## Statement by Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport

## Re: PHD 069/04 - Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone Review

Grounds for call-in

22.5(a)

1. "Paragraph 2.3.11.11 on page 13 of the Officers' Report to TARSAP on 1 st December 2004 reached the conclusion that an extension of the existing yellow line only CPZ north of Whitchurch Lane should be in the form of a Residents' Parking Zone and that this stemmed from approaches made by CAPRA. CAPRA strongly deny this and claim that the preferred option was a simple extension of the yellow line only CPZ."

Canons Park Residents' Association (CAPRA) have been requesting the review of the existing yellow line waiting restrictions scheme for some time now. Their request was considered in March 2004 by TARSAP/Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder as part of the annual review of the Controlled Parking Zones/Residents' Parking Schemes Programme. No priority was given to the review and the area remained on the unprogrammed list. As a result of further representations by CAPRA, the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel in March 2004 suggested to CAPRA a possible way forward. This involved CAPRA carrying out a public consultation in their proposed area of extension to assist the Council in formulating a scheme. This offer was not taken up by CAPRA. The review of the Stanmore CPZ provided the opportunity to carry out a consultation to gauge the level of support for a scheme in the area.

Two stakeholder meetings were held at the outset to determine the type or extent of the areas that needed to be included in the consultation. CAPRA were invited to both of these meetings. They attended the first meeting only, but did not raise any issues.

The officer report indicated that "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". There is no suggestion in the report that the scheme that was offered in the consultation document was CAPRA's preferred option. Yellow line waiting restrictions schemes which are preferred by CAPRA discriminate against those residents who rely on on-street spaces for their parking needs. It is worth noting that when the existing yellow scheme south of Cloyster Wood was introduced in 2002 a number of complaints were received about the lack of residents parking facilities during the restricted hour.

2. "Since Members of the Panel were likely to have been influenced in reaching their decision to make the extension an RPZ by the way paragraph 2.3.11.11 had been worded, an opportunity should be provided for this to be reconsidered."

This was debated at the Panel meeting and an officer explained that whilst CAPRA are requesting a yellow line waiting restrictions scheme, this is not reflected in the message conveyed by the residents. The residents have voted for a residents' parking scheme the details of which were fully explained in the consultation. In the discussion which followed amongst Panel members and back benching ward members present, the Panel came to the conclusion that a yellow line option would be an inferior scheme. Consequently, they

recommended the residents' parking scheme with a proviso that the residents be written to explaining the advantages of the proposed residents' parking scheme.

3. *"In addition, statistical data resulting from the Council's consultation exercise was relatively inconclusive. At the very least residents in the roads concerned ought to be reconsulted and provided with clear details of the options under consideration."* 

The residents were consulted on a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) incorporating a residents' parking scheme. This was clearly explained in the consultation document. The response from Howberry Close and Howberry Road (between Cloyster Wood and Whychwood Avenue) was conclusive (13 for and 4 against). There were nine responses from Howberry Close, eight for and one against. The responses from this part of Howberry Road were, five in favour and three opposed. None of the respondents from Howberry Close in favour had expressed a preference for a yellow line scheme. Two of those in favour from Howberry Road had indicated a preference for a yellow line waiting restrictions scheme. The reason given in both was the that they would have to pay for a permit. This appears to be based on a misunderstanding. Essentially, the only difference between a yellow lines scheme and a residents' parking scheme is the provision of on-street parking spaces to accommodate those residents and their visitors who do not have sufficient off-street spaces for their needs. Only those who need to park on-street during the hour of operation of the scheme would need to purchase a permit. Those who do not need to park on-street during the restricted hour would not need to purchase a permit. Permits would not be required for parking outside the proposed hour of operation of the scheme (2 pm to 3 pm, Monday to Friday). Therefore, it is difficult to understand CAPRA's stance given that the proposed scheme offers the same restrictions as a yellow line waiting restrictions scheme but with the added benefit of accommodating the residents by allowing them to buy a permit to park on-street during the restricted hour if they want to.

In summary, CAPRA was consulted by way of the key stakeholder meetings and the residents were consulted on a residents' parking scheme. The merits of the proposed scheme as opposed to a yellow line waiting restrictions scheme were fully debated at the Panel meeting and there is insufficient justification for delaying the scheme for further consultation.

## 22.5(b) – Minutes of TARSAP meeting which form basis of decision not yet published nor draft of such minutes seen by Conservative Nominated Member.

The minutes of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting on 1st December 2004 have been available to the public since 16th December, when they were published on the internet, and the minutes were also circulated to the Borough libraries on the same date. The responsibility for the accuracy of the draft minutes lies with the Director of Legal Services. Statutory provision is that a Committee will receive the minutes of its previous meeting for confirmation (and/or amendment) at its next meeting.

The minutes were part of the documentation sent to the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder to inform his decision. All of that documentation, including the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel minutes, was published to the internet prior to the decision being taken.