

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

**Date of Meeting:** 23rd June 2011

**Subject:** Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone  
Results of Statutory Consultation

**Key Decision:** No

**Responsible Officer:** Brendon Hills - Corporate Director  
Environmental Services

**Portfolio Holder:** Phillip O'Dell - Portfolio Holder for  
Environment and Community Safety

**Exempt:** No

**Decision subject to  
Call-in:** Yes, following consideration by the Portfolio  
Holder

**Enclosures:** **Appendix A**  
Sample zone extension consultation  
documents and plans

**Appendix B**  
Sample double yellow line restriction  
consultation documents

**Appendix C**  
Summary of statutory objections with  
officers' response

**Appendix D**  
Analysis of questionnaire responses

**Appendix E**  
Summary of consultation comments

**Appendix F**  
Copy of petitions received

## **Appendix G**

Controlled Parking Zone extension plans recommended for implementation

## **Appendix H**

Double yellow line restriction plans recommended for implementation

# **Section 1 – summary and recommendations**

This document reports the results of the formal statutory consultation on the proposed extension of the Rayners Lane controlled parking zone (CPZ). 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 as explained in this report.

### **Recommendations:**

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

- (a) that an extension to the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Zone L be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in **Appendix G**, with operational hours of Monday-Friday 10am-11am 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 single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday be introduced in sections of Village Way as shown in **Appendix G**;
- (c) that double yellow lines be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in **Appendix H**;
- (d) that the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone in Ovesdon Avenue, Capthorne Avenue and Kings Road south of the junction of Capthorne Avenue as detailed in **Appendix A** not be included within the extension;
- (e) That the proposed double yellow lines at the junctions of Torbay Road, Exeter Road and Lynton Road with Capthorne Avenue remain as recommended in **Appendix A**;
- (f) that the proposed double yellow lines be reduced as shown in **Appendix H** for the following roads:
  - Newlyn Gardens
  - Trescoe Gardens
  - Waverly Road
  - Dewsbury Close

- Southbourne Close
- Fernbrook Drive
- Lynton Drive
- Torbay Road

- (g) that the proposed double yellow lines on the southern side of the carriageway adjacent to 1 Village Way as shown in **Appendix A** are to be extended to the boundary of 5-7 Village Way as shown in **Appendix G**;
- (h) that the location of the bays proposed outside 16-18 Downs Avenue and 24-26 Downs Avenue are relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway as shown in **Appendix G**;
- (i) that the location of the bay proposed opposite 112-114 The Avenue is relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway as shown in **Appendix G**;
- (j) that the existing double yellow line on the north eastern corner of the junction of Capthorne Avenue and Kings Road be extended on Kings Road as shown in **Appendix G**;
- (k) that objections to the proposals in **Appendix C** be set aside excepting those objections accommodated by the revised proposals listed at (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) above.
- (l) That the Service Manager – Traffic & Highway Network Management be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown in **Appendix G** and **Appendix H**, subject to all recommendations of the Panel;
- (m) That all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of the final decision

**REASON:** To control parking on the periphery of the existing Rayners Lane CPZ – Zone L as detailed in the report.

## **Section 2 – report**

### **Background**

- 2.1 The Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) L was originally implemented in 1998 and reviewed/extended in 2002 following public consultation. The parking controls were introduced primarily because of commuters using Rayners Lane Station and parking in the surrounding roads, leaving vehicles on street all day, and causing parking problems for local residents. Since the extension of the Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone in 2002, requests have been received from residents living in the surrounding roads who have reported suffering from displaced and obstructive parking that blocks access to off street parking provision. This is compounded by parking demand for the nearby Rayners Lane Station shopping facilities and offices. A review of the Rayners Lane CPZ has been on the programme approved by the panel since 2005.

## **Public consultation**

2.2 Following a stakeholders meeting held in December 2009, which determined the consultation boundary a public consultation was carried out between 7th June and 28th June. The result of this consultation was reported to the Panel meeting on 16th September 2010, which recommended that where there was a majority support from residents proposals should go forward to statutory consultation. It was therefore decided to consult on an extension in the following roads:-

- The Avenue (between Church Avenue and Hillcroft Avenue)
- Hillcroft Avenue (between West Avenue and Downs Avenue)
- Downs Avenue (between The Glen and Village Way)
- West Avenue (between Hillcroft Avenue and Village Way)
- Village Way (between Cannon Lane and existing zone boundary)
- Alfriston Avenue (between Imperial Drive and No.53 Alfriston Ave)
- Warden Avenue (between Torbay Road and Kings Road)
- Ovesdon Avenue (between Torbay Road and Kings Road)
- Capthorne Avenue (between Torbay Road and Alexandra Ave)
- Kings Road ( between Drake Road and Ovesdon Avenue)

In addition to the zone extension it was also recommended that double yellow line restrictions proceed to statutory consultation at junctions and locations where inadequate road widths don't allow for safe parking on opposite sides of the road. These include locations both in and on the periphery of the proposed zone.

This is primarily for safety reasons including emergency service access and improved visibility for both motorists and pedestrians.

2.3 At the Panel meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2011, it was resolved that due to a late petition received from residents of Central Avenue the street would be consulted in a separate statutory consultation as soon as possible. Therefore, Central Avenue has not been included within this report.

## **Statutory Consultation**

2.4 All Councillors in the affected wards were sent the consultation materials prior to distribution.

2.5 A number of statutory consultees such as the Police and the Fire Brigade were consulted as part of the statutory requirements.

2.6 Statutory consultation was carried out for 21 days from 17<sup>th</sup> March to 6<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

2.7 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.

2.8 Traffic orders were advertised in the Harrow Times newspaper on 17th March 2011 and this information was also available on the council's web site at [www.harrow.gov.uk/raynerslaneparking](http://www.harrow.gov.uk/raynerslaneparking)

- 2.9 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 June 2010.

### **Statutory Consultation Documents**

- 2.10 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 that received the controlled parking zone extension consultation document had the opportunity to complete their questionnaire online.
- 2.11 Consultation documents were distributed to addresses between 14th and 16th March 2011 to coincide with the start of the statutory objection period.

### **Controlled Parking Zone Extension Consultation Document**

- 2.12 The leaflet set out background information with, details about the proposed zone extension, where to obtain further information and the statutory (legal) consultation process necessary to implement the proposals. A plan showing the detailed proposals relating to the individual's address was also provided along with information on how to obtain plans of other roads within the consultation area. A leaflet together with the seven detailed plans can be seen in **Appendix A**.
- 2.13 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 within the proposed CPZ extension 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 CPZ's. A prepaid envelope was supplied with the consultation documents for people to return the completed questionnaire.

### **Double yellow line restrictions**

- 2.14 A separate consultation leaflet was also sent out to areas on the periphery of the proposed zone detailing proposals for double yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions and locations where there is inadequate road width to allow safe parking on both sides of the road. The document provided background information on the safety issues, relevance to the Highway Code Rule 243, a plan indicating the proposals in the residents immediate vicinity, where to obtain further information and details of the statutory (legal) consultation process necessary to implement the proposals. A copy of the consultation leaflet together with the individual plans can be seen in **Appendix B**.

## **Responses**

- 2.15 As a result of the consultation, 99 statutory objections were received from the 233 questionnaire responses, 72 e-mails, 67 letters and 4 petitions received.
- 2.16 A copy of all replies received in response to the Statutory Consultation are available for members to review in the members library.

## **Statutory Objections**

- 2.17 A total of 99 statutory objections were received within the statutory objection period:
- 35 from within the proposed CPZ
  - 62 from within the consultation area but outside the proposed CPZ
  - 2 from outside the consultation area.
- 2.18 A summary of statutory objections with officers' comments can be seen in **Appendix C**.
- 2.19 A number of properties returned statutory objections in various forms and this therefore resulted in duplication of some objections. For the purposes of this report these have been considered as one objection.
- 2.20 No objections were received from statutory consultees such as the Police and Emergency services. Through other communications regarding the scheme we are aware that the Fire Brigade are supportive of the scheme proposals.

## **Questionnaire Responses**

- 2.21 There were 233 questionnaire responses received, 14 of which met the criteria as statutory objections. This represented an overall response rate of 36% from the 643 questionnaires delivered, which is considered average when compared with other similar consultations undertaken recently. The highest response rate of 71% was from Romney Drive.
- 2.22 The analysis of the results of the questionnaire responses on a street by street basis together with their response and support rate can be seen in **Appendix D**.

## **Letter and E-mail Responses**

- 2.23 In addition to the questionnaires, 72 e-mails and 67 letters were received, of which 44 e-mails and 41 letters met the criteria of a statutory objection.
- 2.24 2 of the responses received were from outside the consultation area and relate to requests for the double yellow lines on Village Way to be extended to the boundary of 5 and 7 Village Way.
- 2.25 A Summary of consultation responses can be seen in **Appendix E**.

## Petitions

2.26 Four petitions were received from the following streets:

**Raynton Close** – 17 signatures were received from 11 addresses. The objection is to the proposed double yellow lines on Raynton Close. No justification was provided with the petition.

**Newlyn Gardens** – 19 signatures were received from 16 addresses. The objection is to the proposed double yellow lines within the close as there is no problems with access or visibility.

**Waverley Road** – 22 signatures were received from 21 addresses. The objection is to the proposed double yellow lines. Residents have concerns that the restrictions in the area will create tension amongst neighbours.

**Southborne Close** – 6 signatures were received from 6 addresses. The objection is to the double yellow lines outside properties numbered 22-28 and 23-29.

A copy of these petitions can be seen in **Appendix F**.

## Consideration of statutory objections

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

2.28 Statutory objections in the following areas have been considered and following further consultation with ward councillors proposals have been amended as detailed below:-

- **Newlyn Gardens** – Residents object to all restrictions within the close stating that access has never been a problem and parking is self regulating. Further to a site meeting on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> May with Ward Councillors, having taken into consideration the comments and objections of the residents Councillors were agreed that they support restrictions on the junction but feel that restrictions in the close are unnecessary. Considering both the Councillors and residents comments officers discussed the proposals with the fire brigade and subsequently recommend that the double yellow line restrictions should be reduced to the northern building line of 12 Newlyn Gardens, this allows for more flexible parking arrangements at the end of the close whilst ensuring that the fire brigade can obtain access to within 30m of all properties ensuring an emergency would be serviceable.
- **Trescoe Gardens** – As with Newlyn Gardens, residents object to all restrictions within the close stating that access has never been a problem and parking is self regulating. Further to a site meeting on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> May with Ward Councillors, having taken into consideration the comments and objections of the residents Councillors were agreed that they support restrictions on the junction but feel that restrictions in the close are unnecessary. Considering both the Councillors and residents comments officers discussed the proposals with the fire brigade and subsequently recommend that the double

yellow line restrictions should be reduced to the northern building line of 12 Trescoe Gardens, this allows for more flexible parking arrangements at the end of the close whilst ensuring that the fire brigade can obtain access to within 30m of all properties ensuring an emergency would be serviceable.

- **Waverly Road** – Parking restrictions in Waverley Road were reviewed with ward councillors and although there were a significant number of objections it was agreed that the vast majority of restrictions were required. The one amendment to the proposals was for the restrictions outside 23 Waverley Road to be cut back to the southern side of the vehicular access, 3 meters north of the boundary of 23-25 Waverly Road.
- **Dewsbury Close** – Due to a number of objections the proposed double yellow line restrictions around the roundabout at the end of the close have been removed. Restrictions accessing the close have been maintained and ensure emergency services can gain access to within the 30m required for a fire appliance to service a building.
- **Southborne Close** – residents raised concerns regarding the reduction in parking capacity and the possible displacement of parking to the narrow sections of the close should the restrictions be implemented in the turning head. Officers propose to reduce the parking restrictions within the turning head to maintain a number of parking spaces whilst ensuring there is suitable space for vehicles to turn negating the possibility of vehicles having to reverse down the close.
- **Village Way** – A number of responses raised concerns regarding visibility and traffic flow on the southern side of Village Way in close proximity to the junction with Rayners Lane. As a result officers recommend that the double yellow line restrictions extend from the boundary of 1 and 3 Village Way to the property boundary of 5 and 7 Village Way.
- **Downs Avenue** – Access issues to properties on Downs Avenue have been highlighted due to narrow accesses and the location of the parking bay outside 16-18 and 24-26 Downs Avenue. Officers therefore recommend the bays are relocated on the opposite side of the carriageway outside 13-15 and 19-21 Downs Avenue respectively where accesses to properties opposite are more accessible.
- **The Avenue** – Access and visibility concerns were raised with regards to the parking bay located opposite 112-114 The Avenue. As a result officers propose that the bay be relocated onto the opposite side of the carriageway adjacent to where it is currently located.
- **Fernbrook Drive** – Double yellow line restrictions reduced to boundary of 16-18 Fernbrook Drive to maximise parking capacity whilst maintaining acceptable visibility on the bend.
- **Lynton Drive** – Double yellow line restrictions reduced to boundary of 121-123 Lynton Drive to maximise parking capacity whilst protecting the junction with Widdicombe Avenue.



- **Torbay Road** – Double yellow line restrictions reduced to the boundary of 389-391 Torbay Road to maximise parking capacity whilst maintaining visibility at the bend.

These amendments address 18 of the statutory objections and partially address a further 40 statutory objections.

2.29 The remaining statutory objections are from the following areas:

- 22 within the proposed CPZ area
- 19 from outside the CPZ 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 up held due to modifications of the proposals.

#### **Roads to be included in the CPZ (with majority support)**

2.30 **Appendix D** indicates that there is majority support for the proposals in the following roads or part roads as detailed:-

- Alfriston Avenue
- Downs Avenue
- Hillcroft Avenue
- Kings Road (North of the junction with Capthorne Avenue)
- Romney Drive
- The Avenue
- Village Way
- Warden Avenue
- West Avenue

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

#### Alfriston Avenue

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Alfriston Avenue	46	20	43%	15	3	2	75%

2.31 One response that ticked the box indicating they supported the revised parking proposals also met the statutory objection criteria in their comments by objecting to the double yellow lines on the corner of the junction where Alfriston Avenue meets the side road, also known as Alfriston Avenue which connects the Avenue with The Ridgeway. As the restrictions are proposed to ensure safe visibility, access and compliance with the Highway Code officers do not feel parking capacity is being reduced as vehicles should not be parked in this location as set out in the Highway Code.

- 2.32 Officers therefore recommend that Alfriston Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

Downs Avenue

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Downs Avenue	34	10	29%	8	2	0	80%

- 2.33 Of the two questionnaire responses received, one met the statutory objection criteria. The objection highlighted that due to the location of a parking bay, access to a property would be impaired due to the narrow width of both the carriageway and the private access. As a result officers recommend the relocation of the parking bay to a location where access issues will be alleviated whilst maintaining the same parking capacity within the Avenue.
- 2.34 Officers therefore recommend that Downs Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

Hillcroft Avenue

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Hillcroft Avenue	14	6	43%	5	1	0	83%

- 2.35 The one objection to the revised parking proposals did not meet the statutory objection criteria.
- 2.36 Officers therefore recommend that Hillcroft Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

Kings Road

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Kings Road	47	11	23%	7	2	2	64%

- 2.37 When officers analysed the responses with Ward Councillors, the majority of the support for the proposals originated from the section of Kings Road north of the junction with Capthorne Avenue. North of the junction there was majority support of 83%, whereas south of the junction the support level was only 40%. In addition to this due to the lower level of support responses received from Capthorne Avenue which will be detailed later in the report officers and Ward Councillors recommend that only the section of Kings Road north of Capthorne Avenue should be recommended to be included in the proposed zone extension.
- 2.38 None of the objections to the revised parking proposals met the statutory objection criteria.

- 2.39 Officers therefore recommend that Kings Road, north of the junction with Capthorne Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

Romney Drive

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Romney Drive	7	5	71%	3	2	0	60%

- 2.40 Given that the vast majority of Romney Drive is already located within the zone, the consultation only covered the small area at the top of Romney Drive at the junction with Alfriston Avenue. As a result the responses have been considered not just in relation to the proposals at the junction but also for Alfriston Avenue.
- 2.41 Of the two responses received one met the criteria of a statutory objection. The objection is to the proposed double yellow line outside 4-10 Romney Drive due to there not being any incidents there and the space currently being used for visitor parking. As the restrictions are proposed to ensure safe visibility, access and compliance with the Highway Code at the junction officers do not feel as though parking capacity is being reduced as vehicles should not currently be parking in this location and recommend the restrictions should remain as proposed.
- 2.42 Officers therefore recommend that Romney Drive is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

The Avenue

Road	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
The Avenue	53	31	58%	25	5	1	81%

- 2.43 Of the responses that did not support the revised parking proposals four met the statutory objection criteria.
- 2.44 Two of the statutory objections received were from questionnaires indicating support for the revised parking proposals in their part of the road but then objected to elements of the proposals through their comments. The first raised concerns over a bay location that obscured visibility when accessing their property, this objection was supported by another objection which raised concerns over the same bay location but with regards to access to their property. As a result Ward Councillors and officers recommend that the bay location is amended and is relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway. The second objection raised an issue with regards to two proposed parking bays between 71-77 The Avenue, the objection was due to their location as they not only obstruct visibility for drivers but by relocating the bays and an additional space could be provided. Officers recommend that the spaces remain proposed in their current location as by creating a chicane effect the bay locations act as a traffic calming measure. In addition to this by relocating the bays access issues may arise and previously the objector supported the layout during the public consultation phase.

- 2.45 The other two statutory objections originate from residents who do not support the revised parking layout. The first as detailed above, objects to the extension of the zone in addition to a proposed bay location should the scheme go ahead. This is due to access concerns given the narrow carriageway and private access. As a result of another supporting objection officers recommend the proposed bay location is relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway. The second objection is not in favour of the CPZ extension due to the damage it will do to the area and economy of the local businesses. Parking issues around the Rayners Lane shopping area are currently being reviewed and improved as part of a separate scheme where on street parking capacity is being increased.
- 2.46 Officers therefore recommend that The Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

#### Village Way

Road Consulted	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Village Way	143	44	31%	31	9	4	70%

- 2.47 Of the responses that did not support the revised parking proposals two met the statutory objection criteria. The first statutory objection is to the loss of parking capacity on the street as they have no spare parking capacity on their drive and visitors will have nowhere to park. The second statutory objection states that they do not suffer from commuter parking and should the proposals go ahead, not only will there be no parking for visitors but residents will turn their gardens into off street parking. In addition to this, the objection also raises concerns that the current parking layout slows vehicles down and by removing the parking vehicle speeds on Village Way will increase, finally it states that as there is very little commuter parking on Saturdays these restrictions are not required. Currently traffic flow is significantly obstructed by parking along Village Way, in some locations this results in one way traffic flow through sections during peak hours. By improving traffic flow officers are aware it is possible vehicle speeds may increase, therefore officers will be proposing to introduce Vehicle Activated Signs along Village Way which have been shown to be effective in reducing vehicle speeds elsewhere in the borough.
- 2.48 Officers therefore recommend that Village Way is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

#### Warden Avenue

Road Consulted	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Warden Avenue	87	32	37%	21	9	2	66%

- 2.49 Of the responses that did not support the revised parking proposals two met the statutory objection criteria. The first objects to the extension of the CPZ as they are unable to obtain permission for off street parking due to footway obstructions and would therefore have to pay for permits for all of their

vehicles. The second statutory objection objects to the CPZ as it is believed there is not a problem with commuter parking during the day and neighbours with driveways but without cars allow neighbours to park over their driveway when they do not have visitors and under the scheme proposals these spaces would be removed during the hours of operation. Further concerns were raised with regards to the financial burdens placed on families and that many more gardens will be converted into off street parking as well as parking being displaced into neighbouring streets. Officers have taken these concerns into consideration however due to the majority of residents experience problems and responded supporting the proposals recommendations are that the CPZ extension includes Warden Avenue.

- 2.50 Officers therefore recommend that Warden Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

West Avenue

Road Consulted	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
West Avenue	51	30	59%	25	3	2	83%

- 2.51 Of the responses that did not support the revised parking proposals one met the statutory objection criteria. The statutory objection opposes the introduction of a parking levy on top of the existing council tax and wishes for facilities where friends and family can park for free without restrictions. Having considered the statutory objection officers feel that given the high level of support in the street from other residents that West Avenue should be included within the CPZ extension.

- 2.52 Officers therefore recommend that Warden Avenue is included within a CPZ extension as detailed in **Appendix G**.

**Roads not obtaining majority support**

- 2.53 **Appendix D** indicates that there was not majority support for the proposals in the following roads or part roads as detailed:-

- Capthorne Avenue
- Ovesdon Avenue
- Kings Road (South of the junction with Capthorne Avenue)

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

Capthorne Avenue

Road Consulted	No. Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Capthorne Avenue	96	28	29%	12	16	0	43%

- 2.54 Given there was no majority support received from the responses received officers recommend that the CPZ extension does not include Capthorne Avenue.

## Ovesdon Avenue

Road Consulted	No.Sent out	No. of Replies	Response Rate	Support	Not Support	No Opinion	Support Rate
Ovesdon Avenue	65	16	25%	8	8	0	50%

- 2.55 Although there is an even number of responses both supporting and not supporting the proposals given that there are mixed feelings amongst residents over the requirement for a CPZ further to discussions between Ward Councillors and officers it is recommended that Ovesdon Avenue is not included within the CPZ extension.

## Kings Road (South of junction with Capthorne Avenue)

- 2.56 As detailed in paragraph 2.34, when officers and Ward Councillors analysed the Kings Road responses south of the junction the support level was 40%.
- 2.57 Given there was no majority support south of the junction and Capthorne Avenue and Ovesdon Avenue was no longer to be recommended for inclusion within the zone, officers and Ward Councillors agree to recommendations that Kings Road south of the junction with Capthorne Avenue should not be included within the CPZ extension.

## **Other issues**

- 2.58 Further to a meeting at the Civic Centre with ward councillors to discuss consultation responses received during the consultation process a number of locations arose where it was agreed a site meeting attended by officers and Councillors would be beneficial to discuss the consultation responses in more detail.
- 2.59 On 7 May a meeting was held on site to discuss a number of locations. Below are details of the proposals reviewed along with officers and Ward Councillors recommendations.

## Double yellow line restrictions in Trescoe Gardens, Newlyn Gardens and Raynton Close

- 2.60 A significant number of objections and comments were received in relation to the double yellow line restrictions in the above roads. The majority of responses felt that the restrictions are unnecessary due to the narrow width of the carriageway and parking to date had not been a problem and was self regulating.
- 2.61 Ward Councillors expressed their support for the restrictions on each of the junctions and around the roundabout at the end of High Warpole for safety reasons. However, Ward Councillors felt that the restrictions along each of the three cul de sacs were unnecessary and agreed with the views of the residents.
- 2.62 Further to consultation with the Fire Brigade officers feel that from experience most drivers perception of the space required for a large vehicle

like a fire tender to pass vehicles parked on alternate sides of narrow carriageways is usually insufficient and therefore recommend that to ensure sufficient space is provided double yellow line restrictions are maintained up to 30m from the last property in each of the closes. This ensures that if a fire should occur it would be accessible.

- 2.63 This would allow for the double yellow line restrictions in both Trescoe Gardens and Newlyn Gardens to be reduced to the northern building line of property number 12. However, due to the layout of Raynton Close the recommendations for restrictions would remain as recommended.

#### Double yellow line restrictions on Waverly Road

- 2.64 A number of responses were received objecting to the extent of the proposed double yellow lines on Waverly Road. Many of these also raised concerns over displaced parking and additional parking pressure on Waverly Road should the restrictions in Trescoe Gardens, Newlyn Gardens and Raynton Close be implemented.
- 2.65 Having reviewed the proposed restrictions Ward Councillors agreed that other than outside 23 Waverly Road the proposed recommendations were required on the grounds of safety and should therefore be maintained as recommendations.
- 2.66 Officers and Ward Councillors agree that the recommendations outside 23 Waverly Road can be reduced to maximise parking capacity in Waverly Road without compromising road safety. Recommendations are for the restrictions to now terminate 3 meters north of the boundary of 23-25 Waverly Road.

#### Traffic flow on Kings Road and visibility concerns at the Junction of Capthorne Avenue and Kings Road

- 2.67 Ward Councillors highlighted concerns over disruptions to traffic flow on Kings Road when the bus stop opposite Chichester Court is occupied. They requested that double yellow line restrictions should be extended from the junction of Capthorne Avenue to ensure parking is kept clear in this location and traffic flow is maintained. Furthermore, all of the ward members raised concerns about poor visibility for vehicles travelling southbound on Kings Road approaching the junction on Capthorne Avenue.
- 2.68 Officers feel that due to the limited number of buses servicing the stop and that this is not a particularly busy stop the impact on traffic flow is considered minimal and does not warrant the permanent removal of six parking spaces. Furthermore, given the characteristics of Kings Road, officers would be concerned that removing the parking spaces may encourage vehicle speeds to increase.
- 2.69 With regards to the visibility concerns raised by Ward Councillors officers agree with their concerns and recommend that the double yellow lines on the north eastern corner of the junction are extended 10 meters from the junction to encourage motorists to adhere to the highway code and ensure adequate junction visibility.

### Location of the proposed parking bay on West Avenue adjacent to 54 Village Way

- 2.70 Councillors support residents request for the location of the parking bay adjacent to 54 Village Way to be relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway. It is believed that the bay is currently located in a location where motorists turning off Village Way will not be expecting vehicles to be parked and it could therefore be unsafe.
- 2.71 Having investigated the impact of relocating the bay officers recommend the original proposal for the bay to be located on the western side of West Avenue should be maintained as relocating it to the eastern side would result in a reduction in parking capacity due to the rear private access to 52 Village Way. Furthermore, officers feel that councillors' concern that motorists will not be expecting vehicles to be parked a safe distance from a junction raises minimal safety concerns.

### Double yellow line restrictions in The Gardens

- 2.72 Councillors support the requirement for the double yellow line restrictions on the two junctions of The Gardens with Rayners Lane. However, Councillors support the residents in their views that the proposals extending into The Gardens are unnecessary as motorists are unlikely to park along the section of carriageway where they are proposed due to the narrow width.
- 2.73 From experience officers have found where there are area wide restrictions, like within a CPZ, in locations where there are no restrictions motorists are more likely to park. Although residents feel it is unlikely, one concern is that motorists may attempt to park partially on the footway allowing access for smaller vehicles but leaving insufficient space for emergency service access.
- 2.74 Initial proposals included double yellow line restrictions throughout the full length of The Gardens however subject to discussions with the Fire Brigade these restrictions were reduced to the current proposals which encourage vehicles not to park in an obstructive manor and ensure access within 30 meters of all properties within The Gardens. Given these findings officers recommend that the proposals remain unchanged.

### **Summary**

- 2.75 Notwithstanding the objections detailed above to the proposed CPZ, there is general support to implement the proposals as advertised.
- 2.76 Having considered the objections and comments it is recommended that the proposed CPZ be implemented as shown in **Appendix G** and **Appendix H** for the benefit of the majority of residents within the proposed CPZ.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2.77 The estimated cost of the scheme is £40K. This funding has been allocated in the parking programme of schemes which was agreed by the panel in February 2011 and is funded from the Harrow Capital programme.



### **Risk management Implications**

- 2.78 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. The risk register is included in the Community & Environment Directorate Risk Register.

### **Equalities Implications**

- 2.79 A review of equality issues at the design stage of the scheme has indicated no adverse impact or illegal discrimination on any of the specified equality groups. There will be some positive impacts of the scheme on all equalities groups, particularly people with mobility difficulties.

### **Corporate priorities**

- 2.80 The parking policies detailed in the report accords with our wider corporate priorities as follows:
- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
  - Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
  - United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
  - Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses
- 2.81 The principle of enforcing parking controls is also integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's LIP.

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

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 25/05/11		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 03/06/11		

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

**Contact:** Elliott Hill, Project Engineer - Parking and Sustainable Transport,  
Tel: 020 8424 1535, Fax: 020 8424 7662,  
E-mail: [elliott.hill@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:elliott.hill@harrow.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers:**

Minutes of Stakeholders meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009.

Report to TARSAP on Burnt Oak Broadway Area Proposed Parking Controls –  
Public Consultation Results 16 September 2010.

Report to TARSAP on Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual  
Review 2 February 2011.