

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

Date of Meeting:	21 st June 2012
Subject:	Hatch End Parking Scheme
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	John Edwards – Divisional Director, Environmental Services
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor 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 – Consultation Area Appendix B – Tabulated summary of consultation results for Hatch End Broadway area Appendix C – Copy of consultation document and questionnaire Appendix D – Copy of consultation stakeholders meeting 29 July 2010 Appendix E – Proposals location plan

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report informs the Panel of the results of the public consultation undertaken to introduce pay & display parking in the Hatch End Broadway area. It seeks the Panel to recommend a course of action to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

Recommendations:

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

1. That the following elements of the scheme listed below are taken forward (see appendix E) and further consultation undertaken:
 - Undertake a statutory consultation on making Grimsdyke Car Park become Pay & Display - Mon-Sat, 8am – 6:30pm at a charge of 20p per hour,
 - Undertake a statutory consultation on making Uxbridge Road parking bays (near Hatch End station) become Pay & Display – Mon-Sat, 8am – 6:30pm at a charge of 10p per 20 mins and £4 for parking stays in excess of 6 hours,
 - Develop revised proposals for residential streets surrounding the Hatch End Broadway area including Anselm Road and undertake a public consultation.
2. Abandon the Hatch End parking scheme and reassign any surplus funds to Pinner CPZ Review which is the next priority on the programme (as agreed by the panel meeting 8th February 2012).

Reason: (For recommendation)

As a consequence of the inconclusive results of the public consultation a range of options is available to the Panel to choose from. The panel can decide whether to take forward parts of the scheme, undertake new consultations or abandon the scheme and assign funds to another scheme in 2012/13.

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

- 2.1 Parking has a significant impact on the quality of life of Harrow's residents and a significant impact on the viability of Harrow's businesses and is one of the main concerns reported to the Council regarding transport issues. This report sets out how parking issues raised in the Hatch End area are being addressed in order to support local residents and businesses.

Options considered

- 2.2 The public consultation proposals were developed from meetings with stakeholders and members and took into account as many of the comments received as possible. The options available to local people were to show support or opposition to the proposed scheme and also to offer comments as necessary to help in deciding how to move forward with the scheme.

Background

- 2.3 On 30th November 2005, TARSAP instructed officers to investigate the feasibility of implementing parking controls in the service roads in Hatch End. The matter was originally reported to TARSAP in February 2007 and has remained on the programme. The Portfolio Holder only agreed recently that a public consultation could proceed on a parking scheme.
- 2.4 In July 2010 a stakeholder meeting was held with local residents, businesses and councillors to hear their concerns about traffic and parking in the Hatch End area. This was originally intended to discuss both parking and traffic concerns in The Broadway area because there were a number of schemes planned for the area in 2010/11. However as a result of the ongoing council review into parking charges the parking scheme proposed was delayed pending an outcome and it was agreed that the traffic scheme would proceed first. Subsequently a comprehensive traffic management scheme along Uxbridge Road was developed which addressed some of the issues raised at the meeting.
- 2.5 The traffic scheme which was completed in the spring of 2011 included some minor changes to the existing parking arrangements (yellow lines and new disabled bays) and resulted in a 'loss' of about 14 parking spaces. In conjunction with this London Overground decided at that time to re-introduce parking charges at Hatch End station which caused some

of this parking to transfer to nearby streets and increased the parking pressure in The Broadway area.

- 2.6 Taking into consideration these concerns raised by the local traders, the council developed parking proposals to help find a balance between residents, customers and commuters using the existing parking facilities in the Hatch End area. It was these proposals that formed the basis of the consultation document delivered to local residents in March 2012.

Public consultation

- 2.7 The public review consultation took place during March 2012. A copy of the consultation document and questionnaire can be seen in Appendix C. The consultation was available on the Harrow Council public website and was hand delivered to a consultation area of approximately 1550 residential and business premises. This is the area indicated by the dash-dot line in the overview plan in **Appendix A**.
- 2.8 After a request from the Hatch End Residents Association for a wider consultation area, posters advertising the proposals and public exhibition were placed both in The Broadway and in some streets outside the original consultation area. The poster locations are also shown in **Appendix A**.
- 2.9 There were a steady number of returns received both online and via the postal service from throughout the consultation area. This indicated to officers that all the roads within the consultation area received the consultation documents and that there was a good and accurate delivery service provided by the delivery company contracted to carry out this work. It was also apparent that a significant number of returns were coming from outside the consultation area.
- 2.10 At their invitation, officers have had meetings with the Hatch End Trade Association and the Hatch End Residents Association to discuss traffic and parking related issues.
- 2.11 There were **451** responses received overall from the Hatch End Broadway area, with **1550** addresses delivered to within the consultation area. These were by return of the questionnaire, email and web submissions. This represented an overall return rate of **29.1%**. It should be noted that a significant number of leaflets were given out at the public exhibitions and that the consultation was well publicised in the local press. This may explain the good overall response rate. A tabulated summary of the responses for each road can be found in **Appendix B**.
- 2.12 The council also received a number of petitions and requests from interested parties.

Petition - Hatch End Trade Association:

- 2.13 A petition with 86 signatures from traders opposed to the introduction of parking charges was presented at the 8th February 2012 TARSAP meeting.
- 2.14 A response was sent on 10th February 2012 asking the Trade Association to encourage local businesses to individually respond to the public consultation, so that officers and councillors have the maximum amount of detailed information on which to make future decisions.

Petition - Jigsaw Nursery (Grimsdyke Car Park):

- 2.15 A petition with 94 signatures from staff and users of the nursery opposed to the introduction of parking charges.
- 2.16 A response was sent on 28th March 2012 informing Jigsaw Nursery that their petition would be reported to 21st June 2012 TARSAP meeting and that at the same meeting, the results of the Hatch End Broadway Parking Review will also be considered.
- 2.17 During the consultation period informal contact with a local resident highlighted the possibility that Grimsdyke car park was protected by a covenant prohibiting the council from charging for parking. The matter was referred to the council's legal department and it has subsequently been confirmed that the Land Registry title for the Car Park area does not contain any covenant against charging for Car Parking.

Petition - Anselm Road:

- 2.18 A petition with 29 signatures was received from residents requesting parking controls in their road if the proposals to introduce Pay & Display go ahead.
- 2.19 A response was sent on 21st March 2012 informing the residents that their petition would be reported to 21st June 2012 TARSAP meeting and that at the same meeting, the results of the Hatch End Broadway Parking Review will also be considered. In the response, the residents were asked if they wanted parking controls irrespective of whether the proposals to introduce Pay & Display parking went ahead. The residents responded that they wanted parking controls regardless of any decision on the proposals, as they already have a problem with large vans and cars parking all day.
- 2.20 With residents already experiencing displaced parking, even before any decision on the proposals, members may wish to bring forward a

consultation on a residential parking zone as detailed in the Parking Schemes Programme, TARSAP 8th February 2012.

- 2.21 The petitions from Jigsaw Nursery and the residents of Anselm Road will be presented to 21st June TARSAP meeting separately.
- 2.22 Quality assurance checks have been carried out on the responses from both consultations and a copy of all replies received in response to the consultations are available for members to review in the members' library.

Analysis of public consultation results

- 2.23 An analysis of the responses to the questionnaire is shown in the table below.

Question 1: Are you responding to this questionnaire as a resident or business?

	Number
Total responses	451 (100%)
Responding as a resident	388 (86.0%)
Responding as a business	53 (11.8%)
Responding as a both	10 (2.2%)

Question 2: Do you consider there are parking problems in your street?

	Number
Total responses	451 (100%)
Number of responses who said YES	199 (44.1%)
Number of responses who said NO	235 (52.1%)
Number of responses who had no opinion	17 (3.8%)

Question 3: Do you support the proposed introduction of Pay & Display parking bays in the Hatch End Broadway area?

	Number
Total responses	451 (100%)
Number of responses who said YES	116 (25.7%)
Number of responses who said NO	310 (68.7%)
Number of responses who had no opinion	25 (5.6%)

Question 4: Do you support the proposed change to the existing loading bays in Anselm Road and Cornwall Road?

	Number
Total responses	451 (100%)
Number of responses who said YES	127 (28.2%)

Number of responses who said NO	226 (50.1%)
Number of responses who had no opinion	98 (21.7%)

2.24 The questionnaire responses have also been analysed on a road by road basis. This is shown in **Appendix B** and provides more detail about response rates in individual roads.

2.25 As well as answering the four specific questions respondents were also asked to provide any other relevant comments. Where common comments were identified these have been grouped together and summarised as follows:

Displaced Parking

2.26 Displaced parking was highlighted in 163 responses (36.1%). Respondents were concerned about the possible impact on available parking spaces in the side roads off The Broadway and believe the proposals will increase the number of vehicles parking in adjacent roads. Should the local parking pressure increase, the council may recommend a consultation on a control zone, as detailed in the council's parking schemes programme, TARSAP Feb 2012.

Initial free parking period

2.27 Allowing a free parking period before pay & display charges apply was highlighted in 86 responses (19.1%). Respondents would like to see a free period, ½ hour or 1 hour provided. The council's current policy regarding parking charges does not allow this, however, the current ongoing borough wide review of charges is considering the viability of concessionary levels of charge in smaller commercial centres.

Local trade will be adversely affected

2.28 The fear that local trade will be adversely affected was highlighted in 39 responses (8.6%). Respondents believe that the proposals will adversely affect local trade and may force some shops to close. Whilst there is a possibility that pay & display may discourage shoppers/customers from visiting the Hatch End area it is also possible that the recent parking problems will continue to discourage people from visiting Hatch End.

Provide a 1 hour parking restriction during the day

2.29 Considering the option of a 1 hour parking restriction during the day was highlighted in 34 responses (7.5%). Respondents commented that they would like to see a period of the day where no one would be able to park, say 1 hour. Respondents believed that this would prevent commuters from long term parking, thereby freeing up valuable parking space. This type of control has already been tried in other parts of the borough and

has caused problems with local traders affected by the loss of trade during the control period which would prevent anyone from parking.

Too many disabled parking bays in the service road: 27 (6.0%)

- 2.30 The number of disabled parking bays in the service road was highlighted in 27 responses (6.0%). Respondents commented that there were too many disabled parking spaces in the service road and that they were not fully utilised. These were introduced as a result of the traffic scheme implemented in 2011 and were provided to ensure that suitable access is available to Blue Badge holders for local amenities, retail units and restaurants. Formal and informal surveys show the bays are well used.

Activities based around Grimsdyke car park

- 2.31 Grimsdyke car park was highlighted in 22 responses (4.9%). Respondents were concerned about the impact that charges would have on local groups and activities based in and around Grimsdyke car park. The proposed charging would not affect people driving vehicles into the car park that were dropping off and picking up passengers for activities associated with the nursery. Vehicles are permitted to do this without incurring any charge. However, if vehicles are left parked and unattended for a period of time then charges would apply in the same way as in other controlled areas. The level of charging is proposed as 20p per hour which is relatively low when compared to other similar areas in the borough. A petition received regarding this point can be seen in the Petitions report on the agenda for this meeting.

Summary and conclusion

- 2.32 This public consultation has highlighted a wide range of differing views from the respondents. The following key points can be concluded:
- The response rate was comparatively high compared with other consultations (29%) and is a representative view,
 - There are marginally more people that feel that parking isn't a problem (50%) but still a significant proportion that do (44%),
 - The proposals in their current form were not well supported (more than 50% against).
 - Most respondents were residents (86%),
 - Many residents were concerned about parking displacement occurring onto nearby uncontrolled streets (36%),
 - Most businesses were concerned about parking charges being levied in front of the main shopping frontage in the service road (2 petitions received) and in the car park and the impact on trade.
- 2.33 It is clear that the proposal in its current form cannot proceed. However, whilst the current proposal has no consensus it is also clear that some

measures are still desired to address local parking problems. On this basis it is obvious that a different set of proposals may be able to achieve a more positive outcome.

2.34 In respect of levying parking charges the Council's policy is to introduce charges where this would improve parking accessibility and be a tool to manage demand. Hatch End is an area which is largely uncontrolled, one of only two local centres in the borough, and as a consequence it does have problems with long stay or all day parking in the central area. This denies access for people that want to park for a short duration and stifles trade by restricting the turnover of parking needed by shoppers to be able to park close to shops.

2.35 Officers have reviewed the results in detail and consider that an alternative scheme could still be put forward. A number of factors need to be taken into account in this regard:

- There is still a significant proportion of people in the area that feel that there are parking problems to be addressed (44%) so developing a revised set of proposal for consultation targeted at specific areas identified in the comments received and through stakeholder meetings could be considered.
- Many residents reacted to the impact of potential parking displacement (36%) due to the controls focussing on the central commercial area in isolation. Many residential streets do suffer with some displacement parking already and therefore consideration of residents permit parking or one hour working day restrictions in surrounding streets does need consideration. Many residents may feel this was overlooked in the original scheme proposal. For example, Anselm Road has sent a petition indicating a desire to have parking controls irrespective of the outcome of consultation.
- There are existing issues highlighted at the stakeholders meeting such as parking displacement around Hatch End Station and improving access to short stay parking in the main shopping area that are still significant issues. Taking forward parts of the scheme in isolation could help to address these problems.
- Making only Grimsdyke Car Park subject to controls would provide some limited short stay parking facilities to improve access to the central area whilst recognising the main objections of the traders to controls in the service roads by shop frontages. Introducing charging in Grimsdyke Car Park would not affect vehicles intending to set down or pick up passengers for the nursery or other local amenities because charging only applies to vehicles that are left unattended for a longer period of time. The controls in this location would also be of significant benefit to people with mobility impairment requiring closer

access to the central area and improve their prospect of finding available short stay parking in a convenient location.

- Making parking bays on the Uxbridge Road close to Hatch End Station would also regulate the impact of the existing displaced parking from the Station car park.

2.36 If the Panel consider that there is no overall support for the current proposal and no prospect of successfully promoting a viable scheme then the scheme could be abandoned. If this was the recommendation then the funds allocated to the Hatch End scheme would be transferred to the next scheme in the programme which is the review of the Pinner CPZ.

2.37 If the Panel consider that a viable alternative scheme could be taken forward then officers would recommend the following:

- Undertaking a statutory consultation on parts of the scheme in isolation as shown in **APPENDIX E** which would include Grimsdyke car park and the parking bays close to Hatch End Station,
- Developing measures to restrict commuter / long stay parking in residential streets close to the centre and undertaking consultation to establish resident's views.

2.38 If this option was agreed by members then the measures in **Appendix E** would proceed to statutory consultation and be reported back to the next meeting of TARSAP for consideration. During the statutory consultation comments or formal objection to the proposal may be made and the Panel would still be able to decide on whether the scheme should proceed or be abandoned.

Financial Implications

2.39 This scheme is part of the parking management programme. There is a Harrow Capital allocation for this programme of 300k in 2012/13. A sub allocation of 70k has been assigned to this scheme by TARSAP in February 2012.

2.40 The proposed parking charges in the option to undertake statutory consultation (20p per hour in the car park and 10p per 20 mins on street) are compatible with the charging rate proposed for local centres as a part of the current borough wide review of parking charges. The review of parking charges is ongoing and will be considered by Cabinet later on in the year.

Risk Management Implications

- 2.41 Risk included on Directorate risk register? Yes.
- 2.42 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 this report. The risk register is included in the Community & Environment Directorate Risk Register.

Equalities Implications

- 2.43 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes.
- 2.44 A review of equality issues was undertaken as a part of the design risk assessment stage of the scheme and has indicated no adverse impact on any of the specified equality groups. There are positive impacts of the scheme on some equalities groups, particularly, women, children and people with mobility difficulties. Benefits are likely to be as follows:

Equalities Group	Benefit
Disability	Improved availability of short term parking and additional provision of blue badge holder disabled bays in closer proximity to local shops / amenities. This will help disabled people with mobility impairment and wheelchair users.
Age	Improved availability of short term parking in closer proximity to local shops / amenities. This will help elderly people with restricted mobility. Restrictions on parking at crossing points will make it safer to cross the road particularly for the young and elderly.
Sex	Mothers with young children or pregnant women are more likely to benefit from parking spaces as close as possible to their destination.

- 2.45 As part of the consultation process, the councils' corporate Equality Monitoring Forms (EMF) was sent out with each set of documents. Of the 451 consultation responses received 246 (55%) residents completed and returned the EMF and fall broadly in line with expectations of the makeup of the community expressed in the 2009/2010 Harrow Vitality Profiles document. Some returns were not completed correctly and some contained comments regarding the necessity of such information for a parking scheme. Therefore officers consider the consultation is valid and

representative of the community and further assists the council in its obligations under the Equality Act 2010

Corporate Priorities

2.46 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 & display facilities will support local businesses to serve more customers.

2.47 The principle of enforcing parking controls is also integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's adopted LIP.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 01/06/12		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 31/05/12		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Paul Newman – Team Leader Parking and Sustainable
Transport Tel: 020 8424 1065
E-mail: paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

TARSAP report dated 8th February 2012