

**REPORT FOR: Traffic And Road Safety  
Advisory Panel**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> September 2010
<b>Subject:</b>	Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone Results of Statutory Consultation
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Brendon Hills - Corporate Director Community and Environment
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Phillip O'Dell - Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> Statutory consultation plans <b>Appendix B</b> Sample consultation documents <b>Appendix C</b> Summary of statutory objections with officers' response <b>Appendix D</b> Analysis of the consultation responses <b>Appendix E</b> Summary of consultation comments with officers' comments <b>Appendix F</b> Petition from residents of Orchard Grove area

### **Appendix G**

Copy of information down loaded from Bacon Lane Surgery's web site

### **Appendix H**

Representation from patients of Bacon Lane Surgery

### **Appendix J**

Scheme plans recommended for implementation

### **Appendix K**

Equality Monitoring results

## **Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

This document reports the results of the formal statutory consultation on the proposed new controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the Burnt Oak Broadway area, associated parking restrictions at junctions and bends, and proposed one way traffic for Park Way. This document also seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to implement the proposals, subject to modifications as a result of statutory consultation with the affected residents and businesses explained in this report.

### **Recommendations:**

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

- (a) that a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Zone X be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in Appendix J, with operational hours of Monday-Friday 10am-11am and 2pm-3pm and that residents and businesses within the new CPZ be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
- (b) that short term pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of 2 hours with no return within 4 hours be provided in Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as shown in Appendix J;
- (c) that short term shared pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of 2 hours with no return within 4 hours be provided in Bacon Lane and Vancouver Road as shown in Appendix J;
- (d) that long term shared pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of 4 hours with no return within 5 hours be provided in Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue,

The Chase and Northholme Gardens and Vancouver Road as shown in Appendix J;

- (e) That charges for the pay and display bays listed at (b), (c) and (d) above to be 50 pence per half hour, or part half hour;
- (f) that loading bays, to enable delivery vehicles to service local businesses at no charge, be introduced in Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as shown in Appendix J;
- (g) that one-way traffic be introduced in Park Way as shown in Appendix J;
- (h) that single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm be introduced in sections of Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, Park Way, The Chase and Stag Lane as shown in Appendix J;
- (i) that double yellow lines, no waiting at “anytime,” be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in Appendix J;
- (j) that loading restrictions at “anytime” be introduced at junctions and pinch points shown in Appendix J;
- (k) that proposed double yellow lines across the entrances to rear garages of No. 105 The Chase and No 2 Northholme Gardens as shown in Appendix A be amended to single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm;
- (l) that the pay and display bays in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be amended to accommodate a street trader’s pitch to be provided outside No 67 Burnt Oak Broadway;
- (m) that the pay and display bays outside Nos.97 and 99 Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be amended to accommodate the relocated informal pedestrian crossing;
- (n) that the two proposed loading bays in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be relocated to better serve businesses following their detailed comments;
- (o) that the proposed pay and display parking bays in the unnamed access road between 197 and 199 Burnt Oak Broadway as shown in Appendix A be removed and replaced by double yellow lines to facilitate access for large commercial vehicles;
- (p) that objections to the proposals at Appendix C be set aside excepting those objections accommodated by the revised proposals listed at (l), (m), (n) and (o) above, and that each objector is written to with details of how to obtain a copy of this report;
- (q) That officers be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown at Appendix J, subject to all recommendations of the Panel;
- (r) That all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of this decision; and

- (s) that after a period of 6-12 months from the implementation of the scheme a review be carried out, as detailed in the report, subject to the availability of funding and recommendation of the February 2011 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting.

**REASON:** To control parking in the Burnt Oak Broadway area as detailed in the report.

## **SECTION 2 – REPORT**

### **Background**

- 2.1 Burnt Oak Broadway has experienced worsening parking problems in recent years. Following a proposal from Barnet Council to introduce a parking scheme on their side of the A5, Harrow Council brought forward a planned parking review for the Harrow side of Burnt Oak Broadway area.

### **Public consultation**

- 2.2 Following a stakeholders meeting held on 11th September 2008, a public consultation was carried out in April 2009 to cover an area between Stag Lane and Bacon Lane and between Burnt Oak Broadway and Broomgrove Gardens. The result of this consultation was reported to the Panel meeting of 17 June 2009, which recommended that the revised proposals should go forward to statutory consultation.

### **Statutory Consultation**

- 2.3 All Councillors in the affected wards were sent the consultation materials prior to distribution.
- 2.4 A number of statutory consultees such as the Police and the Fire Brigade including Highway departments for the adjoining Borough Councils of Barnet and Brent were consulted as part of the statutory requirements.
- 2.5 Statutory consultation was carried out for 21 days from 17 June to 7 July 2010.
- 2.6 Street notices were erected on lamp columns throughout the area giving information as to where details of the proposals could be viewed, and the process to make a formal objection during the statutory period.
- 2.7 Traffic orders were advertised in the Harrow Times newspaper on 17th June 2010 and this information was also available on the council's web site at [www.harrow.gov.uk/burntoak](http://www.harrow.gov.uk/burntoak)
- 2.8 To coincide with the statutory consultation, residents and businesses within the original consultation area were informed by leaflet of the revision to the proposals originally consulted on in April 2009.

## Statutory Consultation Documents

- 2.9 The leaflet sets out background information, details of the revised proposals, where to obtain further information and the statutory (legal) consultation process necessary to implement the proposals. An A3 plan showing the detailed proposals relating to the individual's address was also provided. Information on how to obtain plans of other roads within the consultation area was also given. A key plan together with the five detailed plans can be seen in **Appendix A**.
- 2.10 The consultation document also incorporated a questionnaire which included a simple 'yes or no' question: "Do you support the revised parking proposals in your part of the road?" This was included so that everyone consulted both inside and outside the proposed CPZ area could indicate their support or opposition to the proposals. The questionnaire also gives the opportunity for people to change their minds and comment on the revised proposals. This information is used for the Council to take a balanced view when considering objections and petitions in order to revise the proposals to best fit and tailor the extents of the CPZs. A prepaid envelope was also supplied with the consultation documents for people to return the completed questionnaire.
- 2.11 All businesses and residents were provided with the same general information. 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. In addition residents and businesses had the opportunity to complete their questionnaire online.
- 2.12 Consultation documents were distributed to addresses between 15th and 17th June 2010 to coincide with the start of the statutory objection period. A sample of the consultation documents is at **Appendix B**.
- 2.13 As a result of the statutory consultation, 19 objections were received as well as 286 questionnaire responses, 1 petition and also copies of 94 pro-forma letters from patients of the Bacon Lane surgery, which did not meet the statutory consultation requirements.

## Statutory Objections

- 2.14 A total of 19 statutory objections were received all within the statutory objection period:
- 10 from residents within the proposed CPZ
  - 4 from businesses within the proposed CPZ
  - 4 from residents within the consultation area but outside the proposed CPZ
  - 1 from a resident outside the consultation area.
- 2.15 A summary of statutory objections with officers' comments can be seen at **Appendix C**.
- 2.16 No objections were received from statutory consultees such as the Police and Emergency services. However, we are aware that the Fire Brigade have visited the area and are supportive of the scheme proposals. Barnet and

Brent were consulted on the scheme proposals and no comments were received.

### Questionnaire Responses

- 2.17 286 questionnaire responses were received, 12 of which contained objections and were therefore taken as statutory objections. Another 7 written objections were received giving a total response of 293. This represented an overall response rate of 22% which is considered average when compared with other similar consultations. The highest response rate of 46% was from The Chase.
- 2.18 Two roads within the proposed CPZ, Columbia Avenue and Stag Lane, provided less than 10% response returns, whilst no responses were received from Berridge Green, Camrose Avenue and Penylan Place. In accordance with our Quality Assurance procedure we draw this to the Panel's attention. However, analysis suggests that this does not invalidate the consultation or the subsequent recommendations and the reasons are given below.
- 2.19 Berridge Green and Penylan Place have been included to be eligible for parking permits since access to the rear of these properties is affected by the proposals, however, no parking controls are planned for these two roads and therefore the zero response rates is understandable.
- 2.20 Similarly the rear of Nos. 75-87 Camrose Avenue is affected by the proposals in Bacon Lane, but these properties already have existing parking controls to their frontages and likely to use the parking spaces to the rear of their properties in Bacon Lane. In addition, double yellow lines are proposed to the frontages of Nos. 82 -92 Camrose Avenue, in order to control parking in front of the Krishna – Avanti School, hence these properties were also included in the statutory consultation.
- 2.21 The low response rate for Columbia Avenue could be due to the fact no responses were received from Mayna Court which contains 20 flats with their own off street parking. It is possible that they considered they were not affected by the proposals. Whilst Stag Lane is a boundary road and it is not possible to provide permit bays in this road other than providing a single yellow line which had been requested at the stakeholders meeting. The issues raised concerning Columbia Avenue and Stag Lane are discussed in detail later in this report.
- 2.22 Two responses were void due to no name and address being supplied, whilst duplicate responses from two households and one business were considered as one from each property. Ten of the responses were completed via Harrow's website [www.harrow.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.harrow.gov.uk/consultations).
- 2.23 The analysis of the results of the consultation responses on a street by street basis together with their response rate can be seen in **Appendix D** and are tabulated in two tables as follows:

**Table 1** shows 161 responses from roads within the proposed CPZ  
**Table 2** shows 122 responses from roads outside the proposed CPZ.

- 2.24 5 responses were received from roads outside the consultation area and are Listed in **Table 3, Appendix D**:
- one a statutory objection to the proposals in Bacon Lane
  - two in support of the proposals for Bacon Lane
  - one response indicating they had concerns how the proposals would affect the Bacon lane surgery
  - one an incomplete return.

- 2.25 A Summary of consultation responses with officers' responses can be seen at **Appendix E**.

### **Petition**

- 2.26 One petition containing 32 signatures representing 28 households was received; the majority of signatures were from residents in Orchard Close. A copy of the petition can be seen at **Appendix F**.

### **Representation from Patients of Bacon Lane Surgery**

- 2.27 94 copies of pro-forma letters were received under cover of a letter from the Bacon Lane surgery requesting that these letters be considered as formal objections to the proposals in Bacon Lane. Five of these letters were duplicates and on two the signatures and lack of address meant they were unidentifiable and therefore could not be considered.
- 2.28 Fifty two of the pro-forma letters representing thirty four households had previously been received and were responded to in May 2010 before the statutory consultation was carried out. The remainder were downloaded from the surgery's website/or provided by the surgery and were associated with information provided by the surgery again prior to statutory consultation. A copy of the information and the pro-forma downloaded from the surgery's website on 1st August 2010 is at **Appendix G**.
- 2.29 All the names and addresses on the pro-forma letter together with the surgery were informed that unfortunately these letters did not meet the strict criteria for making a statutory objection. In addition, the surgery was informed that we could not accept their request that we consider the surgery's formal statutory objection as being on the behalf of their 9,600 patients. However we did inform all parties that their comments would be taken into consideration. Representation from patients of the Bacon Lane surgery, together with officers' comments is at **Appendix H**.
- 2.30 Copies of all statutory objections, consultation responses, petition and representations from patients of Bacon Lane Surgery have been placed in The Members library for inspection.

### **Consideration of statutory objections**

- 2.31 A summary of statutory objections with officers' responses can be seen at **Appendix C**.

2.32 Three statutory objections concerning the following issues have been considered and proposals have been amended to meet the wishes of the objectors:-

- the proposed double yellow lines across the garage entrance in The Chase;
- the proposed pay and display parking bays in the unnamed access road between Nos. 297 and 299 Burnt Oak Broadway; and
- provision of a street trader's pitch in Burnt Oak Broadway.

2.33 It is therefore recommended that the above three statutory objections have been satisfactorily resolved for the reasons given in **Appendix C**.

2.34 The remaining 16 statutory objections are from the following areas:

- 9 within the proposed CPZ area
- 3 from outside the CPZ area
- 1 from outside the consultation area.

Each element of the statutory objections together with the officers' detailed response is listed at **Appendix C**. After consideration of these objections it is recommended that individual objections are to be set aside for the reasons given or that the objections have been upheld due to modifications of the proposals. These are shown in detail at **Appendix C**

#### **Analysis of roads proposed to be included in the CPZ**

2.35 **Table 1, Appendix D** indicates that there is support for the proposals in the following roads or part roads as detailed:-

- Argyll Gardens
- Bacon Lane
- Columbia Avenue
- Gordon Gardens
- Kenmore Gardens;
- Northolme Gardens
- Oakleigh Avenue - between Burnt Oak Broadway and The Chase
- Strathmore Gardens
- The Chase - between Bacon Lane and Columbia Avenue
- Vancouver Road

The statutory objections and comments either in support or against the CPZ proposals for the above roads are discussed in more detail below:

#### **Bacon Lane**

2.36 The response for this road is 17 in support and 2 against the proposals. Two statutory objections apply to this road, one from Bacon Lane Surgery and one from a patient of the surgery. Both objections to the proposals state that the proposals would be detrimental to the running of the surgery and that patients would have to pay for parking. The objection from the surgery also requests that the CPZ controlled hours should be during the lunch hour when clinical staff make their home visits and be less disruptive to the operation of the surgery. However, it should be noted that this suggestion would be of no



benefit to the patients attending this surgery because parking spaces in the surrounding roads within the CPZ are likely to be taken by individuals who work or visit the local area for either morning or afternoon periods.

- 2.37 Representations from patients (see paragraph 2.26 above) express concerns regarding provision for parking for staff and customers, the cost of parking and issues concerned with patients incurring possible penalty charge notices for overstaying the pay and display meter charges due to appointments being delayed. Resident comments which support the proposals note that their road has been taken over by the businesses operating in the area and that their driveway is frequently blocked.
- 2.38 Patients and doctors have acknowledged that there are current parking problems in the immediate area to the surgery and welcomed the council's parking review of this area. The proposals will provide approximately 40 parking spaces adjacent to the surgery, albeit those patients will have to pay.

### **The Chase**

- 2.39 Four residents have made statutory objections to the proposals. Three base their objections on the view that parking problems are caused by businesses operating in or off Bacon Lane, and as residents who pay council and road taxes they should not incur additional charges for permits to park outside their houses. The remaining resident's objection has been resolved by amending the parking proposal (see paragraph 2.31 above). The majority of the comments from those who did not support the proposals from this road are similar to those residents who objected, stating that the parking would be made difficult for their visitors and the proposals would reduce the number of available parking spaces.

### **Northolme Gardens**

- 2.40 One resident has objected to the proposal in Northolme Gardens. This objection is similar to those from The Chase stating that the first permit should be free.

### **Vancouver Road**

- 2.41 Three residents have objected to the proposal in Vancouver Road. Comments from residents who do not support the proposal range from the view that the proposal will inconvenience their visitors, that residents and their visitors will not be able to park across driveways and that residents should not have to pay for permits. Comments from residents who support the proposal are similar to those for Bacon Lane.

### **Oakleigh Avenue**

- 2.42 One resident from Oakleigh Avenue has objected on the basis that they consider there are no parking problems in this road. A comment from a resident who does not support the proposal is that a CPZ will inconvenience visitors and those residents and their visitors will be unable to park across driveways. Comments from those who support the proposal state that driveways are often obstructed.

- 2.43 It can be seen in **Table 1** at **Appendix D** that responses from two roads Columbia Avenue and Park Way indicate no overall support for or against the proposals.

### **Columbia Avenue**

- 2.44 One business in Columbia Avenue has objected to the CPZ proposal. This objection is similar to that of Bacon Lane in that they consider staff and visitors will have nowhere to park unless they pay which will have a detrimental effect on their business. Other issues raised concern the proposed operational hours of the single yellow lines and pay and display bays, which are discussed later in this report.

### **Park Way**

- 2.45 The comment from a business in Park Way is that a CPZ will be detrimental to businesses. Other issues of parking restrictions and proposed one-way traffic are discussed later in this report.

- 2.46 It can be seen in the **Table 1** at **Appendix D** that responses from two roads Burnt Oak Broadway and Stag Lane within the CPZ indicate no support for the proposals.

### **Burnt Oak Broadway**

- 2.47 Three objections were received from this road. The proposals have been amended to address the issues raised in two of the objections as noted in paragraph 2.31 above. Therefore the proposed amendment to the proposals should change the support from 9 to 11 against, to 11 to 9 in support for the proposal in this road.
- 2.48 The majority of comments from people not in support of the proposals for Burnt Oak Broadway raise a number of issues, the most frequent being that a CPZ will affect businesses by loss of customers who will not be able to park, and a request for more parking spaces. Other issues regarding pay and display bays and loading bays are discussed later in this report.

### **Stag Lane**

- 2.49 Properties between Nos. 2 and 26 are eligible for permits if the scheme proceeds, however, there is no available space to provide permit only parking bays in this section of the road due to positioning and numbers of dropped kerbs. At the initial stage of the consultation, residents from this section of the road complained about obstructive parking to driveways by people going to the bank and shops in Burnt Oak Broadway. In order to deal with this problem, a single yellow line with operational hours of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturdays has been proposed.
- 2.50 With only one response to the questionnaire from this section of the road, it is difficult to gauge what is the majority support for the proposal. On balance, since there is a parking problem for residents in this section of the road it is suggested that it would be better to implement the proposed yellow line to deal with the obstructive parking. Parking for residents is available off street via a lane to the rear of these properties, or alternatively they could

park in a permit-only parking bay by purchasing a residents permit, albeit that these bays would be some distance from their properties.

### **Analysis of roads outside the proposed CPZ but within the consultation area**

- 2.51 Responses for this area are at **Table 2, Appendix D**. Some of the responses from this area given to Question 2 - "Do you support the revised parking proposal in your part of the road?" do not always agree with the comments given for clarification of their support or not. For example, some responses indicated no support the proposals in a road since they did not wish to pay for parking permits. However, in reality responses from these roads are outside the revised proposed CPZ and therefore such comments do not apply.
- 2.52 The following roads, within the original public consultation but outside the proposed CPZ, showed majority support for the proposals:
- Axholme Avenue
  - Briary Grove
  - Broomgrove Gardens
  - Greencourt Avenue.
- 2.53 Responses from the following roads within the original public consultation but outside the proposed CPZ demonstrated a majority for their road against the proposal:
- Oakleigh Avenue (between The Chase and Broomgrove Gardens)
  - Orchard Grove
  - The Chase (between Oakleigh Avenue and Columbia Avenue)
- 2.54 There are 4 statutory objections to the proposals from this area; 2 from Oakleigh Avenue and 1 each from Orchard Grove and Broomgrove Gardens.
- 2.55 The majority of the statutory objections and responses relating to this area raise concerns that residents did not want a CPZ since they consider there are no parking problems in this area, whilst others argue that the parking problems are caused by local businesses in Bacon Lane and that the proposed CPZ will displace the parking problem into those roads outside the proposed Zone.
- 2.56 Similarly a petition, containing 32 signatures representing 28 properties, mainly from residents in Orchard Grove, are strongly opposed to the proposed CPZ in the Bacon Lane area which they consider will make parking worse in their area. A copy of the petition can be seen at **Appendix F**.
- 2.57 There is always the likelihood that parking could be displaced into roads immediately outside the CPZ. However, residents within the proposed CPZ clearly show that they support the proposals.
- 2.58 A separate issue regarding parking problems in Broomgrove Gardens caused by parents and staff of the Krishna – Avanti School was also noted in several responses and this has been addressed with the school separately.

- 2.59 An undertaking has been given, subject to the Panel's agreement to be requested in February 2011, that within 6 to 12 months after the implementation of the agreed proposals a review of roads affected by the proposals would be carried out. This review would also incorporate any parking issues raised by residents related to the Krishna- Avanti School due to the year on year increase as the school expands to its full capacity. There is separate Section 106 funding available to deal with parking around the school.

### **Responses from roads outside the consultation area**

- 2.60 Five responses including a statutory objection were received from the following roads outside the consultation area, related mainly to issues concerning parking proposals in Bacon Lane in respect of the doctors surgery and are shown in **Table 3, Appendix D**:
- Dale Avenue
  - Hogarth Road
  - Glengall Road
  - London Road
  - Roch Avenue.
- 2.61 Two responses supported the proposal, one response against the proposal is a statutory objection, whilst one letter from the chairman of the Bacon Lane Surgery Patients Group listed various concerns how the proposals would affect the running of the surgery. The remaining response did not fully complete the questionnaire and is therefore not categorised as a statutory objection.

### **Summary of objections and responses to the proposed CPZ**

- 2.62 Notwithstanding the objections to the proposed CPZ, there is general support to implement the proposals as advertised. The two main issues not in support are; the proposed operational hours not being convenient for some businesses, whilst some residents want the parking issues in the area resolved but consider they should not have to pay for themselves or their visitors to park in their road.
- 2.63 The officers' response to the objections and comments to the responses are shown at **Appendix C and E**.
- 2.64 Having considered the objections and comments it is recommended that the proposed CPZ be implemented as shown at **Appendix J** for the benefit of the majority of residents within the proposed CPZ.
- 2.65 Other issues raised specific to the overall proposal are listed below:

### **Double yellow lines at Junction, bend and pinch points**

- 2.66 An analysis of all the comments made regarding the proposals for double yellow lines showed that 50 people supported these whilst 19 did not. Reasons given for not supporting the double yellow lines are: -

- 5 considered that there is no parking problem and therefore no need to implement double yellow lines,
- 2 stated they could not see the purpose of the double yellow line. The remainder gave no reason for not supporting double yellow lines.

Seven responses have commented that the double yellow lines should be extended or that the proposed single yellow line be replaced by a double yellow line in various locations, typically across driveways or at junctions outside the consultation area.

Requests for additional waiting restrictions cannot be considered at this time since a new traffic order would have to be advertised which would delay the proposals being implemented. However, these requests will be considered when the next Burnt Oak Broadway parking review is carried out.

- 2.67 Whilst a minority of responses do not support implementation of double yellow lines at junctions, sharp bends and pinch points, it is recommended that the double yellow lines are implemented as shown at **Appendix J** for the well-established principles contained in the Highway Code.

### **Pay and display bays (general)**

- 2.68 An analysis of the most frequent comments made regarding the pay and display bays including long and short term shared use pay and display parking bays are listed below:
- 8 responses did not support the introduction of pay and display bays
  - 5 responses requested that the operational hours be changed to suit residents/traders
  - 3 responses considered that the charge of 50 pence per half hour or part half hour was excessive
  - 6 responses stated that they supported the proposals.
- 2.69 4 responses including 2 objections related to the proposed pay and display bays in Burnt Oak Broadway service road. The main objections and comments raised related to the charge of 50 pence per half hour or part half hour as too expensive and requesting various changes to operational hours to suit requests of businesses and from residents in flats above the shops.
- 2.70 It should be noted that in the location where it is proposed to introduce the pay and display bays, on the south-west side of the service road, the existing waiting restrictions are 8.00 - 9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm Monday to Friday inclusive (peak hour to allow for deliveries). The proposed operational hours for the proposed pay and display bays are 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive.

### **Pay and display bays and complementary single yellow line in Columbia Avenue**

- 2.71 The statutory objection for this road refers to the long term shared use pay and display parking bays and to the extent of the single yellow line, both with the operational hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive. The objector considers that staff and visitors will have nowhere to park unless they pay, which will have a detrimental effect on their business. The

objector also objects to the extent of the double yellow lines in Columbia Avenue.

- 2.72 The proposed long term shared use pay and display bays are considered necessary to provide parking for residents in the immediate area and for visitors to the local business. The proposed single yellow line, opposite the parking bays, needs to have the same operational hours as the parking bays in order to protect the entrance to the small industrial estate, Mill Works, and protect frontages from obstructive parking.
- 2.73 The double yellow lines to the entrance to the Mill Works are necessary to provide access for the large articulated lorries which service the industrial units.
- 2.74 Whilst charging for parking is never popular with the public, having considered the objections and responses regarding the introduction of the short term pay and display and long and short term shared use pay and display parking bays, it is recommended that these bays are implemented as shown at **Appendix J** to provide positive parking facilities for visitors to shops and businesses in the area.

### **Loading Bays**

- 2.75 Single loading bays are proposed in Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands and two in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road to facilitate deliveries to the local shops.
- 2.76 There are 4 responses regarding the loading bays including one objection raised, namely:
- Not needed
  - Considered that the proposed loading bay in The Highlands will obstruct free flow due to narrow width of road
  - Request that the two loading bays in Burnt Oak Broadway be relocated to better serve local shops and businesses
- 2.77 A revised location of the loading bays in Burnt Oak Broadway service road has been considered and proposed, however, it is not possible to fully meet the business's expectations.
- 2.78 Having considered the objections and comments regarding the loading bay proposal as shown in **Appendix C and E**, it is recommended that Loading Bays as shown at **Appendix J** be implemented to facilitate deliveries and to support local businesses.

### **One way traffic in Park Way**

- 2.79 The proposals for this road include:
- Creating a one-way traffic system with direction of flow from The Highland towards Oakleigh Avenue and from The Highlands towards Stag Lane
  - A single yellow line on the south-west side of Park Way with prohibited parking during the hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive

- Double yellow lines at junctions and pinch points, adjacent to the church
  - Introduction of proposed No Loading restrictions on the north-east side of Park Way.
- 2.80 From an analysis of all the responses regarding the one-way traffic in Park Way, 8 responses, including 1 objection, were as follows:
- 4 responses - Support the proposal
  - 2 responses - Do not support the proposal
  - 2 responses - Made other comments.
- 2.81 Other comments that were raised were a request for the one-way proposal to operate in the reverse direction. Also it was considered that the exit at the junction of Stag Lane would be blocked by queuing traffic, and that businesses would be adversely affected by the proposal.
- 2.82 One business considered that the single yellow line across the entrance to his business was not necessary and would adversely affect his business.
- 2.83 Those who support this proposal commented that it would free up traffic, stop confrontations and allow those with rear access to Burnt Oak Broadway better unobstructed access.
- 2.84 Park Way is a narrow road with insufficient width to support two-way traffic without vehicles mounting the footway to gain access. The proposed one-way traffic together with the loading restrictions will improve access in this road and enable free flow for emergency vehicles and other large lorries. In order to provide a free flow of traffic from Park Way into Stag Lane, a “KEEP CLEAR” road marking is proposed at this junction.
- 2.85 Having taken into consideration the objections and comments regarding the one-way traffic proposal together with the proposed waiting restrictions, it is recommended that the above proposals be implemented as shown at **Appendix J**.

### **Loading restrictions**

- 2.86 No comments were received regarding the proposed loading restrictions at some of the more busy junctions and pinch points in roads near to the shops. These junctions are regularly obstructed by vehicles either loading or displaying a blue badge. Vehicles that need to load or unload can use the pay and display bays free, if available, or use the loading only bays provided. Blue badge holders are entitled to park in the pay and display parking bays free for an unlimited period of time.
- 2.87 In order to keep junctions and accesses clear at all times, it is recommended to prohibit loading at all times as shown in **Appendix J**.

## **Financial Implications**

- 2.88 A sum of £60,000 has been allocated in the financial year 2010/2011 for the cost of implementing the scheme and informing residents of the outcome of the statutory consultation. This sum will be sufficient to cover the costs anticipated, and the works would be completed on site by the end of March 2011.
- 2.89 There is no funding currently allocated for carrying out the recommended 6-12 month review; however, this will be reported to the February 2011 meeting of the Panel when the annual review is considered and Harrow Capital funding for CPZs is known.

## **Legal Implications**

- 2.90 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions, and designated pay and display parking places, and the introduction of one-way sections can be implemented by making Traffic Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 2.91 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.

## **Performance Issues**

- 2.92 There are no Best Value performance indicators relating to CPZs.
- 2.93 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).
- 2.94 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.
- 2.95 This proposal supports the Harrow Vision and Corporate Priorities as follows:
- Deliver cleaner and safer streets
  - Build stronger communities.

## **Environmental Impact**

- 2.96 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, will once the scheme has settled down, lead to a reduction in traffic noise.

### **Equalities Impact**

- 2.97 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.

### **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.98 This project is not included on the Directorate Risk Register
- 2.99 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**

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 26 <sup>th</sup> August 2010		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 27 <sup>th</sup> August 2010		

## **Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

**Contact:** Owen Northwood, Project Engineer, Parking and Sustainable Transport,  
Tel: 020 8424 1535, Fax: 020 8424 7662,  
E-mail: [owen.northwood@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:owen.northwood@harrow.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:**

Minutes of Stakeholders meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

Report to TARSAP on Burnt Oak Broadway Area Proposed Parking Controls – Consultation Results 17 June 2009.

Report to TARSAP on Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual Review 17 February 2010.