occupy spaces between crossovers that are not long enough to accommodate a permit bay. It is likely that this problem has led to the western portion of Butler Avenue showing strong opposition to the permit scheme and hence the reduction in the recommended extents of Zone V.
- 2.125 Furthermore, support in the eastern part of Butler Avenue for permit parking controls is marginal albeit still in a majority. If Zone V is to be implemented, it is recommended that to provide residents with Saturday parking two long sections of “zone time” yellow line running across driveways are modified to be only in force Monday-Friday 2pm-3pm. However, the permit bays and the other shorter sections of yellow line would remain in force during the overall zone time of Monday-Saturday 10-11am and 2-3pm. The extents and locations of these changes are included in the plans shown at **Appendix M**.
- 2.126 In the same vein, the single yellow line at the south side of Vaughan Road between Nos. 1 and 5 could also be reduced to Monday-Friday 2-3pm for the same reasons, but also to help with the needs of the Harrow Spiritualist Church at No. 1 Vaughan Road whilst still deterring all day commuter parking.
- 2.127 Badgers Close in Zone V previously showed support for parking controls but – possibly in confusion that the controls would apply to private parking bays – support is no longer sufficient to justify its inclusion. Nevertheless, the double yellow lines proposed should be implemented to dissuade obstructive parking, which is often caused by railway contractors.
- 2.128 The surgery at No. 43 Butler Avenue requested inclusion and it is recommended to remain within Zone V so that it can be eligible for two business permits, having communicated in the consultation its present difficulty in doctors on call finding parking during the day whilst having only one off-street parking space within its premises.
- 2.129 Further to the above, the revised recommendations also include a placing a Business Permit Bay outside the surgery to assist in the above, with its hours of operation as Monday-Friday 8.30am-6.30pm and Saturday 8.30am-12.30pm, subject to further consultation with the surgery.
- 2.130 As the surgery would be at the edge of the revised Zone V, there will be uncontrolled on-street parking within the vicinity of the surgery.
- 2.131 In Zone W, support is still strong from residents of The Gardens and Wilson Gardens. Surprisingly, only one business in the parade of shops in Blenheim Road replied to the consultation. This is in spite of the June 2009 petition signed by some of the business owners and their customers requesting Pay & Display parking in order to prevent long-term occupation by all-day commuters. In light of this petition it is recommended that this section of Blenheim Road remain in the scheme.
- 2.132 The consultation results still show strong support for the creation of Zone W as a majority of all affected residences and businesses combined are in favour.

Nevertheless, because of opposition at the periphery, it is recommended to reduce the extent of the proposals in Butler Road, Bouverie Road, Drury Road and Vaughan Road, with the section of Bowen Road originally included now to be removed and the entirety of Heath Road should also be removed from the final scheme.

- 2.133 The proposed recommended reduction in the extent of the scheme in Vaughan Road means the originally proposed shared use pay and display parking outside some of the shops should be removed from the scheme.
- 2.134 The results summarised at **Table 2** below show a majority of respondents in support of the revised CPZ areas from consultees within both those zones.
- 2.135 The results in **Table 2** are calculated by adding to the questionnaire responses the letters of support or objection received from the same area. These additional votes are counted on a one-per-household basis and only if the household did not respond to the questionnaire.

**Table 2 - summary of results within revised CPZ areas**

Zone	Street	Section	Yes	+ Support	Yes + Support	No Opinion	No	+ Objection	No + Objection	Majority	Notes
V	Vaughan Road	1-69; 2-80	21	3	24	2	14	5	19	53%	Includes 24-34 Bessborough Road
V	Butler Avenue	1-11; 43; 2-8	6	0	6	0	2	3	5	55%	Includes 36-60 Bessborough Road
<b>Zone V</b>			<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>54%</b>	
W	The Gardens	all	45	0	45	0	5	0	5	90%	Includes 126-136 Blenheim Road
W	Wilson Gardens	all	12	0	12	0	9	0	9	57%	
W	Butler Road	157-175; 154-172	6	0	6	0	3	2	5	55%	
W	Bouverie Road	55-79; 40-50	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	60%	
W	Vaughan Road	143-189; 158-222	14	0	14	1	12	0	12	52%	
<b>Zone W</b>			<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>70%</b>	
<b>Both Zones</b>			<b>107</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>65%</b>	

**NB:**

Yes / No Opinion / No are households

**+ Support** refers to households who sent in a letter of support without responding via the Questionnaire, and therefore counted as an addition to the Yes vote

**+ Objection** refers to households who objected without responding via the Questionnaire, and therefore counted as an addition to the No vote

The Gardens includes results from one property that voted twice, once in favour and once against

Copies of objection and support letters are available in the Members' Library for inspection by Councillors

- 2.136 Many respondents from Wilson Gardens expressed their concern at the layout of the parking bays and yellow lines in the western cul-de-sac of that street. In light of these comments, it is recommended to revise the arrangements here which would create more parking, albeit this would mean a present access difficulty would continue where it would have been solved with the previously designed layout.
- 2.137 A handful of respondents not originally included in the advertised zone expressed disappointment and objection to not having a permit parking scheme for their road. However, it is not possible to include isolated sections and therefore these residents unfortunately cannot be included.
- 2.138 Nevertheless, if the recommended proposals are implemented, the council will, subject to funding being available, consider requests for extensions or modification to the zones after 6-12 months have elapsed after they have come into effect.

### **2.139 Pay and Display Parking**

- 2.140 The consulted proposals incorporated pay and display facilities to assist local businesses. These were located at:-
- Blenheim Road outside the shops/businesses/offices
  - Vaughan Road outside the shops between No 130 and No 152
  - The Gardens near its junction with Blenheim Road
  - The unnamed link road between Butler Avenue and Vaughan Road
- 2.141 These bays are located in areas that appear to suffer from commuter parking but where a level of non-resident parking is needed during the day to support the businesses or to facilitate access to local services.
- 2.142 The original Panel recommendations of 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009 included shared-use pay and display parking bays in Bouverie Road, but concerns about loss of resident parking have been taken into account and these bays were not advertised. Further surveys are needed to determine if sufficient capacity is available to include all-day pay and display in the location recommended without detriment to residents before this recommendation could be implemented, and therefore it was not practical to advertise these bays at this stage.
- 2.143 The reduction in the recommended extents of Zone W means that the proposed shared-use pay and display bays outside the shops of Vaughan Road would not be implemented.
- 2.144 The reduction in the recommended extents of Zone V means that the proposed shared-use pay and display bays in the link road between Butler Avenue and Vaughan Road would now be at the very periphery of that zone. In light of people's concerns that permit holders would occupy those bays all day long and therefore prevent their intended use for surgery patients, the recommendations include the modification of these bays to be for Business Permit Holder and Pay

and Display use only, with a maximum stay of four hours for Pay and Display. To facilitate their use by residents when demand for the surgery would be less, the hours of operation are recommended to be reduced from Monday – Saturday 8am-6.30pm to Monday – Friday 9.30am-5.30pm and Saturday 9.30am-1.30pm.

- 2.145 The intention of these bays being available for Business Permit use is bearing in mind that the surgery would be – as a business – eligible for two Business Permits and therefore permitting one vehicle to enjoy a parking location close to the surgery, in addition to the single Business Permit Bay outside its frontage.

#### **2.146 Loading Bay Provision**

- 2.147 In addition to the loading bay associated with the platform and loading restrictions 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.

All loading bays are proposed to be in operation Monday to Saturday 8am-6.30pm and are required to ensure loading can take place from kerbside rather than in the main carriageway if all kerb space is taken up by parked vehicles. Clearly it is preferential to have delivery activities taking place in locations that are not prejudicial to traffic flow and road safety

- 2.148 A resident expressed their dissatisfaction at the location of the loading bay in Colbeck Road. However, its location is designed to provide the nearest possible access for wheelchair patients arriving or being collected by ambulance.
- 2.149 A resident in Vaughan Road could not understand why a loading bay was required there, just to the east of its junction with Wilson Gardens. However, the loading and stopping restrictions at that location prevent kerb-side loading for a number of houses, and therefore this loading bay is proposed as a compensatory measure.

#### **2.150 Summary of changes to advertised proposals**

- 2.151 Taking into account all comments received, and as discussed in the report and the appendices, the recommended changes to the advertised proposals that should be incorporated in the final scheme are:
1. Reducing the extents of the proposed Zone V and Zone W permit parking schemes (CPZs), with deletion of permit bays, single yellow lines and pay and display parking in the areas removed and amending the schedule of permit eligible addresses accordingly.
  2. Making the Pay & Display bays in the unnamed link road between Butler Avenue and Vaughan Road only available for Pay & Display parking or Business Permit use, albeit with reduced hours of operations to impact less on residents.

3. Reducing the hours of operation of some sections of single yellow line in Zone V to be in force Monday-Friday 2pm-3pm to enable some residents to park across their own drive where there are limited numbers of permit bays proposed.
  4. In the western cul-de-sac of Wilson Gardens, reconfiguring the bay layout and extents of double yellow lines.
  5. In Wilson Gardens, deleting part of a permit bay and replacing it with single yellow line Monday-Friday 10am-11am across an access that had been mistakenly omitted from the initial ground survey.
  6. Retaining the existing Monday-Saturday 8am-6.30pm waiting restriction (single yellow line) to act as a passing place outside Nos. 30 and 32 The Gardens, as requested in writing by the affected frontages and other residents in the street.
  7. Reconfiguring the yellow lines on North Avenue and Merivale Road to take into account residents' comments.
- 2.152 Based upon the revised proposals, a revised parking assessment was carried out which demonstrates a surplus of available overnight off-street parking and is attached at **Appendix N**.

### **2.153 Review process**

- 2.154 In line with agreed procedure, all new or revised CPZs schemes include provision for review within 6-12 months of implementation to give residents an opportunity to request for changes or extensions to the zones or associated parking restrictions.
- 2.155 The purpose of these early CPZ reviews is to identify any fairly immediate issues or concerns following implementation, rather than the previous approach of waiting 2-3 years, or even longer in some cases. These early reviews will take into account feedback from residents, businesses and ward councillors, but will not involve widespread re-consultation. They are intended to deal with minor localised issues that can be dealt fairly easily and quickly, such as small changes to the extent of yellow lines, modifications to bay layouts etc., and in some cases requests for small areas to be added to the CPZ.
- 2.156 Reviewing the operational time of the restrictions of a CPZ is a much more fundamental issue and the process for doing so is essentially the same as introducing the CPZ in the first place.
- 2.157 The outcome of consultation is normally reported to the Panel for recommendation to the Portfolio Holder which, if agreed, would then proceed to statutory consultation. The results of the statutory consultation would be reported to the subsequent meeting of TARSAP. For a scheme included in the approved programme, the minimum timescale for consultation and implementation is about 12 months. No budget is currently allocated for this review, but the February 2010 TARSAP meeting will consider the CPZ programme for 2010/11 and allocation of Harrow Capital funding to schemes according to a priority of need.



## **2.158 Quality Assurance**

2.159 EnterpriseMouchel has independently checked the recording, interpretation, analysis and presentation of the consultation results and statutory objections contained in this report and its appendices for compliance with the Quality Assurance procedures for consultation. The QA procedure compliance certificate is attached at **Appendix P**.

## **2.160 Financial Implications**

2.161 A sum of £50,000 was made 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 has been made available in the same financial year for the cost of implementing the scheme and informing residents of the outcome of consultation. This sum will be sufficient to cover the costs anticipated, and the works will be completed on site by the end of March 2010.

2.162 The amount has been increased due to the unprecedented workload that the scheme has generated. This has resulted in the removal or amendment of other programmed CPZs and parking reviews.

2.163 There is no funding currently allocated for carrying out the recommended 6-12 month review; however this will be reported to the February 2010 meeting of the Panel when the annual review is considered and Harrow Capital funding for CPZs is known.

## **2.164 Legal Implications**

2.165 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions, and designated paying parking places, can be implemented by making a Traffic Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

2.166 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

## **2.167 Performance Issues**

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

2.169 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).

2.170 The provision of CPZs meets the following priorities in the 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

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

Deliver cleaner and safer streets  
Build stronger communities

**2.172 Environmental Impact**

2.173 There is no environmental legislation or requirements for formal Environmental Impact Assessment that 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 CPZs 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.

**2.174 Equalities Impact**

2.175 CPZ schemes were included in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was approved by full Council. The LIP was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where schemes were identified as having no negative impact on any equality groups. In addition, all CPZs have a positive impact on those with mobility difficulties as more spaces are identified for disabled parking. As a result of yellow lines at junctions, there is also increased protection at junctions which will protect dropped crossing and prevent dangerous parking at these locations and thereby further assist those with mobility difficulties.

**2.176 Risk Management Implications**

2.177 This project is not included on the Directorate Risk Register

2.178 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: <b>Narinderpal Heer</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: <b>18 November 2009</b>		

  

Signature:		
Name: <b>Rachel Jones</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: <b>18 November 2009</b>		

### Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Signature		
Name: <b>Anu Singh</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)
Date: <b>10 November 2009</b>		

### Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Signature		
Name: <b>Andrew Baker</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: <b>18 November 2009</b>		

**Contact:** Andrew Saffrey  
Project Engineer – Parking & Sustainable Transport  
Tel. No: 020 8424 1988 (ext. 2988)

### **Background Papers:**

1. Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel – 26<sup>th</sup> February 2008
  - Agenda Item 9 – Controlled parking zones / parking schemes – Annual review (2008)
2. Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel – 11<sup>th</sup> February 2009
  - Agenda Item 9 – Controlled parking zones / parking schemes – Annual review (2009)
2. Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel – 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009
  - Reports and minutes
3. Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel – 15<sup>th</sup> September 2009
  - Agenda Item 7 – Petitions
4. Pro- and Anti-CPZ campaign material
5. Consultation responses

6. Harrow Council Local Implementation Plan
7. Mayor's Transport Strategy
8. Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996
9. Governance, Audit and Risk Management Committee – 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2009
  - Agenda, Report and Minutes

**IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?**

1.	Consultation	YES/ <del>NO</del>
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / <del>NO</del>