

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	1 December 2004
Subject:	Stanmore CPZ – Review of Existing CPZ’s and possible extension - Consultation Reports
Responsible Officer:	Interim Head of Environment and Transport
Contact Officer:	Steve Swain
Portfolio Holder:	Environment and Transport
Key Decision:	No
Status:	Part I

Section 1: Summary

Decision Required

- 2. Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder):**
- 2.1 that the Panel recommends:**
- (a) that the existing Stanmore Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone B be extended as shown at Appendix M;**
 - (b) that further consultation be carried out in parallel with statutory consultation in Charlbury Avenue, Craigweil Close and Laburnum Court and if further consultation shows there is no support for inclusion in the CPZ, these roads be excluded from the scheme;**
 - (c) that the existing Stanmore Station Controlled Parking Zone H be extended to include London Road (to Court Drive) and Snaresbrook Drive as shown at Appendix M;**
 - (d) that further consultation be carried out in parallel with statutory consultation in the proposed Zone H extension referred to in (c) above to establish if there is support for inclusion in the proposed Monday to Saturday extension and if further consultation shows there is no support, these roads be excluded from the proposals;**
 - (e) that a Controlled Parking Zone be created in Howberry Road between Cloyster Wood and Wychwood Avenue including Howberry Close as shown at Appendix M to operate, Monday to Friday, 2pm – 3pm;**
 - (f) That the traffic orders be amended to incorporate the on-street business permit facility for both zones;**
 - (g) that the existing “pay and display” spaces in the Broadway be amended to shared use, “pay and display”/business permit holders operating from 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Saturday;**
 - (h) that the free parking space in Merrion Avenue be converted to 18 shared use “pay and display”/residents/business spaces operating from 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday as shown at Appendix K;**
 - (i) that double yellow line waiting restrictions be introduced in Stanmore Hill at its junctions with Fallowfield, Park Lane, Hilltop Way and Springfield Close as shown at Appendix O;**
 - (j) that the existing 8 am to 6.30 pm yellow line waiting restrictions on the south side in Gordon Avenue at its junction with Old Church Lane be extended to the eastern wall of 7 Gordon Avenue as shown at Appendix P;**
 - (k) that double yellow line waiting restrictions be introduced in Gordon Avenue at its junction with Water Gardens as shown at Appendix P;**
 - (l) that the existing double yellow line waiting restrictions in Elm Park on the west side be extended northwards to a point opposite the common boundary of 4 and 6 Elm Park as shown at Appendix P;**
 - (m) that officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design in accordance with Appendices K, M, N, O and P for order making purposes and to take all necessary steps under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders the details of which be delegated to officers and implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections, the statement of reasons to be “to control parking” and**
 - (n) inform the head petitioners accordingly.**

Reason for report

To gain agreement for the way forward with a view to implementation of parking controls to address the Council's stated priority of enhancing the environment and encouraging more sustainable transport activity.

Benefits

- Responding to residents' requests.
- CPZs incorporating residents' parking schemes can improve:
 - Safety
 - Access
 - Residential amenity
- CPZs can assist management of parking in town centres to ensure more short stay shopper/visitor spaces are available.

Cost of Proposals

The estimated cost of the re-consultation and possible extension would be in the region of £70,000. Approximately £20,000 would be spent in the current financial year and the remainder in 2005-06. There are sufficient funds in this year's CPZs budget to cover this year's costs of the scheme. Next year's budget allocations are not known at this time but see paragraph 2.4

Risks

The scheme is on the Controlled Parking Zone and Residents' Parking Scheme's programme for implementation in spring 2005. It has already slipped by about six months. The likely implementation date would be autumn 2005. The impact on the CPZs programme would be minimal.

Implications if recommendations rejected

Possible dissatisfaction with the outcome of the consultation from residents in some areas, under-expenditure of allocated funding, possible knock on effect on the Controlled Parking Zones programme. Possible loss of contributory funding from developers.

Section 2: Report

2.1 Brief History

The existing Stanmore CPZs (Zones B and H) were introduced in 1994, and extended in 1996 and have remained unchanged since. Zone B has a one hour control (3pm-4pm) Monday to Friday and pay and display bays operating 8.00am – 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday in the shopping area. Zone H, around the Stanmore Station operates Monday to Saturday with a one hour control in the morning (10am – 11am) and in the afternoon (3pm – 4pm).

- 2.1.2 The Council's consultant has carried out a review of the existing Controlled Parking Zones (Zones B and H). As part of this work, the consultant has undertaken a public consultation exercise with residents/businesses within the existing zones and those within the possible extension areas. The consultation area is shown at Appendix A. The properties in a large area outside the existing zones were included in the consultation in order to inform them of the possible extension of the CPZ and to find out whether they wished the existing CPZs to be extended to include their road. The consultation area was chosen in accordance with requests from members and the local community to address a number of parking problems at various locations. Among these are the college, the area between Marsh Lane and Canons Park Station and certain streets north of the shopping area and station.
- 2.1.3 The opportunity was also taken to consult the residents/businesses in Stanmore Hill between Fallowfield and The Common including the side roads on a yellow line waiting restrictions scheme. The proposal is designed to deal with complaints concerning visibility problems caused by parked vehicles when exiting some of the properties and the side roads.
- 2.1.4 The consultation document for the existing zones is shown at Appendix B. The possible extension to Zone B document is shown at Appendix C and the possible extension to Zone H document is at Appendix D. The Stanmore Hill yellow lines consultation document is shown at Appendix E.

2.2 Options considered

See consultation.

2.3 Consultation

- 2.3.1 Ward councillors were consulted about the proposed review and possible extension of Zones B and H through two Stakeholder meetings (see minutes of two stakeholder meetings at Appendix F). All Ward Councillors were sent a copy of the consultation leaflets. Ward members have also been consulted on the outcome of the consultation and the way forward (see paragraph 2.3.12.7).
- 2.3.2 Consultation was undertaken in September 2004, with approximately 7000 leaflets being hand delivered to residents / businesses within the area shown at Appendix A.
- 2.3.4 A telephone hotline was provided by the consultants who gave residents and businesses the opportunity to discuss in detail the proposals and make observations.

2.3.5 The response rate for each individual study area is set out below: -

STUDY AREA	APPROXIMATE NO. OF LEAFLETS DELIVERED	LEAFLETS RETURNED
Review of existing Zones B and H	1486	249 (17%)
Possible Extension to Zone B	4187	1254 (30%)
Possible Extension to Zone H	1005	278 (28%)
Stanmore Hill yellow line waiting restrictions	81	48 (59%)

2.3.6 The overall response rates are considered good for this type of consultation exercise. The responses have been placed in Members' Library.

2.3.7 During the consultation period three parking roadshows were organised. Table 1 shows a list of the locations and attendance figures. A comments book for visitors was provided at the roadshows. The summary of comments is shown at Appendix G and the comments book has been placed in Members' Library.

Table 1 - Roadshows

DATE	LOCATION	TIME	APPROXIMATE ATTENDANCE
Saturday 11 September 2004	Stanmore Library	11.00am-4.00pm	300
Tuesday 14 th September 2004	Bernays Memorial Hall, Neville New Room	10.00am - 4.00pm	100
Thursday 16 th September 2004	Bernays Memorial Hall, Neville New Room	3.00pm-8.00pm	50

2.3.8 Study Area Responses

2.3.8.1 The consultation sought the views of residents / businesses about the existing CPZs (Zone B and Zone H) and also aimed to establish the extent of the perceived parking problem in the areas surrounding the two zones. Table 2 below shows how residents within the existing zones considered the existing parking controls had helped. Table 3 shows the perception of a parking problem, in the possible extension areas.

Table 2 - Ease of parking

STUDY AREA	MUCH EASIER / EASIER	NO DIFFERENT	MUCH HARDER / HARDER
Existing Zone B and Zone H	85 (34.2%)	69 (27.7%)	74 (29.8%)

Table 3 – Parking problems

STUDY AREA	NO PARKING PROBLEM	PROBLEMS PARKING
Possible Extension to Zone B	920 (73.4%)	303 (24.2%)
Possible Extension to Zone H	188 (67.6%)	83 (29.2%)

2.3.8.2 Table 4 below provides a summary of whether the residents / businesses in the existing zones felt the existing hours of control should change. Table 5 provides a summary of responses for extending parking controls within the possible extension areas.

Table 4 – Hours of operation

STUDY AREA	REMAIN THE SAME	BE LONGER	BE SHORTER
Review of existing Zone B and Zone H	144 (57.8%)	49 (19.7%)	37 (14.9%)

Table 5 – Support for extension of zones

STUDY AREA	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Possible Extension to Zone B	280 (22.3%)	933 (74.4%)	32 (2.6%)
Possible Extension to Zone H	78 (28.1%)	184 (66.2%)	9 (3.2%)

2.3.8.3 The majority (57.8%) of respondents have indicated that the existing hours of operation should remain the same.

2.3.8.4 In the areas that were consulted for a possible extension, the majority of respondents indicated that they did not experience parking problems. A significant number of callers on the telephone hotline, as well as at the open days, indicated that they had no parking problems and were too far away from Stanmore Town Centre and Stanmore Station to be affected.

2.3.8.5 A summary of responses is contained at Appendix H (Review of Existing Zone B and Zone H), Appendix I (Possible extension to Zone B) and Appendix J (Possible new Zone H).

2.3.9 Review of existing Zone B and Zone H

2.3.9.1 The consultation results generally revealed that residents and businesses were happy with the way that the existing zones are operating. The results

did not indicate any clear support to change the operational days or hours of the existing zones (see Appendix H).

2.3.9.2 Some roads in zone B did indicate that there was a requirement for longer hours of control (see Appendix H). Out of those who preferred different hours of control (86 responses), the largest single majority (36%) preferred to have one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon. A total of 17.4% indicated that they wanted 8.30am - 6.30pm restrictions while 20.9% made an alternative suggestion.

2.3.9.3 Dennis Gardens clearly indicated that they wanted longer hours of control. One hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon is the favoured option. It would be confusing to introduce different hours of control for just one road. It is recommended that no alterations be made to the operational days and hours of the existing zones.

2.3.9.4 It is recommended that the existing "pay and display" spaces in the Broadway be amended to shared use, "pay and display"/business permit holders operating from 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Saturday. It is also recommended that the free parking spaces in Merrion Avenue be converted to 18 shared use "pay and display"/business/resident permit holders operating from 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday (see Appendix K). It is also recommended that the traffic orders be amended to incorporate the on-street business permit facility (at designated spaces) for both zones.

2.3.10 Petitions

2.3.10.1 A total of 17 petitions (see table 6) against parking controls were received during the consultation and a further two afterwards. A number of these were also submitted to Cabinet on 14 October. The general gist of the petitions is that there are no parking problems where the petitioners live and that no CPZ is necessary. The petitions are generally from residents a considerable distance away from either the boundary of the existing CPZ or from the Town Centre and where parking problems are likely to be less of a problem. An extract from each petition is at Appendix L and the full petitions have been placed in the Members' Library. The results of the consultation are consistent with the opposition expressed in all the petitions. It is therefore recommended that these roads/areas be excluded from the proposals.

Table 6 – List of petitions

	Road(s) represented	number of signatures
1	Gordon Avenue, Sunningdale Close	44
2	Gleneagles - Gordon Avenue	27
3	Conway Close	8
4	The Chase, Conway Close, Gordon Avenue	36
5	Gordon Avenue	9
6	Green Lane, Culverlands Close	43
7	Green Lane, Cherchefelle Mews	29
8	Courtens Mews	22
9	Wolverton Rd, Savernake Court, Kenilworth House	49
10	Abercorn Road, Barn Crescent, Golf Close, Belmont Lane, Stuart Cottages, Strawberry Cottages, Aberdeen Cottages, Sunningdale Close, London Road, Stonegrove, Winscombe Way, Wetheral Drive, Thirby Cottages, Quadrangle Mews Wolverton Road, Lansdowne Road	149
11	Temple Mead Close	22
12	Colman Court - Gordon Avenue	24
13	Greyfell Close	11
14	Wychwood Close, Wildcroft Gardens, Howberry Road (between Cloyster Wood and Du Cros Drive)	118
15	Wychwood Close	28
16	Wentworth place	5
17	Peters Close	37
18	Silverston Way	55
19	Holland Close, Holland Walk	33

2.3.11 Possible extension to Zone B

2.3.11.1 Generally the responses received indicate that as an area there are few parking problems and that respondents are not in favour of parking controls (see Appendix I). This indicates the lack of support for the scheme in areas that are a considerable distance away from either the existing

boundary or the Town Centre where parking problems are likely to be less of a problem.

- 2.3.11.2 Most of the responses in favour of the introduction of parking controls, have come from the roads that have parking problems and are generally situated on the periphery of the existing zone. Table 7 lists the roads where the majority of respondents (55% or more) support the introduction of parking controls.

Table 7 – Roads in favour of a scheme

Aran Drive	Capuchin Close
Carr Close	Chambers Walk
Chandos Court	Culverlands Close
Dennis Lane	Goodhall Close
Halsbury Close	Hewett Close
Hill Close	Howberry Close
Lemark Close	Linden Close
Nelson Close	Rainsford Close
Sandymount Avenue	September Way
Stangate Gardens	Trenchard Close
Water Gardens	Woodside Close

- 2.3.11.3 A number of these roads are either unadopted or are in isolated areas away from the existing zone boundary or are not in an area where there is a cluster of support to be included in the extension of Zone B.
- 2.3.11.4 The majority of respondents indicated that they would like any extension to Zone B to apply Monday to Friday (see Table 8) as existing zone.

Table 8 – Days of operation

STUDY AREA	NO REPLY	MONDAY - FRIDAY	MONDAY – SATURDAY	MONDAY – SUNDAY
Which days would you like it to apply?	458 (36.6%)	639 (51.0%)	83 (6.60%)	73 (5.80%)

- 2.3.11.5 The highest single support for the operational hours was for a scheme to operate one hour a day (see Table 9). There is no clear indication as to a standard operating time among those in favour of the extension of the zone (see Appendix I).

Table 9 - Hours of operation

STUDY AREA	NO REPLY	ONE HOUR A DAY	ONE HOUR AM AND ONE HOUR PM	ONE HOUR AM OR PM AND ONE HOUR EVENING	8-30AM – 6.30PM	ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION
Which of the following time periods would you prefer?	394 (31.4%)	511 (40.8%)	185 (14.8%)	9 (0.70%)	18 (1.4%)	91 (7.3.%)

- 2.3.11.6 Around the college, there was support for parking controls to operate longer than the existing one hour a day. Generally there was support for a scheme to operate one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon. However the area is too small to be considered for a sub zone operating different hours.
- 2.3.11.7 The Ridgeway respondents are split 50% for and 50% against the extension (see Appendix I). As there is no clear mandate, it is recommended that the road is not included in the proposed extension. Alternatively, The Ridgeway could be included in the traffic order with a proviso that they be re-consulted in parallel with statutory consultation. The road could then be excluded if the result of the re-consultation justified it.
- 2.3.11.8 Stanmore College is opposed to further parking controls in the area and has indicated that alterations to the existing regime is likely to have a severe effect on their operations. The college is understood to have about 300 staff and about 150 off-street spaces. This they maintain is insufficient and have requested that they should be accommodated if the zone is extended. The residents have identified the college as a source of their parking complaints. It would not be practical to improve the situation for the residents if the college is also to be accommodated. Businesses are expected to cater for their own parking needs. However, if a scheme is introduced a limited number of shared use “pay and display”/businesses spaces could be provided close to the college to assist them.
- 2.3.11.9 Green Lane respondents are also split with 20 in favour and 21 against. There are three culs-de-sac in Green Lane (Woodside Close, Ben Hale Close and Culverlands Close). All of these taken together show that there are 29 responses in favour and 26 against. Considering also the two petitions against, it is recommended that Green Lane and associated roads are not included in the scheme. Alternatively, these roads could be included in the traffic order with a proviso that they be re-consulted in parallel with statutory consultation. The roads could then be excluded if the majority view is against parking controls.

2.3.11.10 Elsewhere, the respondents indicate little overall support for an extension of the zone. However, there is support for the extension in a number of roads on the periphery of the zone. Table 10 lists the roads where there is majority support amongst the respondents. It is recommended that consideration be given to extending the zone into the roads listed in Table 10 and shown at Appendix M and detailed at Appendix N, operating Monday to Friday 3 pm – 4 pm (as existing Zone B), except for Howberry Road (between Cloyster Wood and Whychwood Avenue) and Howberry Close (see below).

2.3.11.11 The area between Cloysters Wood and Dalkieth Grove between the railway line and Marsh Lane (Canons Park Station area) was included in the consultation as a result of requests from Canons Park Residents' Association (CAPRA). There is only support for a scheme in Howberry Road (between Cloyster Wood and Whychwood Avenue) and Howberry Close (13 for and 4 against). A new zone could be created to include these residents. A yellow line waiting restrictions scheme is operating in the area south of Cloyster Wood to Whitchurch Lane. Such schemes are not appropriate as they disadvantage many residents and their visitors since no on-street parking would be permitted during the restricted hour(s). There are always some residents who rely on the on-street spaces for their parking needs. The existing yellow line waiting restrictions scheme operates Monday to Friday 2pm – 3pm. It is recommended that Howberry Road (between Cloyster Wood and Whychwood Avenue) and Howberry Close be considered for a new Controlled Parking Zone incorporating a residents' parking scheme operating Monday to Friday 2pm – 3pm (see Appendix M).

Table 10 – Proposed roads for extension

Aran Drive	Sandymount Avenue (part not already in existing CPZ)
Coverdale Close and Rainsford Close	Lemark Close
Halsbury Close	Nelson Road
Hill Close	September Way and Laurimel Close
Hewett Close	Howberry Road (Cloyster Wood to Wychwood Avenue)*
Stangate Gardens	Howberry Close*
Dennis Lane (London Road to Eaton Close)	Eton Close

* The road shown would form a new zone.

2.3.11.12 There have been no responses from Charlbury Avenue and Craigweil Close. Both of these are at the boundary of the existing zone and if the extended zone is to include the adjacent Sandymount Avenue further parking pressure is likely to be placed on these roads. Laburnum Court respondents are not in favour of parking controls, but they are also likely to be affected by displaced parking as a result of the proposed extension (see appendices M and N and M). It is therefore recommended that

Charlbury Avenue and Craigweil Close and Laburnum Court be included in the proposed extension of the zone but the residents be consulted again when the statutory order is advertised. If the majority view indicates a preference for no parking controls, they would be excluded from the zone at that stage.

2.3.12 Possible extension to Zone H

2.3.12.1 There is support in London Road and Snaresbrook Drive only. However, an overwhelming majority (70%) of those in favour have indicated a preference for a Monday to Friday scheme (see Table 11). This is different to the operational days of the existing Zone H, which is Monday to Saturday. Saturday events at Wembley stadium have been a source of complaints previously and Monday to Friday operation is likely to be problematic in this area which is close to the Station. It may also be difficult to identify a suitable location for a change in the operational days for signing purposes. It is recommended that London Road and Snaresbrook Drive properties be re-consulted reminding them of the Wembley events and seeking clarification before an informed decision about the hours of operation can be reached. This could be done in parallel with statutory consultation. It is therefore recommended that Zone H be extended to include the section of London Road (to Court Drive) not already in the zone and Snaresbrook Drive as shown at Appendix M and detailed at Appendix N. Should the results of the re-consultation still show a preference for a Monday to Friday scheme, the proposal can be downgraded accordingly.

2.3.12.2 Elsewhere, the majority of respondents (apart from Rees Drive which is unadopted) indicate that they do not have a parking problem and do not wish to see parking controls introduced.

Table 11 – Days of operation

STUDY AREA	NO REPLY	MONDAY - FRIDAY	MONDAY - SATURDAY	MONDAY - SUNDAY
Which Days would you like it to apply?	67 24.10%	151 54.30%	35 12.60%	25 9.00%

2.3.12.3 The most popular option for the operational hours was for a scheme to operate one hour a day (see Table 12), which again is different to the current operational hours of the existing Zone H. However, the London Road and Snaresbrook Drive respondents are 19 in favour of one hour operation 17 in favour of one hour am and one hour pm as existing and 4 are in favour of 8.30 am to 6.30 pm operation. Therefore, there is majority support for one hour am and one hour pm or longer operation. It follows that the existing Zone H one hour am and one hour pm operation is likely to be acceptable to the residents.

Table 12 – Hours of operation

STUDY AREA	NO REPLY	ONE HOUR A DAY	ONE HOUR AM AND ONE HOUR PM	ONE HOUR AM OR PM AND ONE HOUR EVENING	8-30AM – 6.30PM	ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION
Which of the following time periods would you prefer?	40 14.4%	132 47.5%	65 23.4%	5 1.8%	18 6.5%	28 10.1%

2.3.12.4 Stanmore Hill between Fallowfield and The Common

2.3.12.5 The responses in table 13 below show there is no support for the proposal shown at Appendix E. The main reason for the lack of support is the loss of parking. It is therefore proposed to substantially reduce the extent of the proposed yellow line waiting restrictions as shown at Appendix O. The revised scheme would address mainly the visibility problems at the junctions with the side roads.

Table 13 –Stanmore Hill proposed yellow line waiting restrictions

Road Name	Number of Properties	Number of replies		Support proposal		Broadly support proposal		Do not support proposal	
Park Lane	24	18	75.0%	4	16.7%	2	8.3%	12	50.0%
Hilltop Way	12	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%
Springfield Close	28	9	32.1%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%	6	21.4%
Stanmore Hill	11	12	109.1%	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	6	54.5%
The Common	6	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%
Total	81	48	59.3%	11	13.6%	8	9.9%	29	35.8%

2.3.12.6 The opportunity has been taken to include the introduction of double yellow line waiting restrictions at the junction of Water Gardens with Gordon Avenue and other alterations to existing waiting restrictions to deal with visibility and obstructive parking complaints (see Appendix P). These proposals formed part of the detailed consultation drawings which were on display at the roadshows. Some alterations have been made in response to the comments received.

2.3.12.7 It is recommended that the proposals shown at Appendices K, L, M, N, O and P be progressed to statutory consultation as described in the foregoing and minor adjustments to the scheme be delegated to

officers. Any amendments would be carried out prior to the statutory consultation.

- 2.3.12.8 Further consultation has been carried out with Councillors David Ashton, Marilyn Ashton and Camila Bath. They have suggested that roads/areas with a majority in favour of a scheme should be considered for inclusion where the response rate has been 35% or more. The roads in favour where the response rate has been less than 35% should be considered for re-consultation. Councillor David Ashton has advised that the remaining ward members support this approach. In their view the roads in table 14 should be included in the extension of the CPZs (Zones B and H) without re-consultation and those in tables 15 and 16 be re-consulted. It follows that a decision on the way forward would need to be deferred until the re-consultation has been carried out. This would be a departure from recent practise and the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which advocates streamlining of the process. To speed up the procedure, in recent times, any necessary re-consultation has been carried out in parallel with the statutory consultation. Some of the roads in table 15 where there is no support have been deleted from the proposed extension and those in table 16 are to be re-consulted in parallel with traffic order advertising.
- 2.3.12.9 Separate re-consultation (not in parallel with statutory consultation) would delay implementation. The scheme is currently on the programme for implementation in spring 2005. This has already slipped to autumn 2005 and re-consultation would delay the introduction of the scheme to spring 2006.
- 2.3.12.10 Apart from the Edgware CPZ extension which is due to be implemented in January 2005, this is the only CPZ on the programme for investigation/implementation in this financial year (notwithstanding slippage). Edgware CPZ would be unaffected if a separate re-consultation is carried out. There are two schemes on the CPZs programme for consultation in 2005-06 (Harrow Town Centre Review and South Harrow Stage 3). The timetable for implementation of both schemes is 2006-07. These would also be unaffected as two separate teams are handling them. Any re-consultation will be carried out by consultants but officer time would be spent to brief and manage them and to deal with the outcome. Whilst re-consultation would not affect the CPZ programme, there would be a knock on effect on other work such as the local safety schemes and 20 mph zones programmes. The impact on these would be difficult to quantify. (See paragraph 2.4 for financial implications).

Table 14 – Zone B responses

Road name	Number of properties	Number of replies	% Return	Are you in favour of parking controls?							
				No reply		Yes		No		Don't know	
					%		%		%		%
Arran Drive	68	26	38	1	4	21	80	3	12	1	4
Coverdale Close including Rainsford Close	21	8	38	0	0	7	88	1	12	0	0
Halsbury Close	4	2	50	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Hewett Close	12	5	41	0	0	4	80	0	0	1	20
Lemark Close	12	9	75	0	0	9	100	0	0	0	0
Stangate Gardens	8	3	38	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
Woodside Close	5	3	60	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
Totals	130	56	43	1	2	49	88	4	7	2	4

Table 15 – Zone B possible extension responses

Road name	Number of properties	Number of replies	% Return	Are you in favour of parking controls?							
				No reply		Yes		No		Don't know	
					%		%		%		%
Ben Hale Close	9	4	44	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25
Culverlands Close	31	7	23	0	0	5	62	3	38	0	0
Eaton Close	47	12	26	1	8	6	50	5	42	0	0
Gordon Avenue (part)	71	35	49	0	0	5	14	30	86	0	0
Green Lane	123	46	37	1	2	20	44	21	47	3	6
Hall Farm Close	10	2	20	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
Hill Close	24	4	17	0	0	3	75	0	0	1	25
Howberry Close*	33	11	33	0	0	9	8	2	18	0	0
Howberry Road* (part)	75	22	29	0	0	8	36	14	64	0	0
Linden Close	7	1	14	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Nelson Road	34	10	29	0	0	7	70	3	30	0	0
Sandymount Avenue (extension area)	46	12	26	0	0	9	75	3	25	0	0
September Way	146	32	22	0	0	18	56	12	38	2	6
Laurimel Close	4	4	100	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0
The Ridgeway	44	18	40	0	0	9	50	9	50	0	0
Uxbridge Road (part)	49	7	14	1	14	2	29	3	43	1	14

Water Gardens	18	3	17	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0
Charlbury Av	8	0	0.								
Craigweil Cl	19	0	0								
Totals	819	238	29	3	1	115	48	112	47	8	3

* Howberry Road and Howberry Close will form a separate zone.

Table 16 - Zone H possible extension responses

Road name	Number of properties	Number of Replies	% return	Are you in favour of parking controls							
				No reply		Yes		No		Don't know	
					%		%		%		%
London Road	45	21	46	3	14	10	47	8	38	0	0
Snaresbrook Drive	48	26	54	0	0	13	50	11	42	2	8
Totals	93	47	51	3	6	23	49	19	40	2	4

Note: Property figures only include properties within the proposed extension

2.4 Financial Implications

2.4.1 Consultation so far has cost approximately £30,000. Transport for London (TfL) has contributed £10,000 towards the costs. The Council has secured contributory funding of £7,000 from the developer of the former Government Offices site in London Road to introduce an extension to the existing CPZ. The time limit for funding is 6 February 2006. The Council has also secured £20,000 from Sainsbury's to review the parking controls immediate vicinity of their Elm Park development. The time limit for this is 19 March 2006. Any shortfall will be covered by this financial year's CPZs' allocation of £100,000.

2.4.2 The estimated cost of a separate re-consultation (as suggested by ward members consulted) is in the region of £10,000. The recommended re-consultation of the proposed extensions in parallel is likely to cost in the region of £1500. The reason for the difference is that there would 16 more roads up for re-consultation in the former method. Additionally, separate re-consultation would also require a further report to the Executive.

2.4.3 A bid of £100,000 has been made for CPZ investigations and implementations in each of the next two financial years. It is anticipated that any monies not used in this financial year would be transferred to the next. This year's budget would be under-spent by about £50,000. Assuming this can be carried over, it could be used to fund implementation of the scheme in 2005-06. There are two schemes for consultation in the next financial year (Harrow Town Centre Review and South Harrow). Also assuming the £100,000 capital bid for CPZs

in 2005-06 is agreed, the cost of re-consultation can be absorbed without affecting other schemes on the CPZ programme.

2.5 Legal Implications

2.5.1 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions can be implemented under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

2.6 Equalities Impact

2.6.1 Not applicable.

Section 3: Supporting Information/Background Documents

Appendices:

- Appendix A - Consultation area
- Appendix B - Existing zones review consultation document
- Appendix C - Extension to Zone B Consultation document
- Appendix D - Extension to Zone H Consultation document
- Appendix E - Stanmore Hill waiting restrictions consultation document
- Appendix F - Minutes of two stakeholder meetings
- Appendix G - Summary of roadshow comments
- Appendix H - Summary of existing zones B & H responses
- Appendix I - Summary of extension to zone B responses
- Appendix J - Summary of extension to zone H responses
- Appendix K - Proposed Merrion Avenue "pay and display"/business spaces
- Appendix L - Petitions
- Appendix M - Proposed Zones B and H extension and proposed new zone
- Appendix N -Detailed plans
- Appendix O - Proposed Stanmore Hill yellow line waiting restrictions
- Appendix P - Proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions and alterations to existing waiting restrictions

Background papers: Controlled Parking Zones and Residents' Parking Schemes 2004-5 programme, consultation, petitions.