

**REPORT FOR: TRAFFIC AND ROAD  
SAFETY ADVISORY  
PANEL**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	8 February 2012
<b>Subject:</b>	Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual Review
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Brendon Hills – Corporate Director – Community and Environment
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Phillip O’Dell, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes, Following Consideration by the Portfolio Holder
<b>Enclosures:</b>	<p><b>Appendix A:</b> Borough-wide map of Controlled Parking Zones/Residents’ Parking Schemes</p> <p><b>Appendix B:</b> Proposed priority list for 2012/13 to 2013/14</p> <p><b>Appendix C:</b> Stages involved in preparing a CPZ</p> <p><b>Appendix D:</b> Schedule of Requests and Issues within Borough</p>

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides general information about the identification, development and implementation of parking management schemes in Harrow. It also provides details of requests and representations received, and assesses and recommends priorities for new schemes in 2012/13.

### Recommendations:

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

- i) To agree that the practice of automatically reviewing parking schemes after 6-12 months be abandoned and that any issues following scheme implementation be considered in the next annual review.
- ii) To agree the priority list of parking management schemes for 2012/13 as shown in **Appendix B**, subject to confirmation of funding at Cabinet on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012,
- iii) to authorise officers to carry out scheme design and consultation on the schemes in **Appendix B**,
- iv) To authorise officers to implement the schemes in **Appendix B** subject to a further report and receiving the Panel's recommendation to proceed.

**Reason:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes programme for 2012/13.

## Section 2 – Report

### Background

- 2.1 The annual review of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and other parking schemes is the means by which the parking management schemes programme for the forthcoming financial year are set. This takes account of progress to date, available budgets and current issues.
- 2.2 The council's programme of CPZ reviews has historically been demand led and addresses parking pressures highlighted by local residents and businesses. Progress on the CPZ programme priority list agreed by this Panel in February 2011 is shown in the separate progress report on the agenda for this meeting.

- 2.3 This annual parking review for the borough as a whole includes assessments of existing CPZs and requests for new or extended CPZs, including petitions and other representations received in the last 12 months. The previous programme of works reported in the annual review of February 2011 has been updated in relation to progress on schemes.
- 2.4 **Appendix B** shows the recommended programme and priority list for the next 3 years and also the list of schemes which are not programmed. The list is based on the previous agreed priority list, allowing for schemes that have been completed, other events during the year that might have affected the programme, and available funding. The estimated cost of the programme is also shown. The programme takes into account the council's current financial position, staff resources and capital programme (due to be confirmed at cabinet on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012).

### **Options considered**

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

### **Operating principles**

- 2.8 A CPZ is an area where parking is restricted during a regular period or periods of the day (the operational hours) as specified on signs in and around a defined zone. Other parking restrictions can exist within the zone (which is different from the operational hours), for instance on main roads, which are separately signed. At its simplest a CPZ may just consist of just single yellow lines, but they normally incorporate parking bays. In most cases these are permit bays such as those designated for use by residents. In shopping or commercial areas pay and display bays are used which allow for short term parking for customers during the working day. For flexibility some bays are designated for shared use, which allow for the display of either a permit or a pay and display ticket. Almost all permits are issued to residents whose addresses are within the defined zone. Residents may also purchase permits for visitors. Businesses may also purchase permits for operational purposes only but these are strictly controlled and only a few permits have been issued. For example they can be issued to, doctors, health care workers, etc but there are strict eligibility criteria in place.
- 2.9 CPZs therefore provide preferential parking access for permit holders (e.g. residents) during the hours of the zone. Whilst the zone hours in some instances may be only one hour in the middle of the day, this effectively protects parking in residential areas from long stay duration parking by commuters or local workers. Disabled blue badge holders are allowed to park free of charge in all parking bays except those designated for a special purpose, such as doctor's parking bays.
- 2.10 Schemes which use waiting restrictions only (yellow lines) within CPZ schemes where there is no demand for on-street residents' parking have the advantage of being cheaper and more environmentally friendly because the only signs normally needed are at the entry/exit points (signs don't need to be repeated within the zone where the restrictions are the same as those shown on the entry/exit points). However such schemes should be used with great caution, as even a minority of residents who need on-street parking for themselves or their visitors will also be affected and may be severely disadvantaged. There are already locations such as the area around Canons Park Station where such schemes, implemented in the past, are resulting in requests for resident's permit bays, probably because of increasing car ownership per household.
- 2.11 **Appendix A** is a borough map showing the locations of existing CPZ's. Existing CPZ cover about 22% of the borough road network and have been developed over the last 25 years in response to demand from the public.
- 2.12 In addition to the development and implementation of CPZs an initiative to progress a localised safety parking schemes programme (LSPS),

previously known as “Problem Streets” has been taken forward. Examples of this type of scheme are waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions and bends, where refuse vehicles and the emergency services have reported persistent access difficulties. These schemes are generally outside of CPZs and are a valuable initiative primarily targeted at improving road safety and facilitating adequate vehicular access. The Panel agreed a more formalised evaluation process to prioritise requests for these types of control which was reported at the meeting in June 2011. Progress on LSPS schemes is included in the progress report submitted to each panel meeting.

### **Annual review process**

- 2.13 The programme over the last few years has included an early review of any implemented schemes, generally 6-12 months after scheme implementation. This has been used to examine any unforeseen effects of parking controls implemented as well as giving residents the opportunity to see for themselves the effects of a scheme when it has settled down. Generally this has enabled people at the periphery of parking controls or areas where majority support was not demonstrated originally to be reassessed quickly if circumstances change.
- 2.14 These reviews are relatively expensive to carry out as they require a similar level of assessment, consultation, processing of legal traffic orders that are required for the original scheme. These costs have been factored into the programme. However, the reduction in the level of funding available this year and potentially future years means that undertaking early reviews is not sustainable if requests for new schemes in areas without any parking control are to be tackled in a reasonable time frame.
- 2.15 Taking into account the considerable volume of requests for looking at parking problems and reviewing existing CPZ areas it is recommended that the policy on automatic reviews is reconsidered. This explored further in the section below titled “scheme consultation and reviews”.

### **Scheme Costs**

- 2.16 Although the estimated costs of schemes shown in this report have been reviewed to best reflect likely costs of both consultation and implementation, the process is not able to be accurately forecast since in many cases the costs are dependant on the views of the public. The estimates relate to the total cost of developing and implementing the proposals and includes:
  - a) Staff time in carrying out consultation and scheme designs including site surveys. This includes all correspondence, telephone and personal visits to the civic centre or site.

- b) The preparation, printing and distribution of all consultation material, reply paid postage, analysis of data, updating of website.
  - c) Arranging and staffing exhibitions where appropriate including venue costs and display equipment.
  - d) Preparation of reports and other documents such as briefing notes
  - e) Drafting and advertising draft traffic orders and orders of making.
  - f) Replacing existing CPZ signs (where relevant) that don't contain the operation times following the commitment by Cabinet a number of years ago.
  - g) Setting out and implementing scheme of lining and or signing.
  - h) Dealing with related complaints and comments.
- 2.16 It can be seen that there are significant costs associated with preparing a scheme apart from just the implementation of any physical works on street.
- 2.17 Members may be aware that the partnership contract with Enterprise Mouchel (EM) for delivery of works expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012. The contract has been re-tendered and at the time of writing a new contract with another contractor is being awarded. It is understood that the new contract rates will enable savings to be made on works on street. However a comparison of the prices for parking work has yet to be undertaken.

### **Parking controls at junctions**

- 2.18 The occurrence of dangerous or obstructive parking has continued in recent years due to increasing vehicle ownership and usage. It continues to represent a large proportion of complaints from the public be it residents or businesses and continues to be of concern to the emergency services and council refuse collection service. This is despite the introduction of CPZs and especially if their operational hours are limited say to one hour.
- 2.19 Even with all day parking controls in force problems can occur at evenings and weekends. To address this double yellow lines are now being proposed at all junctions within a proposed zones and immediately surrounding CPZ zones. Although the Highway Code states that drivers should not park within 10m of a junction, this distance is used as a starting point and the actual distance required may be less than 10m and is determined by using a computer simulation programme to determine the swept path of a large vehicle such as a refuse vehicle or fire appliance. Although the council is under

no requirement to provide on-street parking, this procedure allows as much on street parking that can safely be accommodated as possible.

### **Public perception of schemes**

- 2.20 As parking pressures increase, there is a public perception that CPZs will increase on street parking provision when in practice it might not always be possible to make space for all the residents' own vehicles. Whilst schemes are designed to maximise on street parking space the overall quantity of spaces provided during the controlled hours may actually reduce due to the need to apply design standards. This is of course compensated by the fact that demand to park reduces because there are vehicles that are ineligible to obtain permits meaning that available space is dedicated to permit holders (residents). This is of relevance in residential roads with vehicle crossovers to private parking where some configurations can mean that only one or two vehicles spaces can be accommodated between crossovers taking into account space for vehicles manoeuvring in and out of properties.
- 2.21 This, together with waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposals at junctions, leads to CPZs being more contentious with residents wanting the beneficial effects but not wanting any disadvantages and has the effect of increasing the level of resources required to deal with these issues. Increasingly during consultation residents respond that they consider the council is trying to make money rather than the desire to help those residents who are requesting help. It is observed in consultation responses over the last few years that references to money have increased and this is influencing people's decision making.

### **New types of scheme**

- 2.22 It has previously been reported that the Department of Transport (DfT) have been carrying out a trial in CPZs in areas such as cul-de sacs. With special site authorisation it has possible to simply put a sign at the entrance to the road stating permit holders only beyond this point followed by the times of operation. There is no need to mark out bays although some double yellow lines may be necessary.
- 2.23 This has a number of advantages in that it minimises the signing and lining with aesthetic and cost benefits. It also means that it is easier to make adjustments on these types of road that are already within a CPZ where there is a desire to change the hours of control to that of the main CPZ. There are three roads in Stanmore where this type of scheme is about to be implemented. The DfT have just announced that they are going to make regulation soon to allow authorities to implement these measures without specific authorisation. This will reduce the time and resource need to implement these schemes.

## Scheme consultation and reviews

- 2.24 The length of the process for investigating and designing a CPZ is influenced by the extent of consultation undertaken. A summary of the typical stages involved in the current process is shown in **Appendix C**.

The logic to this approach is explained in previous annual review reports. A consequence of this approach is that reviews of the larger CPZs in particular can take 12 to 18 months or even longer in difficult locations, from start to finish. Concern continues to be expressed that it takes so long to implement measures and that the programme is slow to respond to specific needs. The process (shown in **Appendix C**) requires local consultation on detailed proposals and statutory consultation to ensure any scheme properly reflects the needs of the community as a whole and is defensible against minority objections.

- 2.25 In September 2007 the Panel accepted a revised approach whereby there was automatic consultation in roads just beyond an extension or new CPZ between 6 to 12 months after its implementation subject to evidence of displaced parking and availability of funding. The benefits have been:

- It will be less critical determining the first detailed consultation area as, providing there is an extension, further consultation can be matched to new parking patterns;
- occupiers in the second consultation will be able to see the effects on parking caused by the extension rather than having to anticipate parking problems, which may or may not materialise;
- where there was insufficient support in roads in the first consultation they would have a second opportunity to be consulted without waiting for the next full review.
- As well as an opportunity for extending parking controls there is a similar opportunity to remove sections with majority support, as was recently carried out in a road in Wealdstone

- 2.26 The cost of the 6-12 month reviews is a significant part of the programme budget and the question that has to be raised is whether this is sustainable in a programme that has experienced a downward trend in allocation from Harrow's capital programme.

- 2.27 The effect of including the 6-12 month reviews would be to reduce the number of new schemes that could be undertaken or major reviews of existing controls that have traditionally occurred 5-10 years after implementation.



- 2.28 It is suggested that in order to prevent some areas even being considered for consultation and implementation of any parking measures in a reasonable time frame that this general 6-12 month review is abandoned. Instead issues raised would be reported to the panel in the following years February annual parking report to the panel so that consideration. In this way consideration can be given to the most urgent items without automatically seriously impacting on the delivery of new schemes to meet the public's requests.
- 2.29 The table in **Appendix B** shows indicative costs of any scheme reviews in comparison with the costs of new parking schemes. It is proposed that this approach feature in future annual parking reports.

### **Other Funding Sources**

- 2.30 Funding that could support the parking management programme are possible through section 106 developer contributions via planning applications where parking controls needed to facilitate development are required. Monthly liaison meetings are held with the planning department so that the public's aspirations for parking controls and opportunities to address existing problems in the vicinity of development can be met. Increasingly over the last few years it has become more difficult to obtain the actual funds from S106 agreements. There is ongoing work between both transportation and planning departments to minimise such problems in future agreements.
- 2.31 For 2012/13 there are ongoing discussions being held with the education department in the vicinity of the nine schools where expansion is envisaged from 2013. This involves one additional class each year which will probably result in additional parking pressures from staff and parents. Complaints were received at some school sites following the age transfer changes several years ago. It is hoped that some funding can be made available to review parking around each of the schools and, following local consultation, try and prevent some of the obstructive parking problems experienced elsewhere. This subject will be reported to future panel meetings in the regular progress reports.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2.30 Transport for London (TfL) has not provided funding specifically for CPZs in recent years as it considers that these should be funded by boroughs. TfL only funds parking measures where they form a part of an identified traffic, public transport or cycling scheme in the agreed Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment.
- 2.31 The funding available for 2012/13 from the Harrow Capital programme is likely to be £300K, of which £260K is for CPZ /parking reviews and £40K for the local safety parking schemes programme. These

amounts are due to be confirmed at the Cabinet meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012.

- 2.32 It is expected that allocations for future years will be about £300K and this assumption has been used to compile the programme shown in **Appendix B**. In the current economic climate it is no longer appropriate to significantly populate the future years programme as there is a risk that it will raise expectations that cannot be fulfilled.

### **Risk management Implications**

- 2.33 Risk included on Directorate risk register? Yes
- 2.34 There is an operational risk register for transportation projects which covers all the risks associated with developing and implementing physical alterations to the highway. This would include the schemes detailed in the proposed programme in this report.

### **Equalities Implications**

- 2.35 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
- 2.36 CPZ schemes were included in the Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was approved by full Council. The LIP was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where schemes were identified as having no negative impact on any equality groups. In addition, all CPZs have a positive impact on those with mobility difficulties as more spaces are identified for disabled parking. As a result of double yellow lines at junctions, there is also increased protection at junctions which will protect dropped crossing and prevent dangerous parking at these locations and thereby further assist those with mobility difficulties.
- 2.37 Each Scheme that is developed has a design risk assessment undertaken which includes an assessment of the impact on equalities issues. In addition all consultations are subject to issue of the councils corporate Equality Monitoring Forms. The returned forms are subject to analysis to ensure that they reflect the local community by comparing them to data held by the council at the time such as Census, vitality profiles. Any significant differences are used to adapt future consultations and would be reported to the Panel as part of the scheme reports.

### **Corporate priorities**

- 2.38 The parking scheme detailed in the report accords with our wider corporate priorities as follows:

Corporate priority	Impact
Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe	Parking controls make streets easier to clean by reducing the number of vehicles on-street during the day, giving better access to the kerb for cleaning crews. Regular patrols by Civil Enforcement Officers deter criminal activity and can help gather evidence in the event of any incidents.
United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads.	The council has listened to the community in recommending a scheme that meets the needs of the majority of respondents who favour parking controls, whilst retaining the status quo where the majority do not support parking controls.
Supporting and protecting people who are most in need	Controlled parking zones generally help vulnerable people by freeing up spaces for carers, friends and relatives to park during the day. Without parking controls, these spaces would be occupied all day by commuters and other forms of long stay parking.
Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses.	The changes to parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to serve more customers.

### Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 19/01/12		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 19/01/12		

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

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

### **Background Papers:**

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