

Canons Park Station Parking Review Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

Date: 12th July 2011
Time: 7:30pm
Venue: St Lawrence Parish Church, St Lawrence Close, Middlesex. HA8 6RB

Present

Councillor Nizam Ismail	Meeting Chairman and Queensbury Ward Councillor
Councillor Susan Hall	LB Harrow – Leader of Conservative Group
Councillor John Nickolay	LB Harrow – Transport Spokesman for Conservative Group
Councillor Barry Macleod-Culliane	LB Harrow – Belmont Ward Councillor
Councillor Manji Kara	LB Harrow – Belmont Ward Councillor
Councillor Sachin Shah	LB Harrow – Queensbury Ward Councillor
Paul Newman	LB Harrow - Parking and Sustainable Transport Team Leader
Elliott Hill	LB Harrow - Project Engineer

29 various stakeholders also attended including residents and business holders

Apologies

Councillor Jerry Miles	LB Harrow – Deputy Chair TARSAP and Roxeth Ward Councillor
Councillor Nana Asante	LB Harrow – Edgware Ward Councillor
Councillor Mrinal Choudhury	LB Harrow – Edgware Ward Councillor
Councillor Zarina Sheikh	LB Harrow – Queensbury Ward Councillor
Councillor Lynda Seymour	LB Harrow – Belmont Ward Councillor

Appendix

Appendix A – A plan outlining an agreed public consultation boundary

Minutes

Introduction

1. The Chair, Councillor Nizam Ismail welcomed and thanked everyone for attending the meeting.
2. Councillors and Officers were then invited to introduce themselves to stakeholders.
3. Councillor Nizam Ismail passed on apologies for those who had sent notification they would be unable to attend.

Introduction to Consultation Process

4. PN explained the three key steps of the consultation process. The stakeholder meeting, public consultation and finally the statutory consultation.
5. PN highlighted that it was important to hold the stakeholder meeting to gather the views of those living in the area and for everyone to hear each others views. In addition to this at the end of the meeting the aim is to agree a consultation boundary and what options are to be included in the consultation documents.
6. PN informed attendees of the importance of returning their forms and that the outcome of the responses will determine what proposals officers move forward with and what may be implemented.
7. PN explained that funding for the scheme had come from two sources, firstly S106 funding had been secured from the new development on Honeypot Lane, known as Fountain Place. This funding has restrictions in place and will therefore be supported by Harrow Council funding in areas which are not covered by the agreement.

Discussion on Parking Problems

8. A resident of the eastern end of Buckingham Road informed the meeting that they suffer from commuter parking from primarily Edgware Station in addition to Canons Park.
9. The same resident also highlighted safety and congestion concerns regarding the recurring problem of taxi drivers parking on the junction of Buckingham Road and Whitchurch Lane. It was highlighted how well the Burnt Oak CPZ works along with requesting that enforcement takes place in this location.
10. A resident highlighted that on Buckingham Road vehicles regularly park over private accesses, block visibility and create congestion, particularly when delivery vehicles use the road.
11. A resident from Whitchurch Lane raised concerns that the displaced parking from the new development on Hitchin Lane is creating a safety hazard at the junction with Whitchurch Lane. In addition to this once the 2-3pm waiting restriction outside the station parade shops has passed residents park in the service road leaving no spaces for potential customers to access the shops.
12. A resident from Cheyneys Avenue stated the sole problem he experiences is from commuters. The resident went onto point out that the existing single yellow line restricting vehicles between 2-3pm stops one third of the way along Cheyneys Avenue and should be extended.
13. A resident pointed out that the proposals should not just solve the problems that might be experienced during the Olympics due to people using Canons Park Station to access events but a should be a long term solution to problems in the area.
14. It was highlighted from a resident in Bromefield that commuters park from 8am onwards until late in the evening. This caused various problems including, private accesses being blocked, obstructive parking on narrowings and bends creating congestion and safety hazards by blocking visibility. In addition to these concerns

the resident stated that due to Whitchurch School these problems are increased due to vehicles parking on the footway when children are going to or returning from school. Requested that action is taken.

15. A different resident from the area stated that there was actually 3 schools in close proximity and that all roads surrounding Bromefield should be included within the review.
16. A resident from Buckingham Avenue stated they had been requesting parking restrictions since 1998 and that all the roads surrounding Buckingham Road had received them. It was pointed out that historically vehicles had parked on the outside of the bends which was fine but due to a change in parking behaviour vehicles now park on the inside of the bends where there is more parking capacity. As a result this has resulted in poor visibility and access concerns for some residents. This occurs from 7am in the morning and has led to confrontations between neighbours and vehicles driving on the pavement. It was also highlighted that they also shared safety concerns at the junction of Buckingham Road and Whitchurch Lane. Furthermore it was highlighted that due to congestion, vehicles had to drive on the footway and when they could get through, the humps were not an effective deterrent and vehicles were speeding.
17. A resident from Cheyney's Avenue commented on the problems experienced from commuters parking in the sections of the road not subject to the one hour restriction from 2-3pm. States that they regularly get blocked in and out of their drive by vehicles overhanging their drive and questions why only half of the carriageway is protected and raises concerns over safety.
18. A resident from Bromefield commented how vehicles parked around the edge of the roundabout and at junctions towards the northern end of Bromefield resulting in vehicles having to mount the roundabout and ruin the grassed areas which had recently been landscaped by the council. Visibility concerns were also raised at the junction of Bromefield and Wemborough Road.
19. A resident from Whitchurch Lane highlighted that residents in the area had been promised a parking review since 2001 which had never materialised and that the Canons Park Residents Association (CAPRA) appreciates that not all residents want the single yellow line with one hour restrictions but in principal CAPRA are against having to pay to park outside their properties. A number of safety concerns were also raised at various junctions, including Hitchin Lane and Whitchurch Lane along with the junction of Howberry Road and Du Cross Drive.
20. A resident from Longcrofte Road stated they had been campaigning since 2003 for a review of the parking restrictions. They highlighted by introducing permit bays residents would be given the opportunity to choose whether they wanted to pay to park outside their property and that those residents who did not wish to pay would be unaffected by their introduction as they would still be unable to park between the hours of 2-3pm.

The resident apologised to local residents as some members of their family had to park in adjacent streets during the week as they used public transport to commute to work and could not leave their cars in Longcrofte Road during the day. This highlighted that maybe not all vehicles parked in the unrestricted roads are not local commuters and that permit bays for residents may alleviate some of the congestion and obstructive parking on the periphery of the existing one hour restrictions. It was also suggested that due to having to park in adjacent streets a number of the

family's vehicles had been deliberately damaged, adding they had four police reports and that the current single yellow with the one hour restriction negatively effects house prices in the area and that one neighbour had recently lost a buyer for their property due to the lack of on street parking.

21. A resident from Cheyneys Avenue stated that some people park in the road and leave their car to go on holiday and requested permit parking to prevent this. They liked their garden and did not want to have to pave it over to park.
22. A resident from Bromefield commented on their concerns regarding emergency service access due to obstructive parking on the narrow roads in the area. It was also highlighted that commuters often leave rubbish on the carriageway and the council was unable to clean due to obstructive vehicles.
23. A resident from St Lawrence Close stated that the close led to 10 garages out the back of the properties and that is regularly suffered from commuter parking, overflow from the church car park and from people leaving their vehicles when they go on holiday.
24. A resident from Whitchurch Lane asked whether the Council could guarantee if residents purchased a permit for permit parking would they be guaranteed a parking space? And asked if there was any limit to the number of permits that maybe sold.
25. PN stated that the council could not guarantee residents a space and that the permits would only be restricted by the number of properties within the zone, although they may purchase more than one permit and visitor permits.
26. A resident from Longcrofte Road stated that they were aware that a space could not be guaranteed with permit bays but would still like the opportunity to park when spaces were available.
27. A resident from Gyles Park stated they were mainly affected by the schools in the area, however there was also a business being run out of a property in Bromefield taking up a large number of spaces. It was also suggested that a park and ride should be considered on event days at Wembley and during the Olympics to alleviate the number of vehicles coming into the area to use the trains in Stanmore and Canons Park. This was supported by a number of people present.
28. A resident from the Canons Park Estate Association (C.P.E.A) requested that officers look into providing a number of disabled spaces at the North Eastern entrance to the park off Canons Drive.
29. A resident from Longcrofte Road added that they experienced significant problems with carers visiting and quoted an example of an issue surrounding caring for their seriously ill grandmother due to the single yellow line restrictions. Having the option to purchase visitor permits would have made it significantly easier at a difficult time.
30. A business owner from Honeygot Lane stated that commuter parking had resulted in many business losing up to 50% of their business. It was claimed that the council had not done anything in response to their request over 15 years.
31. Councillor Susan Hall responded stating that a scheme had been produced about 4 years ago in response to their request to introduce pay and display parking. This had been rejected by businesses at consultation.

32. This view was supported by another business owner in the same parade who added they had to spend £10,000 to convert the rear of their property to allow vehicles a drop off location.
33. A resident of Whitchurch Lane requested that when the junction of Hitchin Lane is reviewed if restrictions could be considered to extend around into Howberry Road due to safety concerns. Furthermore it was questioned how the residents in the north of Howberry would be protected.
34. PN commented that proposals would be analysed and if there is a clear indication of majority support for proposals in one part of the street and low support in a different section of the same street then different measures in the different sections will be considered.
35. A resident highlighted that they felt the cycle lane on Whitchurch Lane was a waste of time as vehicles park in it and narrow the carriageway.
36. A fellow resident disagreed with the comments and stated that they regularly use the cycle lane and appreciates it.
37. Councillor Susan Hall commented that it is important for all residents and businesses to respond as officers want to design the right scheme. In addition to this it was highlighted she was aware of the issue with taxis at the junction of Buckingham Road and Whitchurch Lane and she would contact parking enforcement to visit the area more frequently.
38. Councillor Barry Macleod-Culliane highlighted to residents that they should consider that the Fountain Park development on Honeypt Lane was only partially completed and that upon full occupation there was likely to be further repercussions with displaced parking.
39. A resident from Whitchurch Lane stated that they had heard the developers maybe reviewing the proposed site layout to provide more parking facilities, which needs investigating and may alleviate some of the displaced parking.
40. A resident from St Lawrence Close expressed a concern that they might be disadvantaged due to the few number of properties in the close.
41. PN informed the resident that officers will be looking for a majority support from the responses received for the proposals to move forward. Displaced parking will also be taken into consideration.
42. A resident from Whitchurch Lane requested that due to Whitchurch Lane being a long road can it be examined in parts and considered in sections.
43. A resident expressed their disappointment that no Councillors from the Canons Ward had attended the meeting.
44. A suggestion to consider the Canons Community Centre for parking overflow was put forward by one resident, however it was disputed by another resident that this was owned by the council.
45. Councillor Susan Hall requested that double yellow lines are proposed at junctions to protect the junction for accessibility and visibility on grounds of safety.

46. Councillor John Nickolay re-emphasised the importance of returning the consultation documents and how this is an opportunity for the community to voice their concerns as it may be another 10 years until another review takes place in the area.

Possible solutions

47. EH explained there was a number of solutions that could be considered and that a controlled parking zone did not mean that throughout the zone all restrictions had to be the same. Restrictions can be bespoke to the parking pressures in defined areas, whether the solution is restrictions at any time, during certain hours of the day, with permit bay or pay and display. The benefit of looking at an area instead of individual locations is that you can assess the impact displaced parking will have.

48. EH also explained there was a number of misconceptions with regards to controlled parking zones. The main one being that if you live within the zone you have to pay for a permit, It was explained that this is not the case and if properties who currently have the 1 hour restriction between 2-3pm outside their property were to choose not to purchase a permit their ability to park outside their property would remain the same, however it does give the residents who wish to park the option.

Extent of area and options to be consulted upon

49. Having considered the comments received so far in the meeting and through previous correspondence received from residents and businesses EH outlined a proposed boundary for the initial public consultation to take place. After further deliberation with the floor the boundary on the attached plan in Appendix A was agreed.

50. PN explained the consultation will offer a number of options for residents to select from. The three agreed options were confirmed as – Do nothing, single yellow lines restricting vehicles from parking during certain hours and an option with restrictions during certain hours with permit bays where residents can park during these hours of control.

51. A number of residents stated that they felt the hours of control from 2-3pm were adequate to deal with commuter parking, however a number of other residents commented that they would like an additional hour in the morning to be considered.

52. One resident suggested that alternating hours of controls on different sides of the road would allow residents to park but not for commuters to leave their vehicle all day.

53. A resident stated that all the restrictions were pointless unless they are enforced and enquired whether there are sufficient numbers of civil enforcement officers working for the council.

54. A resident questioned whether anyone within a controlled parking zone can park anywhere else within the same zone.

55. PN stated that within normal controlled parking zones drivers with a permit can park anywhere within the zone, however it is possible to split zones into a number of separate areas to stop this from taking place and gave an example of preventing local permit holders driving to the station

Summary and where to we go from here?

56. PN explained that now we have a defined boundary and various details of the problems experienced within the area, officers will now look at possible solutions and move forward with a public consultation to seek a consensus of the views of the wider public.

57. PN stated that we are looking to move forward with the public consultation after the summer school holidays as many families are likely to be away at this time.

58. PN thanked everyone for their comments and input.

Summary and where to we go from here?

59. Councillor Nizam Ismail thanked everybody for their attendance and contribution, re-emphasising the importance of people returning their consultation forms.

The meeting closed at 21:40.