

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> June 2012
<b>Subject:</b>	West Harrow Controlled Parking Zone, Honeybun Estate and Whitmore School Area - results of Statutory Consultation
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	John Edwards – Divisional Director Environmental Services
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Phillip O'Dell - 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>	<b>Appendix A</b> - Consultation Documents  <b>Appendix B</b> - Tabulated summary of Statutory Consultation results  <b>Appendix C</b> – Summary of comments submitted

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This document reports the results of the Statutory Consultation carried out during February and March 2012, on the proposed changes to the existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in West Harrow and proposed new parking control areas around the Honeybun Estate and Whitmore School areas. This report requests the Panel to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to proceed with the implementation of the proposals as modified in this report

### Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that the parking schemes be implemented as set out below:

1. Bouverie Road between Vaughan Road and the existing CPZ W - be included within CPZ W with the exception of properties numbered 2-10 and 1-19 as advertised;
2. Butler Avenue - the existing section not within the existing CPZ zone V remain outside of the CPZ as advertised;
3. Butler Road - the western extremity is **NOT** removed from the existing CPZ zone W;
4. Drury Road (Vaughan Road to Sumner Road) - be included within the existing W zone CPZ as advertised;
5. Heath Road - be included within the existing W zone CPZ as advertised;
6. Sandhurst Avenue – is **NOT** included within the existing CPZ W;
7. Vaughan Road between the two existing CPZ – is **NOT** included as a part of CPZ zone W;
8. Vaughan Road near its junction with Bouverie Road – time limited loading bays or time limited Pay and Display parking bays are **NOT** installed;
9. Unnamed link road between Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue – the existing Pay and Display (P&D)/shared business permit parking bays to operate Monday to Friday 8.30am – 6.30pm and allow P&D bays to be used by CPZ zone V resident or business permit holders as advertised;
10. Bessborough Road (Roxborough Avenue to Whitmore Road) – is **NOT** to be included within the existing CPZ zone E, but yellow lines at junctions and other strategic locations for emergency vehicle access and safety purposes to proceed;
11. Honeybun Estate south (Charles Crescent, Pool Road, Wood Close, Farmborough Close) - a new CPZ be created operating Monday to Saturday with a 1 hour morning and 1 hour afternoon restriction as advertised;
12. Lascelles Avenue – be included in the new CPZ for Honeybun Estate

- south (to prevent displaced parking affecting access on this Restricted Borough Distributor Road) as advertised;
13. Merton Road - a new CPZ be created operating Monday to Friday with 1 hour morning and 1 hour afternoon restriction and Saturday and Sunday with 1 hour morning restriction as advertised;
  14. Ferring Close – is **NOT** included in the CPZ for the Merton Road area but proceed with double yellow lines at junctions and along the odd numbered side of the road for emergency vehicle access and safety purposes;
  15. Porlock Avenue between Shaftesbury Avenue and Whitmore Road – single and double yellow lines and free parking bay be installed to prevent displaced parking causing potential access issues on this Restricted Borough Distributor Road as advertised;
  16. Treve Avenue – is **NOT** included in a CPZ but proceed with installation of single and double yellow lines and free parking bays (to prevent displaced parking causing access issues on this Restricted Borough Distributor Road) as advertised;
  17. Whitmore Road (Bessborough Road to Shaftesbury Avenue) – a new CPZ is **NOT** installed but proceed with single and double yellow lines at junctions and other strategic locations for emergency vehicle access and safety purposes as advertised;
  18. Marshall Close – south side - remove the waiting restrictions from the shoulders of the parking lay-by as advertised;
  19. Vaughan Road near Bowen Road - shorten the existing permit bay away from the junction and introduce a short section of waiting restriction (in response to concerns raised by the Police) as advertised;
  20. Authorise the Service Manager – Traffic & Highway Network Management to take the necessary steps to implement the above recommendations;
  21. That residents within the consultation areas are informed of this decision.

**Reason: (For recommendation)**

To control parking in the existing West Harrow CPZ – Zone V and W as well as the area surrounding Whitmore School and the Honeybun Estate as detailed in the report. The measures are in direct response to resident and business requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and in order to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

## **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 West Harrow, Honeybun South and Whitmore School areas are being addressed in order to support local residents and businesses concerns about parking.

## **Options considered**

- 2.2 The Statutory Consultation proposals were developed from previous public consultations and took into account as many of the comments from residents and businesses as possible. The options available to local people were to support or object the proposed scheme advertised.
- 2.3 It should be noted that there is a wide range of opinion in area scheme consultation and whilst it is not possible to act on every individual comment the majority view was reflected in the recommendations made. Where specific measures are supported these are being taken forward and where there is a significant level of opposition they have been removed from the proposal.

## **Background**

- 2.4 The controlled parking zones (CPZ) V and W became operational in the West Harrow area in April 2010. Following its introduction an informal public consultation was carried out during July 2011 to review the scheme.
- 2.5 Following representations from residents during the redevelopment of Whitmore High School a separate informal public consultation was carried out in the Whitmore School and Honeybun Estate areas during September 2010.
- 2.6 The results of both consultations were presented to Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) on 20 September 2011 asking for the Panel to recommend that both schemes are taken forward to the statutory consultation stage which was subsequently approved by the Portfolio Holder.

## **Statutory consultation**

- 2.7 Following the analysis of the informal consultations presented to TARSAP, as described above, parking restrictions and CPZ schemes were developed. The proposals represented the wishes of the majority of those residents and businesses that responded to the public informal consultations.
- 2.8 A statutory consultation was then carried out during February and March 2012 and was based on the scheme proposals that were presented to TARSAP in September 2011. During a statutory consultation comments and representations are invited from the public on the measures advertised. A copy of the consultation documents and plans are shown in **APPENDIX A**.
- 2.9 The results of the statutory consultation indicate that in some areas, detailed below, that there has been a shift in attitude from the residents

and businesses in the area. This has produced results that are now in conflict with the proposals developed based on the previous responses. Some roads or sections of road now have the opposite view from the ones they initially indicated.

- 2.10 The TARSAP report of 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009 that recommended the implementation of CPZ zones V and W went on to recommend under item (14) that after 6-12 months from implementation of those zones that officers consult residents in the areas around Whitmore School, the Honeybun Estate and Bessborough Road. As previously reported to TARSAP September 2011, this review was put on hold while the results of a previous consultation were given to the West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) for their consideration and review.
- 2.11 Within the original West Harrow CPZ consultation area, 24 respondents used part or all of standard paragraphs (shown below) to object to the proposals. The majority of respondents that included this wording in their objection were residents of Butler Avenue (9 no.) and Bowen Road (8 no.) that were outside of any current or proposed CPZ area.

*I object to the CPZ Statutory Consultation in West Harrow on the basis that you did not provide me with all the information in July 2011 Consultation to allow me make an informed decision i.e. you did not explain that you were proposing a CPZ on Whitmore Road, Porlock Avenue, Treve Avenue & Lascelles which would surround West Harrow and have logical implications.*

*The documents you circulated also demonstrate this i.e. the July 2011 consultation is entitled "Review of Controlled Parking Zones and Waiting Restrictions in West Harrow" and the current document entitled "Statutory Consultation on Parking Controls in your area - West Harrow, Honeybun Estate and Whitmore School area". No mention of Honeybun Estate and Whitmore School area in the July 2011 consultation.*

- 2.12 With regard to the above statement, although the information about the Whitmore School area was not specifically mentioned within the 'West Harrow' consultation of July 2011 it was well known within the area and by the WHRG that this was going to be included as this had been discussed previously through regular contact. During the statutory consultation there was no formal response received from the WHRG.

### **Consultation responses**

#### West Harrow CPZ

- 2.13 There were 266 responses received from 1737 addresses within the West Harrow consultation area. These were by return of the questionnaire, email and web submissions. This represented an overall return rate of 15.3%. Of those that responded 84 were formal objections.

#### Whitmore Road area CPZ

- 2.14 From the Whitmore Road and Honeybun area 145 responses were received from 612 addresses within the consultation areas. These were

by return of the questionnaire, email and web submissions. This represented an overall return rate of 23.7%. Of those that responded 32 were formal objections.

- 2.15 A table showing the number of responses from each road or section of road are shown in **APPENDIX B**. It should be noted that some respondents did not indicate a tick or completed more than one tick box for some questions.
- 2.16 A summary of the comments and objections submitted and Council responses are shown in more detail in **APPENDIX C**. It should be noted that some respondents made more than one comment about the proposals and therefore they may appear more than once in the summary.

### Quality Assurance

- 2.17 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 member's library.

### Analysis of results - West Harrow CPZ zones V & W

#### Bouverie Road -

- 2.18 This relates to the section of Bouverie Road between Vaughan Road and the existing CPZ zone 'W' boundary. Due to the responses that were received during the public consultation in July 2011 it was proposed to extend the existing CPZ W into the 'through road' section of Bouverie Road only. This was the section of road that showed support for a CPZ at the time. Of those that responded from the cul-de-sac end of Bouverie Road all showed no support for a CPZ.

Bouverie Road results	Responses from within proposed extension	Responses from within CPZ zone W	Responses from outside CPZ
Number consulted	34	24	19
Number responses	6	3	3
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	3	3	1
Do you agree with the proposals - No	2	0	2
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	1	0	0
Submitted formal objection	0	0	1

- 2.19 The following specific comments were received:
- a. In favour of proposals but should include all of Bouverie Road particularly due to the development at the end of the cul-de-sac section of road – submitted by 1 respondent from within the CPZ zone W and 1 respondent from the proposed extension;
  - b. Considered it a money making exercise by the council – submitted by 4 respondents;

- c. Based on financial claims of already paying enough taxes and civil penalties for minor infringements – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent from outside of the existing or proposed CPZ areas.

2.20 It is recommended to only install the CPZ in the section of Bouverie Road as advertised.

Butler Avenue

2.21 This relates to the remaining section of Butler Avenue outside of the existing CPZ zone V.

Butler Avenue results	Responses from within CPZ zone V	Responses from outside CPZ zone V
Number consulted	23	71
Number responses	3	11
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	2	0
Do you agree with the proposals - No	1	11
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0	0
Submitted formal objection	1	9

2.22 The following specific comments were received:

- a. The council was putting in CPZs despite the majority of residents opposed from the start - submitted as a formal objection by 2 respondents;
- b. Concerned that the proposals would impact on already stretched parking and urged the council to make all of Butler Avenue a CPZ as they couldn't understand why a section of road had been left out. It was also claimed that a growing number of residents are very much in favour of being added to the CPZ – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- c. The new CPZ were too big and was concerned about displaced parking into their section of road – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- d. The CPZ would reduce the number of parking spaces available to residents – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- e. The proposals were not needed on any public safety or improvement grounds or any other reasons to extend CPZ zone W – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- f. Comment was made about the number of flat conversions that Harrow Council are allowing without sufficient off-street parking – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- g. The Pay & Display (P&D) bays in the unnamed link road should be available to all residents not just permit holders – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- h. The 'standard paragraph', as detailed in 2.11 above, was used as part or all of their response – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent from within the CPZ V and 7 respondents from outside the CPZ V;

- 2.23 It is recommended that this section of Butler Avenue remains outside of the CPZ.

Butler Road – (Western extremity)

- 2.24 This relates to the western extremity of Butler Road currently within CPZ zone W.

Butler Road results	Number
Number consulted	20
Number responses	11
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	1
Do you agree with the proposals - No	10
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	4

- 2.25 The western extremity of Butler Road is within CPZ zone W and it was previously indicated that it be removed based on the wishes of the majority of residents that responded to the informal consultation in July 2011 (reported to TARSAP in September 2011).

- 2.26 The following specific comments were received:

- a. The removal of the CPZ would return the road to a free for all and would increase traffic congestion and chaos – submitted by 7 respondents;
- b. Did not support the removal of the CPZ because they claimed they would not be able to park near their house due to commuters and non residents parking in the area – submitted by 3 respondents;
- c. It would be a waste of money to have to remove the CPZ signs and lines – submitted by 3 respondents;
- d. It would put children safety in jeopardy if the CPZ was removed because of increase in traffic looking for parking – submitted by 2 respondents;
- e. The CPZ should be funded through the high Council Tax and not be seen as an additional revenue stream by the council – submitted by 1 respondent.

- 2.27 A petition was also received signed by 22 residents from 19 properties from within the area where the CPZ was to be removed objecting to that proposal. It is obvious that some of the respondents have changed their view since the previous consultation and that this has changed the balance of the majority view.

- 2.28 It is therefore recommended NOT to remove the western extremity of Butler Road from CPZ zone W.

Drury Road

- 2.29 This relates to the section of Drury Road between Vaughan Road and Sumner Road, which is not currently within a CPZ.



Drury Road results	Responses from proposed extension	Responses from outside
Number consulted	37	60
Number responses	13	23
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	9	0
Do you agree with the proposals - No	4	22
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0	1
Submitted formal objection	1	16

2.30 The following specific comments were received:

- a. The 'standard paragraph' as detailed in 2.11 above was used as part or all of their response – submitted as a formal objection by 3 respondents from outside of the proposed extension;
- b. The CPZ cover the whole road – submitted by 1 respondent from within the proposed area and 7 respondents from outside the proposed area;
- c. The proposal was only a revenue generating scheme by the council – submitted by 7 respondents;
- d. Do not want to pay to park outside their house particularly as it would not necessarily guarantee a space – submitted by 5 respondents;
- e. Concerned about the knock on effect of people looking for parking outside of a CPZ – submitted by 3 respondents;
- f. The council should restrict development of existing sites that then puts extra demand on the parking – submitted by 1 respondent.

2.31 There was 1 property (household) that submitted four responses with exactly the same text objecting to the proposals as they felt it would not be beneficial and would create congestion as parking spaces would be reduced, and they didn't want to pay to park in the road when a space was not guaranteed and that the problem was in the evening when everyone was home and felt that extending the CPZ would not improve that.

2.32 It is recommended that the northern end of Drury Road be included in CPZ W as advertised.

#### Heath Road

2.33 Heath Road is not currently within a CPZ.

Heath Road results	Number
Number consulted	44
Number responses	14
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	7
Do you agree with the proposals - No	7
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	4

- 2.34 It was proposed to install a CPZ in Heath Road based on the majority of responses that were received from the residents during the consultation in July 2011.
- 2.35 During the statutory consultation 4 respondents claimed that the previous consultation in July 2011 was not representative and the scheme was proposed with a minority of support. The results presented to TARSAP on 20 September 2011 clearly show that 11 residents wanted to join a CPZ and only 4 did not. During the statutory consultation one less household responded than responded in July 2011. Of those that responded support is still shown for a CPZ in Heath Road.
- 2.36 The following specific comments were received:
- a. The 'standard paragraph' as detailed in 2.11 above was used as part or all of their response – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
  - b. The CPZ was being introduced by stealth – submitted by 1 respondent
- 2.37 It is recommended to proceed with the introduction Heath Road into CPZ zone W extension as advertised.

Sandhurst Avenue

- 2.38 Sandhurst Avenue is not currently within a CPZ.

Sandhurst Avenue results	Number
Number consulted	16
Number responses	13
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	1
Do you agree with the proposals - No	12
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	10

- 2.39 It was proposed to install a CPZ in Sandhurst Avenue based on the majority of responses that were received from the residents during the consultation in July 2011. Although the response rate was low, officers were taking a consistent approach and only proposed extensions or removals in areas that showed a majority, regardless of how big the majority was. .
- 2.40 The following specific comments were received:
- a. It is a money making scheme by the council – submitted by 7 respondents;
  - b. There was no parking problems caused by commuters – submitted by 6 respondents;
  - c. Respondents could not see why they had to pay to park in their own road – submitted by 5 respondents.
- 2.41 It is obvious that some of the respondents have changed their view since the previous consultation and that this has changed the balance of the majority view.

- 2.42 It is therefore recommended NOT to progress the installation of a CPZ in Sandhurst Avenue.

Vaughan Road

- 2.43 This relates to the section of Vaughan Road between the boundaries of the two existing CPZ zones V and W is not currently in a CPZ.

Vaughan Road results	Responses from within proposed extension	Responses from within CPZ W	Responses from within CPZ V
Number consulted	142	59	126
Number responses	24	8	7
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	6	5	6
Do you agree with the proposals - No	17	3	0
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	1	0	1
Submitted formal objection	12	1	0

- 2.44 It was proposed to include the section of Vaughan Road between the existing CPZ zones V and W into one of the CPZs based on the results from the July 2011 consultation. Although the responses were evenly split it was recommended that a CPZ be introduced.

- 2.45 A range of conflicting views from residents were evident from the responses received. The following specific comments were received:

- a. From within the proposed extension 1 respondent said that the proposals do not represent the views of the Village and another said that it was a shame the CPZ were not introduced in their entirety originally so that all the residents could benefit.
- b. From within the existing CPZ W 1 respondent said there was an urgent need to extend the control hours to 2-3pm to discourage workers and shoppers while another respondent said that the 2-3pm restriction was pointless and that there should be restrictions in the evening.
- c. Having part of Vaughan Road out of any CPZ creates traffic problems as commuters look for parking space and that the logical solution was to make all of Vaughan Road a CPZ – submitted by 1 respondent;
- d. Completely distrusted the councils method of traffic management, parking and house/flat building programmes and that the problem was there were too many cars owned by local people than there was space for – submitted by 1 respondent;
- e. It was only revenue generating by the council and why should they, visitors and tradesmen, have to pay to park outside their house – submitted by 1 respondent from within existing CPZ W and 3 respondents in the proposed extension. One went further to suggest it is against the wishes of the majority of residents in West Harrow.
- f. Outraged that the uncontrolled section of Vaughan Road is included as there was no majority previously – submitted by 1 respondent;

- g. Pay & Display (P&D) bays would be bad for business and put off customers from coming into the area and would cause further parking congestion elsewhere – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent and 5 businesses;
- h. The ‘standard paragraph’ as detailed in 2.11 above was used as part or all of their response – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent.

2.46 It is recommended that the proposed CPZ extension, pay and display and Loading bays for Vaughan Road are NOT implemented.

#### Marshall Close – south side

2.47 As reported to TARSAP in September 2011 it was requested that the existing double yellow lines at the shoulders of the lay-by parking bay be cut back to allow more parking space. There were no comments received regarding this during the statutory consultation.

2.48 It is therefore recommended that this alteration to the double yellow lines be implemented as advertised.

#### Vaughan Road – west of Bowen Road

2.49 It is proposed to make a small alteration to shorten a permit parking bay at the junction with Bowen Road.

2.50 Of the responses received, 1 respondent questioned why the first part of the permit parking bay was being removed and the yellow lines extended. As reported to TARSAP in September 2011 the Police had requested this be done as they considered it hazardous to have a parking space positioned over a give way line. It is not possible to move the Give Way line back due to the sightline requirements in this location.

2.51 It is therefore recommended that this alteration progress as advertised.

#### Unnamed link road between Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue

2.52 It is proposed to convert the existing bays into shared use bays for zone V permits and pay & display use.

2.53 Only one response was which received mentioned the change of use for the pay & display (P&D) bay in the unnamed link road. The respondent was from outside of any existing or proposed CPZ and suggested that the P&D bays should be available to all residents not just permit holders.

2.54 It is therefore recommended that the additional eligibility of Zone V resident permit holders for the P&D pays be progressed as advertised.

#### Extension of the operational times of CPZ zone W

2.55 It was proposed to extend the operational hours to include an extra one hour control in the afternoon from 2–3 pm in response to previous representations to the council.

2.56 There were 9 responses from within CPZ zone W that made mention of the additional 2-3pm control hour. Of those that responded 6 did not

agree or objected to the introduction of the additional hour and 3 that supported the introduction of the extra afternoon control hour.

- 2.57 There was also 1 response from a local business outside the CPZ zone W that did not agree with the proposal for the additional hour as it would be bad for their business. This business was mentioned by another respondent who suggested that they were part of the parking problem in the area.
- 2.58 It was reported to TARSAP in September 2011 that there was no overall majority of those that responded to the July 2011 consultation supporting the addition of an extra control hour in the afternoon. This was included in the proposal, however, it has been contentious and objections have been raised.
- 2.59 It is therefore recommended that the additional afternoon hour restriction is NOT implemented.

### **Analysis of results – Whitmore School area CPZ**

#### Bessborough Road

- 2.60 This relates to Bessborough Road, between Roxborough Avenue and Whitmore Road, which is not currently within a CPZ,

Bessborough Road results	Number
Number consulted	96
Number responses	12
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	5
Do you agree with the proposals - No	7
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	4

- 2.61 Of the responses received, 3 objectors suggested the proposed control times were too restrictive with 2 suggesting only 1 hour was needed in the morning and afternoon and 1 suggesting only 1 hour was needed in the morning. A comment was made that parents parking to drop off and pick up children from St Anselm's Catholic Primary School would be badly affected by any changes to the parking restrictions in Bessborough Road.
- 2.62 It was suggested by 2 objectors that the wide section of Bessborough Road near Whitmore Road was more than wide enough to allow some parking bays to be installed rather than the proposed single and double yellow line restrictions.
- 2.63 During the Statutory Consultation correspondence was received from the head teacher of St Anselm's Catholic Primary School in Roxborough Park. The school is surrounded by the current Harrow Town Centre CPZ but not in the consultation area. It was proposed that the existing CPZ be extended to include Bessborough Road. The head teacher expressed concern that if Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road were included in the CPZ the parents dropping off and picking up children would

experience difficulty finding parking within walking distance of the school as they currently use both of these roads.

- 2.64 During the Statutory Consultation correspondence was also received from two business premises that are located in the current Harrow Town Centre CPZ but not within the consultation area. There were three objections received from employees of one company, using the same text, concerned about the loss of parking for their workers as they provide valuable income for the borough. The other business submitted an objection from the CEO based on the same concerns about loss of parking for their employees.
- 2.65 The businesses do raise a valid concern, however, the proposed extension to the CPZ in Bessborough Road had been proposed due to concerns raised by the local residents about the amount of commuter parking occurring in the area.
- 2.66 It is therefore recommended that a CPZ is NOT introduced in Bessborough Road but that the double yellow lines located at the junctions of Roxborough Avenue, Kingsfield Road, Andrews Close, Whitmore Road and other strategic locations are implemented.

#### Honeybun Estate south

- 2.67 The Honeybun Estate, south, consisting of Charles Crescent, Pool Road, Wood Close and Farmborough Close is not currently within a CPZ.

Honeybun Estate (south) results	Number
Number consulted	205
Number responses	22
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	13
Do you agree with the proposals - No	8
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	1
Submitted formal objection	1

- 2.68 Within this part of the Honeybun Estate there are several large private areas used for parking and garages that are not public highway and cannot therefore be subject to parking controls. These areas are looked after by the local housing authority or a private company and together provide approximately 120 parking and garage spaces off the public highway. Residents are able to utilise these parking areas, although it is understood that these areas are managed by the housing department. Discussions have been held with housing officers who are aware of these proposals but did not raise any concerns but would monitor the situation if the proposals go ahead.
- 2.69 There are three unauthorised disabled bays on the public highway in Farmborough Close that would need to be formalised assuming the councils criteria for disabled bays on the public highway are met by the residents in the area. If the criteria are not met the current informal disabled parking bays will be removed and standard permit parking areas will be provided. Separate letters will be sent to the residents of the road to ascertain the need for any disabled parking bay facility in the road.

- 2.70 A resident that objected from the 'northern' arm of Charles Crescent said they wanted resident and visitor parking only. There was no other comment or explanation.
- 2.71 Similar responses were received from 2 respondents with one suggesting there was not enough parking provided and the council should survey the residents to find out how many vehicles there are and then provide the amount of parking that is needed. The other saying there were no problems with double parking or any safety issues and that this was a waste of council tax payers money and that providing more parking areas would be more useful.
- 2.72 There was 1 respondent who was happy with the proposals as it would eliminate people using the road as a car park but was concerned that the double yellow lines in Wood Close would reduce parking.
- 2.73 A respondent from outside of the immediate area objected to the double yellow lines in Pool Road as it would limit parking for her to assist a resident in the road and affect other residents that have carers calling to assist them.
- 2.74 It is recommended that the waiting restrictions and CPZ in the Honeybun Estate (south) is implemented as advertised.

Lascelles Avenue

- 2.75 Lascelles Avenue is not currently within a CPZ.

Lascelles Avenue results	Number
Number consulted	43
Number responses	10
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	6
Do you agree with the proposals - No	1
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	0

- 2.76 It was proposed to include the existing free inset parking bays on Lascelles Avenue in the proposed CPZ for the Honeybun Estate area if it was approved, to prevent displaced parking causing potential access issues on this Restricted Borough Distributor Road. It should be noted that Lascelles Avenue is classed as a Borough Distributor Road and serves the 140 bus route which operates 24 hours a day. The inset parking bays were installed due to delays experienced by the bus operators. It is also a regular topic of discussion with the Harrow Public Transport Users Association (HPTUA).
- 2.77 If the Honeybun Estate is implemented without including the inset parking bays in Lascelles Avenue it is likely that commuter parking would park in the bays affecting those residents that do not choose to purchase permits.

- 2.78 There was 1 respondent that was concerned the council would expect the residents to pay and it is just another stealth tax, but they agreed with the proposals.
- 2.79 Concern was also expressed by another respondent with a disabled family member that wanted a disabled bay provided outside. In a situation such as this the council usually allows the CPZ to become operational for approximately 6 months as this does remove the long term commuter or shopper parking outside a particular property. This can allow better availability for the family and they may not need a disabled bay after the introduction of a CPZ. As part of this process, a disabled parking bay application pack has been sent to the resident to ensure they met the council criteria, to keep the information on file. It should be noted that a disabled badge holder can park free of charge within a resident permit parking bay in Harrow, as long as their blue badge is displayed.
- 2.80 It is recommended that the proposals to include the inset parking bays on Lascelles Avenue in the Honeybun Estate CPZ be implemented as advertised.

Merton Road, Ferring Close and Porlock Avenue

- 2.81 Merton Road, Ferring Close and Porlock Avenue are not currently within a CPZ.

Merton Road, Ferring Close and Porlock Avenue results	Number
Number consulted	108
Number responses	41
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	23
Do you agree with the proposals - No	16
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	2
Submitted formal objection	2

- 2.82 There was a clear split in the responses received from Merton Road and Ferring Close. Merton Road residents that responded were 18 to 6 in favour of the proposals but Ferring Close residents that responded were 10 to 1 against the proposals. There was one formal objection from Merton Road and one from Ferring Close. All four residents that responded from Porlock Avenue were in favour of the proposals.
- 2.83 The following specific comments were received from Merton Road:
- a. Do not think the proposals were necessary as there was no parking problem in the road – submitted by 3 respondents;
  - b. Concerned about the cost to residents and it was only a money making scheme by the council – submitted by 3 respondents with one further suggesting the council charge non residents for parking in the road;
  - c. The proposals were a good idea as it was long overdue, will reduce litter dumped by non residents parked in the street and would ease congestion in the road – submitted by 3 respondents;
  - d. There were 2 respondents, although supportive of the proposals, were concerned that one of the new entrances to Whitmore High



School was opposite the end of Merton Road. They were concerned that this was hazardous and would cause accidents. One went on further to say they considered the junction of Merton Road and Shaftesbury Avenue to be dangerous due to the parking that occurs in the inset parking bays on Shaftesbury Avenue. This last point is being considered by the road safety team as part of a route treatment for Shaftesbury Avenue.

- 2.84 The following specific comments were received from Ferring Close:
- a. The parking problems had eased since the redevelopment of the school had finished and they had opened up their own parking within the school – submitted by 2 respondents;
  - b. It was only a money making scheme by the council – submitted by 3 respondents;
  - c. The proposals would create problems for visitors to the road – submitted by 2 respondents;
  - d. There was no parking problems in the road and the residents had their 'own space' on the road – submitted by 2 respondents. One went on to say that having the double yellow lines (dyl) down the road would substantially reduce the availability of parking on the road
- 2.85 The proposals put forward to Statutory Consultation were developed from the previous informal consultation undertaken at the time when the school was being redeveloped and the area was affected by an increase in demand for on street parking. This demand has subsequently reduced and views have changed as a consequence.
- 2.86 It should be noted by the Panel that because Ferring Close will not be included within the CPZ it will be more vulnerable to any vehicles looking for free available parking near the school and playing fields during periods of high demand.
- 2.87 It is therefore recommended that the proposals for Merton Road and Porlock Avenue proceed to implementation as advertised and Ferring Close is NOT included.
- 2.88 It is also recommended that the double yellow lines proposed in Ferring Close along one side of the road (odd numbers) be installed as advertised to ensure emergency vehicle access is maintained to the end of the cul-de-sac. It has been witnessed on site that the residents along the road tend to park on the even numbered side of the road so this proposal is formalising the existing parking trend. This would not include the double yellow lines in the turning head at the end of the road because there are enough driveway entrances at this point to allow smaller vehicles to carry out three point turns and larger vehicles would always be required to back into the road as there isn't enough space for them to turn around in the turning head.

#### Whitmore Road

- 2.89 Whitmore Road between Bessborough Road and Shaftesbury Avenue is not currently within a CPZ.

Whitmore Road results	Number
Number consulted	145
Number responses	52
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	18
Do you agree with the proposals - No	32
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	2
Submitted formal objection	22

- 2.90 The proposals put forward to Statutory Consultation were developed from the previous informal consultation undertaken during September 2010 at the time when the school was being redeveloped and the area was affected by an increase in demand for on street parking. This demand has subsequently reduced and views have changed as a consequence.
- 2.91 Since that time the redevelopment of the school has been completed and 10 respondents now indicated that the proposed parking restrictions are no longer needed as a consequence.
- 2.92 There were comments submitted by 7 respondents suggesting that the proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Whitmore Road and Porlock Avenue could be reduced in length as the junction is very wide. It was further requested by some that the double yellow lines at the junction of Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road should be extended due to the narrowness of the road at this location and the speed with which traffic enters Whitmore Road.
- 2.93 As mentioned above in the Bessborough Road section of the report a local school and two businesses responded that if restrictions were also introduced in Whitmore Road, as well as Bessborough Road, this would have an impact on their operation due to parent and staff requirements for unrestricted parking in the area. Comments were also received from residents in Shaftesbury Avenue and Bessborough Road saying that they used sections of Whitmore Road to park in as there was sometimes no parking available in their roads to park.
- 2.94 Since the original consultation took place a mini roundabout has been installed at the junction of Whitmore Road and Shaftesbury Avenue which included the installation of double yellow lines on the approaches to the roundabout in both roads to ensure adequate sightlines for traffic in accordance with technical guidance. This has already displaced some residents parking close to the junction in these roads and increased pressure to find parking space.
- 2.95 It is therefore recommended that the proposed CPZ for Whitmore Road is NOT implemented.
- 2.96 However it is recommended that the double yellow lines at the junctions along Whitmore Road be implemented with slight adjustments to take into account the comments received about the junctions with Porlock Avenue and Bessborough Road. In addition the free parking bay proposed in front of the redeveloped pavilion in the sports field be replaced with a length of double yellow line across the entrance to

ensure emergency vehicle access is maintained. This entrance has been designated an emergency vehicle access to the sport fields and pavilion as part of the planning permission for the pavilion, so this is essential to maintaining safety.

Treve Avenue

2.97 Treve Avenue is not currently within a CPZ.

Treve Avenue results	Number
Number consulted	38
Number responses	11
Do you agree with the proposals - Yes	8
Do you agree with the proposals - No	3
Do you agree with the proposals – Don't know/No opinion	0
Submitted formal objection	2

2.98 It was intended to include Treve Avenue in the CPZ for the Whitmore Road area if that went ahead.

2.99 From the responses received in Treve Avenue it is noted that:

- a. The 7am – 7pm waiting restrictions were unreasonable and suggested 8.30am – 6.30pm Monday to Saturday as an alternative. They also suggested the free bays in Whitmore Road should be bigger to provide a better amenity for the residents – submitted as a formal objection from 1 respondent;
- b. A claim was made that vehicles parked at the parking bay locations near Whitmore Road have contributed to traffic accidents in the past – submitted as a formal objection by 1 respondent;
- c. The proposals were welcomed but expressed concern about the speed of traffic along the road if parking was removed – submitted by 1 respondent;
- d. Do not want permit bays on Treve Ave for traffic benefits. It is unclear what was meant by this comment submitted by 1 respondent as there was no other clarification of that point.
- e. Parking was rarely an issue and the proposals have nothing to do with safety but to introduce income generation for the council – submitted by 1 respondent.
- f. Of the responses received regarding Treve Avenue there was a resident from an address in Lascelles Avenue, not included above, that objected on the grounds they wanted the double yellow lines in Charles Crescent at the junction extended slightly. This had already been allowed for in the proposals for the Honeybun Estate area and may not have been clear on the plans the resident had received.

2.100 Treve Avenue does not have any waiting restrictions in place and any parking that occurs on the carriageway is uncontrolled. If this section of road was left outside of a CPZ it would become vulnerable to displaced commuter parking from the surrounding area. This road is classed as a Borough Distributor Road and serves the 140 bus route which operates 24 hours a day.

- 2.101 The Whitmore Road CPZ proposal is not being progressed at this time. However, given the level of support shown in this road it is recommended that the double yellow lines at junctions and strategic locations (e.g. bus stops) are installed as advertised and the single yellow lines along the remaining sections of Treve Avenue operating from Monday to Saturday 8am – 6.30pm are installed. In addition the two parking areas near Whitmore Road will be marked out as free parking to provide some formalisation of the on street parking in the area.

### Summary

- 2.102 This report is presenting the results of the Statutory Consultation and provides a detailed analysis of changes to the proposal required to take the scheme forward to implementation and make the supporting traffic regulation orders. The Panel is requested to recommend the amended scheme to the Portfolio Holder and to proceed with the implementation of the schemes.

### Financial Implications

- 2.103 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 35k for the implementation of the West Harrow area and 50k for the implementation in the Whitmore School / Honeybun Estate areas was made by TARSAP in February 2012.

### Risk Management Implications

- 2.104 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 Environment Directorate Risk Register.

### Equalities Implications

- 2.105 A review of equality issues at the design risk assessment stage of the scheme 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
Age	Improved availability of short term parking, residential parking and blue badge holder parking in closer proximity to local amenities and homes. 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.
Disability	Improved availability of short term parking, residential parking and blue badge holder parking in closer proximity to local amenities and homes.

	This will help disabled people with mobility impairment and wheelchair users.
Sex	Mothers with young children or pregnant women are more likely to benefit from parking spaces as close as possible to their destination.

## Corporate Priorities

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

Corporate priority	Impact
Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe	<p>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.</p> <p>Regular patrols by Civil Enforcement Officers deter criminal activity and can help gather evidence in the event of any incidents.</p>
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 additional parking pay and display facilities will support local businesses to serve more customers.

2.107 The principle of enforcing parking controls is also integral to delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's 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:** Andrew Leitch - Traffic Engineer  
Tel: 020 8424 1888, E-mail: [andrew.leitch@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.leitch@harrow.gov.uk)

#### **Background Papers:**

Previous TARSAP reports of 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009 and 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011