

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	2 February 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual Review
<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> Progress report on schemes since the last review  <b>Appendix B:</b> Borough-wide map of Controlled Parking Zones/Residents’ Parking Schemes  <b>Appendix C:</b> Proposed priority list for 2011/12 to 2014/15  <b>Appendix D:</b> Estimated costs of Programme  <b>Appendix E:</b> Stages involved in preparing a CPZ  <b>Appendix F:</b> Schedule of Requests and Issues within Borough

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides general information about the general principle of developing and implementing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in Harrow. It also reviews progress with the 2010/11 CPZ programme, provides details of requests and representations received, and assesses and recommends priorities for new schemes and review in 2011/12.

### Recommendations:

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

- i) To agree the priority list of schemes as shown at **Appendix C** to form the controlled parking zone programme for 2011/12, subject to confirmation of funding;
- ii) to authorise officers to carry out scheme design and consultation on the schemes in **Appendix C**;
- iii) to authorise officers to implement the schemes in **Appendix C** subject to receiving the Panel's recommendation to proceed.

**Reason:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes programme for 2011/12.

## Section 2 – Report

### Background

- 2.1 The annual review of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) / Resident Parking Schemes have been the means by which the priorities for existing and new CPZs are assessed and progress with consultations and implementation of schemes is reported.
- 2.2 This annual parking review for the borough as a whole includes assessments of existing zones and requests for new or extended zones, including petitions and other representations received in the last 12 months. The previous programme of works has been updated and reviewed in relation to progress on schemes and a revised programme is recommended as shown in **Appendix C**. The programme takes into account the council's financial position, staff resources and capital programme.
- 2.3 The council's programme of CPZ reviews has historically been demand led and addresses parking pressures highlighted by local residents and

businesses. Progress on the CPZ programme priority list agreed by this Panel in February 2010 is shown in **Appendix A** for information.

- 2.4 Another initiative taken forward in 2010/11 has been to progress a programme of minor localised parking controls (Problem streets). Examples of this type of scheme are double yellow lines at junctions and bends, where refuse vehicles and the emergency services have reported persistent access difficulties. These schemes are generally outside of CPZs and are a valuable initiative primarily targeted at improving road safety and facilitating adequate vehicular access.

### **Options considered**

- 2.5 CPZs are a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport policies. They form part of the Mayor for London's Transport Strategy, West London Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the council's local transport strategy (Local Implementation Plan or LIP). Further restraint based parking standards in new developments as required by national and regional policy cannot be effective unless on-street parking controls exist, otherwise parking can simply take place in local streets rather than lead to reduced car use. Hence there are strong strategic reasons for introducing CPZs, as well as the local need to manage parking problems and parking demand as effectively as possible. CPZs also allow the introduction of "resident permit restricted" developments, which is in line with the strategy of reducing car parking provision at sites well served by public transport. CPZs incorporating residents parking schemes improve safety, access and residential amenity and assist management of parking in town centres to ensure more short stay shopper/visitor spaces are available.
- 2.6 The only option available is to take forward parking management schemes because these form a key part of national and local transport strategies and make a significant contribution to the wider aspirations of improving safety, reducing congestion and encouraging modal shift and sustainable transport.

### **Operating principles**

- 2.7 A CPZ is an area where parking is restricted during a regular period or periods of the day (the operational hours) as specified on signs in and around a defined zone. Other parking restrictions can exist within the zone (which is different from the operational hours), for instance on main roads, which are separately signed. At its simplest a CPZ may just consist of just single yellow lines, but they normally incorporate parking bays. In most cases these are permit bays such as those designated for use by residents. In shopping or commercial areas pay and display bays are used which allow for short term parking for customers during the working day. For flexibility some bays are designated for shared use, which allow for the display of either a permit or a pay and display ticket. Almost all permits are issued to residents

whose addresses are within the defined zone. Residents may also purchase permits for visitors. Businesses may also purchase permits for operational purposes only but these are strictly controlled and only a few permits have been issued. For example they can be issued to, doctors, health care workers etc but there are strict eligibility criteria in place.

- 2.8 CPZs therefore provide preferential parking access for permit holders (e.g. residents) during the hours of the zone. Whilst the zone hours in some instances may be only one hour in the middle of the day, this effectively protects parking in residential areas from long stay duration parking by commuters or local workers. Disabled blue badge holders are allowed to park free of charge in all parking bays except those designated for a special purpose, such as doctors' parking bays.
- 2.9 Yellow line only CPZ schemes where there is no demand for on-street residents' parking have the advantage of being cheaper and more environmentally friendly because the only signs normally needed are at the entry/exit points (signs don't need to be repeated within the zone where the restrictions are the same as those shown on the entry/exit points). However such schemes should be used with great caution, as even a minority of residents who need on-street parking for themselves or their visitors will also be affected and may be severely disadvantaged. There are already locations such as the area around Canons Park Station where such schemes, implemented in the past, are resulting in requests for resident's permit bays, probably because of increasing car ownership per household.
- 2.10 **Appendix B** is a borough map showing the locations of existing CPZs. A review of both existing and potential new zones is set out in the section titled "CPZ areas and reviews" below, including petitions received in the last 12 months. Based on the review of areas set out below and petitions received, **Appendix C** shows the recommended programme and priority list for the next 3 years and also the list of schemes which are not programmed. The list is based on the previous agreed priority list, allowing for schemes that have been completed, other events during the year that might have affected the programme, and available funding. The estimated cost of the programme is shown at **Appendix D**.

#### **Programme review process**

- 2.11 The rationale for the programme review process was explained in the report to this Panel in February 2009. The review of the process over the last three years has provided a more realistic approach to programme and resource planning.
- 2.12 There have been, however, additional demands introduced as a result of consultation feedback and objections raised during statutory consultation. An example of this is the West Harrow CPZ consultation

which resulted in unprecedented levels of communication by telephone, email and letter. As a consequence this has resulted in delays to other schemes.

#### Communications and updates

- 2.13 Arrangements have been introduced to manage residents' expectations for better information about scheme development and progress following initial consultation which generally occurs about one year before implementation. Progress information is provided on the council website, people are advised how they can contact the council for the results of consultation and copies of street notices are posted when the draft traffic orders are advertised. There has been increasing demand for progress information to be delivered to each household. With the Stanmore CPZ review 4000 information leaflets were distributed at the statutory consultation phase and similarly around 1800 were distributed for the West Harrow CPZ review. Public Exhibitions now feature on all but the very smallest of schemes. This clearly provides an enhanced consultation process to the community but has cost and programme implications. In Autumn 2009 an independent quality assurance system was established covering the consultation process and management, collation and presentation of results. This is covered in more detail in the section titled "Policy issues and review of scheme design principles".

#### Scheme estimates and priorities

- 2.14 Although the estimated costs of schemes shown later in this report have been reviewed to more accurately reflect likely costs of both consultation and implementation, work is ongoing to develop a more robust estimating process. This has been achieved by an on-going review of the actual costs of recent schemes, against which the cost of proposed new schemes can be benchmarked. The cost estimate will be based initially on the initially proposed extent of a CPZ scheme or review, and then refined when the results of consultation determine the final extent. Although that may result in the final costs being more or less than the original estimate, the differences, in the main, are unlikely to be significant and it will, in either event, enable the programme to be adjusted. However there may always be the situation as already mentioned where a scheme potentially exceeds the normal levels of staff involvement and consultation and cost. Progress on the CPZ programme is now included in the information report that is a standing item on the Panel's agenda, and members will be advised of any adjustments to the programme through this process.
- 2.15 This process enables the programme to be managed more effectively and flexibly and will enable the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to make more informed decisions about workload and priorities during the course of the year, although it should be borne in mind that the programme in **Appendix D** does not represent all the schemes that

officers within the parking design section are involved in. It should also be recognised that in view of the factors outlined above, costs and available budget in future years are indicative only at this stage. In particular, the programme for 2011/12 shown in **Appendix D** is not fully developed at this stage, but it will be developed as the programme in years 2010/11 is delivered and there is more certainty about costs and priorities.

#### Integrity of consultation results

- 2.16 In Autumn 2009, the council commissioned an independent report on local procedures for consultation and Quality Assurance. The study looked at the existing procedures for consultation and its strengths and weaknesses. Some of the recommendations were to clarify roles and responsibilities in consultation and to suggest things like issuing a simple reminder letter mid way through the consultation period to encourage responses, to remind people of contact details should they have questions before they respond to consultation and also trying to identify people who may not have the necessary consultation material (mainly in properties sharing a communal letterbox). The remaining recommendations relate to the collation, analysis and presentation of consultation results. The procedure now incorporates independent checks to ensure the robustness of the consultation and give the public confidence in the results. This is particularly important given that the public's responses are frequently conflicting, even over a relatively small area, and the principle that a majority view of respondents will decide the outcome.

#### **New schemes and reviews - design principles**

##### Impact of CPZ reviews

- 2.17 As referred to above, the size of some of the CPZ areas and the wide variety of parking issues that are considered means that reviews are taking longer and costing more. The most recent example of this is West Harrow CPZ, although it is generally acknowledged that this case has been somewhat unprecedented in our experience.

##### Parking controls at junctions

- 2.18 The occurrence of dangerous or obstructive parking has deteriorated in recent years due to increasing vehicle ownership and usage. This is despite the introduction of CPZs and especially if their operational hours are limited say to one hour. Even with all day parking controls in force problems can occur at evenings and weekends. To address this double yellow lines are now being proposed at all junctions within a proposed zones and immediately surrounding CPZ zones. Although the Highway Code states that drivers should not park within 10m of a junction, this distance is used as a starting point and the actual distance required may be less than 10m and is determined by using a

computer simulation programme to determine the swept path of a large vehicle such as a refuse vehicle or fire appliance. Although the council is under no requirement to provide on-street parking, this procedure allows as much on street parking that can safely be accommodated as possible.

#### Public perception of schemes

- 2.19 As parking pressures increase, there is a public perception that CPZs will increase on street parking provision. However, physical on street capacity does not increase but access to the actual space available improves for permit holders as a result of introducing the parking management controls. Therefore additional space is made available for local parking by removing other types of parking such as commuter. This misconception has increased the amount of communications and contact with the public. The council can only sanction parking where it is both safe and does not cause undue obstruction. Whilst schemes are designed to maximise on street parking space the overall quantity of spaces provided during the controlled hours may actually reduce due to the need to apply design standards. This, together with double yellow line proposals at junctions, leads to CPZs being more contentious and has the effect of increasing the level of resources required to deal with these issues.

#### Size of schemes

- 2.20 The consideration of smaller reviews and particularly possible new CPZs, would in some respects address these issues and should lead to a more focussed and more responsive approach. Consideration of very small or single street schemes, however, is not supported as this would tend to just move problems by displacing parking to surrounding streets. This approach addresses the issues raised by the Sustainable Development and Enterprise Scrutiny Sub-Committee in their 2007 annual review which highlighted that residents wanted more attention paid to small local parking issues and supported having a larger number of small schemes rather than a smaller number of large ones.

#### New types of scheme

- 2.21 One new initiative that officers are pursuing is a CPZ which minimises the use of signing and bay markings and can reduce costs and minimise street clutter. Currently the Department of Transport are carrying out a trial in CPZs in areas such as cul-de sacs. With special site authorisation it is possible to simply put a sign at the entrance to the road stating Permit Holders only beyond this point followed by the times of operation. There is no need to mark out bays although some double yellow lines may be necessary. This has a number of advantages in that it minimises the signing and lining with aesthetic and cost benefits. It also means that it is easier to make adjustments on these types of road that are already within a CPZ where there is a

desire to change the hours of control to that of the main CPZ. Officers have applied for permission to treat a few roads within Harrow on this basis as part of the trial. Subject to successful implementation it is hoped that when the regulations are reviewed this process will be made available without authorisation.

### **Scheme consultation stages**

- 2.22 The length of the process for investigating and designing a CPZ is influenced by the extent of consultation undertaken. A summary of the typical stages involved in the process is shown in **Appendix E**.
- 2.23 The logic to this approach is explained in previous annual review reports. A consequence of this approach is that reviews of the larger CPZs in particular can take 18 to 24 months, or even longer, from start to finish. Concern has been expressed for some years that it takes so long to implement measures and that the programme is slow to respond to specific needs. As reported in the 2007 annual review, the Sustainable Development and Enterprise Scrutiny Sub-Committee asked that this Panel be made aware of the Sub-Committee's wish to encourage positive use of small scale parking restriction and CPZ areas, and this is referred to above. The process (shown in **Appendix E**) requires local consultation on detailed proposals and statutory consultation to ensure any scheme properly reflects the needs of the community as a whole and is defensible against minority objections. Stages 1 and 2 are often combined if the area for consultation upon detailed proposals can be identified without an "in principle" consultation.
- 2.24 The process of reviewing the larger CPZs, including a holistic approach to traffic issues, has led to increasing complexity, resulting in multiple consultations of residents and businesses. These reviews have taken longer to complete and have absorbed a large proportion of the available resources to the detriment of smaller area schemes. The time period between successive reviews has been lengthened and it has sometimes proved impractical to carry out the 12-month review (subject to demand) as laid out in **Appendix E**. Addressing issues which have resulted from the implementation of a CPZ review or extension, for instance displaced parking, may take quite a number of years to investigate and resolve and leave people living in the affected area particularly aggrieved when parking problems take a long time to deal with.
- 2.25 To address this consultation on whether further consultation was wanted was carried out in a buffer area around the main area being considered for an extension. Occupiers in most roads within the buffer area requested further consultation, which resulted in more extensive proposals than the original consultation. The further consultation went ahead in advance of implementing the already agreed scheme in order to reduce the period to deal with peripheral roads experiencing



displaced parking. Despite the extent of the agreed scheme being made clear in this re-consultation, there was still insufficient support for any significant further extension. It appeared that people were considering the current parking situation rather than the potential for problems when the agreed scheme was implemented. Although it can be argued that residents have been given an opportunity to join the scheme, it is anticipated that there may be calls for immediate further consultation in areas just outside the extended CPZ, whilst the first opportunity to revisit the area at the next review will be several years away. A good example of this situation was in the case of the Wealdstone reviews.

- 2.26 In September 2007 the Panel accepted a revised approach whereby there was automatic consultation in roads just beyond an extension or new CPZ between 6 to 12 months after its implementation subject to evidence of displaced parking and availability of funding. This may well lengthen the overall period for a review but it should simplify the process thus allowing more reviews to take place simultaneously. The other benefits are:-
- it will be less critical determining the first detailed consultation area as, providing there is an extension, further consultation can be matched to new parking patterns;
  - occupiers in the second consultation will be able to see the effects on parking caused by the extension rather than having to anticipate parking problems, which may or may not materialise;
  - where there was insufficient support in roads in the first consultation they would have a second opportunity to be consulted without waiting for the next full review.
- 2.27 Co-ordination with other traffic management initiatives, such as customer parking, reviewing main road restrictions, or junction restrictions to address access or visibility problems within the study might also influence programmes.
- 2.28 Where area wide CPZs are proposed and consulted upon it is now the practice to also propose double yellow lines at junctions, bends and other areas where obstruction can occur. These restrictions are required for safety and are therefore not optional and not subject to majority support from residents and businesses. Consultation material asks for people's comments on these lengths of double yellow line and officers do take these into account and make small adjustments where practical. Consultation material produced in the last 12 months makes it clear that these lengths of yellow line are not optional.
- 2.29 The 6-12 month reviews, as already highlighted, are designed to make minor changes such as changing lengths of yellow line, small

adjustments to the CPZ boundary to deal with parking displacement and similar small scale issues.

- 2.30 Sometimes these reviews highlight larger issues. In the case of the review of Stanmore CPZ Zone H that was implemented a year ago, there have been requests to change the zone time and days covered both by residents and the Watling Medical Centre. Although this is dealt with in **Appendix F** it should be noted that such major changes are outside the scope of the 6-12 month reviews that were envisaged. Reviewing the operational times of a CPZ is a fundamental issue and the process for doing so is essentially the same as introducing the CPZ in the first place, including informal re-consultation of the whole zone, statutory consultation and advertising traffic orders and, if agreed, changing all the parking signs affected

### **Scheme Progress 2010/11**

- 2.31 Progress on the 2010/11 programme is reported to each Panel meeting as part of the Information Report on the Capital Programme and Traffic and parking Schemes.
- 2.32 The salient aspects of the schemes that were approved at the February 2010 Panel meeting are:
- a) **Wealdstone Review** - This includes Spencer Road & possible removal of the CPZ in the northern section; Oxford Road - removal of parking bays to ease reported congestion; Badminton Close - short length of double yellow lines to help disabled access; Milton Road - changes to loading restrictions and double yellow lines around Civic Centre. Statutory Consultation period ends on 29<sup>th</sup> December 2010. It may be necessary to fund changes from 2011/12.
  - b) **Stanmore CPZ Review** - Statutory Consultation to commence January 2011. Includes changes at Canons Corner and extension of CPZ into Marsh Lane. Scheme being funded by S106 monies.
  - c) **Rayners Lane CPZ Review** - Statutory Consultation programmed to commence in January 2011, and it may be necessary to fund changes from 2011/12.
  - d) **South Harrow CPZ Review** - Statutory Consultation programmed to commence in January 2011 and it may be necessary to fund changes from 2011/12.
  - e) **Hatch End Parking Controls** - The scheme to investigate introducing parking controls in Grimsdyke Car Park; complementary controls in the service roads along Uxbridge Road is on hold pending the outcome of the Parking Review requested by Cabinet.

- f) **West Harrow CPZ Review Zones V&W** - The review of the scheme implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 has commenced with a meeting of ward councillors and representatives of the West Harrow Residents Group (WHRG). WHRG are studying parking survey data and data on manoeuvring requirements of emergency service and refuse vehicles. Objective is for group to come back with their considerations before issuing consultation documentation across the original consultation area. Three sites where reductions in double yellow line proposals have been agreed are included in the statutory consultation on the Problem Streets programme. It may be necessary to fund further works from the 2011/12 budget.
- g) **Burnt Oak CPZ** - The local community have been informed that this scheme is programmed to go live on 1st February 2011. However progress is on hold due to the stop on schemes funded from Harrow Capital. It may be necessary to fund some or all of the works from the 2011/12 budget.
- h) **Pinner Road CPZ Review** - A Meeting has been arranged to discuss the programmed review with ward councillors in January of the scheme that was implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2010. However, progress is on hold due to the stop on schemes funded from Harrow Capital. It may be necessary to fund some or all of the works from the 2011/12 budget.

2.33 Because of the timescales involved in preparing this report and the Christmas and New Year Holiday period, an update will be given at the Panel meeting, on the impact of the delays to the Harrow Capital programme and its effects on the above and future programmes.

#### **Future Parking review Programmes**

- 2.34 The suggested programme of parking reviews is contained within **Appendix F**.
- 2.35 In the case of the reviews at Rayners Lane, South Harrow, West Harrow Zone V&W and Pinner Road there is likely to be some delay on these projects and there will be a need for at least some expenditure in 2011/12.
- 2.36 At Hatch End it had originally been the intention to carry out consultation on possible parking controls in Grimsdyke Car Park and in the Service Roads following a Stakeholders Meeting held in July 2010. This was envisaged to be combined with consultation on proposals to minimise congestion, reducing traffic speeds (following a fatal accident in July 2010), providing loading facilities to aid businesses and facilities to assist pedestrians. Whilst the other schemes, funded by Transport for London (TfL) are progressing, the parking study has been placed on hold pending the outcome of the Parking Review across the whole borough. To allow parking in Hatch End to be reviewed it is necessary to include it in the programme to

allow funding for officer time and any further works. This does not prejudice any outcome from the Borough-Wide Parking Review.

- 2.37 Canons Park Station area review has been on the programme for a number of years but has been delayed because of funding and resource issues and the need to bring other schemes forward (eg Burnt Oak Broadway) due to external influences. The programme represents the officer's estimates of time and expenditure but it is not always possible to accurately predict the outcome of any consultation or the work involved in arriving at any final decision. Officers have received a number of contacts arising from parking problems in the area.
- 2.38 The Panel will be aware that the parking controls that were implemented at Stanmore in 2009, and recently reviewed were focussed on parking problems attributed to visitors to Wembley Stadium using Stanmore Station, and its ease of access along the Jubilee Line. Anecdotal evidence suggests that parking pressures around Canons Park Station have also increased, which may also be partially attributed to the same source. In addition, officers are aware of the possible increase in activity in 2012 arising from people visiting the Olympic Games events at Wembley and also the Olympic Stadium. It is likely that people will use the opportunity to visit Central London as part of their trips and consequently parking pressures at Canons Park Station are likely to increase. If the parking review is commenced early in 2011 then it is theoretically possible to introduce additional parking controls that meet local needs before the Olympic Games commence.
- 2.39 Another benefit to the Canons Park Station Review commencing in 2011/12 is that advantage can be taken of external funding. There is £40,000 available from a S106 agreement from the redevelopment of the Old Government offices along Honeypot Lane. This is triggered when the 250<sup>th</sup> unit is completed and this is expected to be during 2011/12.
- 2.40 On the basis that the Burnt Oak Broadway CPZ becomes operational on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2011, there is an expectation that the scheme will be reviewed in line with procedures that have been put in place in recent years. There is a source of external funding potentially available from a S106 agreement for Krishna Avanti School which lies just to the south west of the Burnt Oak CPZ. A sum of £30,000 is potentially available for parking controls around the school. The school, which opened in September 2009, has additional year classes being started each year with the consequential increase in car journeys and parking. Some comments were received about parking attributed to the school during consultation on the Burnt Oak CPZ, although this was during the stage when the school was newly opened. The majority of residents of Broomgrove Gardens, the road closest to the school, chose at that time not to be included in the Burnt Oak CPZ. However, it is considered that a review of parking around the school could be carried out in 2011/12 integrated with the Burnt Oak CPZ review.

## **Legal Implications**

- 2.41 Controlled Parking Zones can be introduced under powers given in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 2.42 There are minimum requirements for consultation and publication before making an order which is set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

## **Performance issues**

- 2.43 There are no Best Value performance indicators in relation to CPZs.
- 2.44 Although no funding is provided by TfL, CPZs form part of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, West London Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the council's LIP.
- 2.45 The provision of CPZs meets the following priorities in the Mayor of London's LIP:
- Priority IV Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
  - Priority V Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network

## **Equalities Impact**

- 2.46 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 double 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.

## **Community Safety (s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998)**

- 2.47 The proposals will have a neutral impact on crime and disorder.

## **Financial Implications**

- 2.48 TfL has not provided funding for CPZs in recent years as it considers that these should be funded by boroughs and only funds projects in exceptional circumstances. TfL did allocate £25,000 for disabled persons' parking spaces in 2009/10 and £25,000 was allocated for 2010/11. This has been increased to £35,000 in 2011/12.

- 2.49 The funding available for 2010/11 from the Harrow Capital programme is £310K, of which £290K is for CPZ /parking reviews and £20K for the problem streets programme.
- 2.50 For 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 provisional assumptions of 280K have been used to compile the programme shown in **Appendix D** but are still subject to confirmation. The figures for years beyond 2012/13 will be subject to future reviews of the councils capital programme and may be optimistic.
- 2.51 The allocation for CPZs and estimated cost of the proposed programme is shown in **Appendix D**. It should be noted that the estimated costs have been prepared before consultation and design and are therefore provisional. The programme for 2012/13 and beyond is not fully developed at this stage, but it will be developed as the 2011/12 programme is progressed and implemented.

### **Risk management Implication**

- 2.52 The risk of not carrying out reviews of parking and CPZ and introducing parking controls may have an adverse effect on road safety and the effect on National Indicator 47 and 48 (Killed and Seriously Injured - KSI).
- 2.53 This project is not included on the Directorate risk register. When individual schemes are approved for implementation they will have their own generic risk register as part of the project management process.

### **Corporate priorities**

- 2.54 The delivery of the CPZ and problem street programme will support the draft new corporate priorities as follows:;
- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
  - United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
  - Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
  - A Town Centre to be proud of: changing Harrow for the better

### **Environmental Impact**

- 2.55 There is no environmental legislation or requirement for formal Environmental Impact Assessment which directly relates to the introduction of a CPZ or other parking controls. CPZs are however recognised as a fundamental component of national, regional and local transport policies. They do help support traffic reduction and encouragement of consideration of more sustainable alternatives to private car use (ie public transport, walking and cycling). CPZs and the

review of parking restrictions address traffic congestion and road safety issues. The positive effect of CPZ on traffic and congestion issues will in turn have advantages with regard to air quality and pollution.

### **Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

Name: Anthony Lineker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2011		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 7 <sup>th</sup> January 2011		

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

**Contact:** Paul Newman, Interim Team Leader, Parking and Sustainable Transport; Tel: 020 8424 1065; E-mail: [paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk)

#### **Background Papers:**

Previous reports to TARSAP  
Mayor of London Transport Strategy  
West London Transport Strategy  
Local Implementation Plan (LIP)  
Petitions  
General correspondence