



TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

**WEDNESDAY 17 JUNE 2009
7.30 PM**

PANEL AGENDA (ADVISORY)

**COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 & 2,
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE**

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor John Nickolay

Councillors:

**Manji Kara
Ashok Kulkarni
Julia Merison
Yogesh Teli
Jeremy Zeid**

**Mrinal Choudhury
Nizam Ismail
Jerry Miles
David Perry**

Advisers: To be confirmed

Reserve Members:

1. G Chowdhury
2. Paul Osborn
3. Mrs Vina Mithani
4. Husain Akhtar
5. Susan Hall

1. Bob Currie
2. Graham Henson
3. Raj Ray
4. Keith Ferry

**Issued by the Democratic Services Section,
Legal and Governance Services Department**

**Contact: Lysandra Dwyer, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1264 E-mail: lysandra.dwyer@harrow.gov.uk**

***NOTE FOR THOSE ATTENDING THE MEETING:
IF YOU WISH TO DISPOSE OF THIS AGENDA, PLEASE LEAVE IT BEHIND AFTER THE MEETING.
IT WILL BE COLLECTED FOR RECYCLING.***

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

Section 1- Summary

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

FOR INFORMATION

2.14. Lake View Edgware

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

2.16. The petition states:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.26 High Street Edgware

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

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