



## Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee

16 February 2017

<b>Title</b>	<b>Friary Way and Valley Avenue, N12 – Results of Parking Consultation</b>
<b>Report of</b>	Commissioning Director for Environment
<b>Wards</b>	Woodhouse
<b>Status</b>	Public
<b>Urgent</b>	No
<b>Key</b>	No
<b>Enclosures</b>	Appendix A – Copy of consultation letter and questionnaire Appendix B – Drawing of consultation area
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	Jamie Blake, Commissioning Director (Environment) <a href="mailto:Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk">Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk</a>

### Summary

The purpose of this report is to advise on the outcome of the informal parking consultation carried out in Friary Way and Valley Avenue N12 and to outline the findings. The report recommends that, having considered the feedback to the consultation, a detailed design and statutory consultation should take place in respect of introducing new waiting restrictions in these roads

### Recommendations

1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee note the results of the Friary Way and Valley Avenue, N12 parking consultation and the recommendation not to seek to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in these roads.

- 2. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, give instruction to the Commissioning Director for Environment to liaise with Ward Councillors in developing proposals to:**
  - (a) Introduce waiting restrictions (yellow lines) around the junction of Friary Way and Valley Avenue; and**
  - (b) Introduce waiting restrictions on Valley Avenue to deter obstructive parking from taking place.**
- 3. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, give instruction to the Commissioning Director for Environment to, once proposals have been developed following liaison with Ward Councillors, carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to:**
  - (a) Introduce waiting restrictions (yellow lines) around the junction of Friary Way and Valley Avenue; and**
  - (b) Introduce waiting restrictions on Valley Avenue to deter obstructive parking from taking place.**
- 4. That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultation, referred to in recommendation 3, the committee instruct officers to introduce the proposed waiting restrictions**
- 5. That the Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, referred to in recommendation 3, the Commissioning Director for Environment will consider and determine whether the proposed changes should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.**
- 6. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee give instruction to the Commissioning Director for Environment to write to all those previously consulted to update them on the Committee's decisions and proposed future action.**
- 7. That the Committee agree to allocate £4,000 (CIL from this year's CIL Area Committee budget for the waiting restrictions to design and carry out statutory consultation and, subject to the outcome of that consultation, introduce the waiting restrictions.**

## **1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED**

- 1.1** The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 21 October 2015 resolved, after the issue has been referred to the Committee from the Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum in July 2015, that an informal parking consultation should take place in respect of parking in Friary Way and Valley Avenue N12.

- 1.2 This report summarises the findings of the consultation and recommends further action as a result of those findings.

## **2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 An informal consultation was carried out in September/October 2016 with residents in Friary Way and Valley Avenue as agreed with Ward Councillors, as outlined in drawing 20493/200 (Appendix B).
- 2.2 A letter was hand delivered to all residential properties within the consultation area asking the recipient to complete an on-line "SurveyMonkey" questionnaire. The questionnaire asked a range of questions about the parking situation in their road/area and amongst other things, whether they had any parking related concerns in the local area, whether they would like a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and whether they would like parking issues investigated further in their road/area. A copy of the questionnaire is attached in Appendix A.
- 2.3 Approximately 44 letters were hand delivered to residential properties in the area. A web page was also set up on the Council's Engage Portal containing details of the informal consultation. The closing date for the consultation was 14 October 2016. Paper or emailed copies of the questionnaire were also made available to residents on request if they were having difficulties or were unwilling to complete the questionnaire online.
- 2.4 A total of 38 questionnaires were submitted or returned, of which 3 were considered as duplicates as they were submitted from the same households as questionnaires already submitted. Therefore for the purposes of analysing the responses, a total of 35 valid responses have been considered, a response rate of 79%.

### Analysis of responses received

- 2.5 The responses received appear to be quite mixed in terms of the extent of the parking issues in the road, and whether it is considered that further action should take place.
- 2.6 18 (51%) of respondents stated they find it difficult to park in their road, whereas 17 (49%) do not find it difficult to park.
- 2.7 At the same time, 7 (20%) of respondents find that they have to park in neighbouring roads because there is no space in their road, whereas 28 (80%) do not.
- 2.8 The responses to these particular questions appear to be contradictory, as the responses to one question indicates residents have problems in parking in their particular road, although it would seem that the impact on those residents, in terms of them being compelled to park in neighbouring roads, seems low.

- 2.9 Of those residents who considered it difficult to park in their road, the majority stated that mornings and afternoons from Monday to Friday were the worst periods, with slightly lesser concern about parking on Saturdays and minimal concern about parking on Sundays. This, in addition to 'free text' comments received in some responses, suggests that the perception is that may be attributable to commuter or local workers seeking to park in the nearest unrestricted road to where they need to visit.
- 2.10 Concern was raised about general road safety. 25 (71%) of respondents find that vehicles are regularly parked obstructively, unfairly and/or inconsiderately, whereas 10 (29%) do not. Furthermore 22 (62%) of respondents find it difficult to turn at junctions of their road due to parked vehicles, whereas 13 (38%) do not.
- 2.11 Of the junctions mentioned as being an issue, the junction of Friary Way and Valley Avenue was of most concern, with 14 mentions. The junctions of Friary Way and Torrington Park, and Friary Way and Friary Road were also mentioned as problematic with 8 and 7 mentions respectively, despite they both having Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm waiting restrictions (yellow lines) around them already which Officers consider should be sufficient in deterring problematic parking particularly through the traditional working week.
- 2.12 Furthermore focus has been placed by residents on a range of issues, the other main issues raised being:
- the perceived narrow width of Valley Avenue/cars parked opposite each other/effect on larger vehicles: 14 mentions
  - Residents' difficulties exiting their driveway: 7 mentions
  - Speeding in Friary Way: 4 mentions
- 2.13 Friary Way and Valley Avenue, N12 fall just outside the boundary of the North Finchley 'FN' CPZ which operates between 9am and 5pm, Mondays to Saturdays. Friary Road is situated to their immediate north, and Torrington Park to their immediate south. Both roads fall within the CPZ at their immediate vicinity with Friary Way.
- 2.14 When considering the question whether they would like their road to be in a CPZ, 18 (53%) respondents stated that they would like their road to be included in a CPZ, whereas 16 (47%) stated they would not.
- 2.15 The slight majority of respondents appear to be in favour of a CPZ, however when breaking down the results on a road by road basis, it is noted that for Friary Way, the results are 6 (60%) in favour and 4 (40%) against a CPZ. For Valley Avenue, the results are 12 (50%) in favour and 12 (50%) against.
- 2.16 In order to understand the layout and characteristics of the roads, an Officer visited Friary Way and Valley Avenue on a weekday daytime and a weekday evening.
- 2.17 It was noted in the daytime visit that in Friary Way, 17 vehicles were parked and there was 0 available kerbside spaces for additional vehicles to park. 10

of these vehicles were parked adjacent to the properties of Friary Road and Torrington Park, as opposed to directly in front of Friary Way properties.

- 2.18 In the evening, there were 6 vehicles parked on-street in Friary Way.
- 2.19 Furthermore there are 15 properties in Friary Way, of which 14 appeared to have some sort of off-street parking facility, which is estimated to accommodate a minimum of 25 vehicles in total.
- 2.20 In Valley Avenue in the daytime, there were 17 vehicles parked on-street with approximately 5 spaces available on the proviso that it is only satisfactory to be parked on one side at any one part of the road.
- 2.21 In the evening there were 17 vehicles parked on-street in Valley Avenue.
- 2.22 There are 29 properties in Valley Avenue, of which 27 appeared to have some sort of off-street parking facility, estimated to accommodate a minimum of 30 vehicles in total.
- 2.23 When matched against the number of vehicles in a household, as stated in the questionnaire responses, it appears that 9 out of the 10 households in Friary Way and 17 out of the 25 households in Valley Avenue that responded can accommodate all the vehicles associated with their households on their off-street parking facilities.

#### Overall conclusions and recommendations

- 2.24 The response rate of 79% gives confidence that the responses are a good representation from the two roads in question.
- 2.25 There is no doubt that there is concern from local residents about non-residents parking in Friary Way and Valley Avenue, and certainly the observations from site visits, does support the view that non-residents are utilising the roads during the daytime.
- 2.26 Furthermore that concern extends to particular safety issues, such as parking at junctions, with the junction of Friary Way and Valley Avenue cited as the most problematic location from the respondents, although it should be noted that a site visit by an Officer did not indicate a major problem at the location, although vehicles were seen to have been parked in Valley Avenue too close to the junction with Friary Way.
- 2.27 Due to the concern it is considered that a waiting restriction (yellow line) could be considered for implementation at the junction to ensure it is kept clear from parked vehicles, although the introduction of the measure would reduce the opportunity and hence increase the competition for kerbside space in the roads.

- 2.28 Furthermore, the concern about the width of Valley Avenue and the difficulties which arise from having vehicles parked opposite each other, could also be addressed through the provision of yellow lines, although again this would reduce the available kerbside space that motorists have become accustomed to utilising.
- 2.29 In considering whether Friary Way and Valley Avenue should be included in a CPZ, it is considered that any action or non-action should apply to both roads, as opposed to one or the other, due to their proximity to each other and the potential negative impact that could occur (e.g. displacement of motorists seeking to park) should action take place on one road and not the other.
- 2.30 Based on both the overall results of the CPZ question, although there is a very slight majority in favour of a CPZ, with one road split 50/50 and the other with a 60/40 split, Officers remain unconvinced about whether there is a significant demand or need for a CPZ in these roads.
- 2.31 The existence of off-street parking facilities matched against the number of vehicles associated with the respondents' households indicates that demand for on-street parking by residents is not as high as if there were no off-street parking facilities.
- 2.32 Furthermore the off-street parking facilities at 26 out of the 35 households (74%) which responded is considered sufficient to accommodate the vehicles associated with those households.
- 2.33 Direct questions were asked in the questionnaire about whether the respondents have difficulties parking in their road, and the majority response was "yes". However this slightly contradicts the results of an associated question about whether the respondents find that they need to park in a neighbouring road, where a larger majority response was "no".
- 2.34 The 'free text' sections of the questionnaire allowed residents to put in their own words what they considered the main problems to be.
- 2.35 However, aside from a general discontent of their roads being used by non-residents to park in, the responses do not give the impression that the use of the road by non-residents is affecting residents' abilities to park near their homes.
- 2.36 Consequently although there was a slight majority in favour of a CPZ, Officers do not feel that a CPZ is necessarily required on traffic management grounds nor to make it easier for residents to park near their homes considering that the majority have sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the vehicles associated with their households.
- 2.37 It is considered that although a CPZ would bring the roads 'protection' from non-residents that some residents clearly would like, there would be a likelihood of displacement of non-resident vehicles into nearby uncontrolled

roads, such as Ashurst Road and the unrestricted lengths of Friary Road and Torrington Park.

- 2.38 Furthermore due to the number of driveways in the two roads, it is considered that the benefits that a CPZ is envisaged to bring to a community, would be relatively low in comparison.
- 2.39 Therefore, Officers will not be recommending to the Committee that Officers should pursue a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in these roads.
- 2.40 However, there does appear to be concern about parking at certain junctions, Friary Way/Valley Avenue, Friary Way/Friary Road and Friary Way/Torrington Park. The latter two junctions already have yellow lines around them so this issue will be passed to the Parking Enforcement Team to note and enforce as appropriate.
- 2.41 Furthermore, there is also concern about parking on both sides of Valley Avenue at certain parts of the road due to concern about potential obstruction of larger vehicles, which could theoretically include emergency vehicles.
- 2.42 Although the concern about exiting driveways is noted, the Council would not necessarily provide parking restrictions to address this specific problem, although residents can apply for a white line to be provided if they find their driveways are completely blocked.
- 2.43 With regards to the speeding issue, the Council has introduced a Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) in Friary Way relatively recently. A report to the October F&GG Area Committee was approved and confirmed that no measures were required in addition to the VAS.
- 2.44 The Committee will also be asked to instruct Officers to design, in consultation with Ward Councillors proposals for:
- (a) Waiting restrictions (yellow lines) around the junction of Friary Way and Valley Avenue; and
  - (b) Waiting restrictions on Valley Avenue to deter obstructive parking from taking place.
- 2.45 These proposals should then be subject to a statutory consultation with residents of Friary Way and Valley Avenue, and subject to no objections, be implemented.
- 2.46 If objections are introduced, it is considered that they should be considered and resolved by Officer DPR for a decision on whether to introduce the measures or no, and if so, with or without modification.

### **3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED**

- 3.1 It is considered that any potential alternative options and impacts have been considered and addressed elsewhere in this report.

#### **4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.1 Officers would seek to investigate the provision of waiting restrictions and liaising with Ward Councillors about this, prior to carrying out a statutory consultation on the agreed proposals.

#### **5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION**

##### **5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance**

- 5.1.1 The consultation seeks to establish whether measures are required to particularly help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of “a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic”.

##### **5.2 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

- 5.2.1 There is £5,000 already committed from the Area Committee budget CIL (approved at the 21 October 2015 F&GG Area Committee) for a parking consultation and analysis to take place with a view to reporting back to this Committee.
- 5.2.2 The costs of developing the design of waiting restrictions in liaison with Ward Councillors, carrying out a statutory consultation of proposals, analysis of responses, and the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders, writing to all properties that were previously consulted and the work to introduce new road signs and road markings, are estimated to be an additional £4,000.
- 5.2.3 This work is currently unfunded. It is proposed that the Committee agree Area Funding.
- 5.2.4 Any measures introduced will require sufficient on-going enforcement to ensure the measures are adhered to. Any lines and signs would require periodic on-going routine maintenance. Any associated costs of enforcement or maintenance will be attributable to the councils Special Parking Account (SPA). Any income from the CPZ permits or PCNs issued for contraventions will also be allocated to the SPA.

##### **5.3 Social Value**

Not applicable in the context of this report.

##### **5.4 Legal and Constitutional References**

The Council's Constitution (Responsibility for Functions, Annex A) provides that in the area covered by the committee:

- Discharge any functions, within the budget and policy framework agreed by Policy and Resources, of the theme committees that they agree are more properly delegated to a more local level. These include but are not limited to local highways and safety schemes.



5.4.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligation on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements as they consider appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing the duty.

5.4.3 The Council as the Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## **5.5 Risk Management**

5.5.1 It is not considered the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations as any additional measures would improve safety and improve loading and parking facilities in the Town Centre to the benefit of all motorists

5.5.2 It is considered the issues involved proposing or introducing new parking restrictions may lead to some level of public concern from local residents who do not wish for additional restrictions, or from residents of other roads in the area concerned about parking being displaced into their road or network of roads. However, for both issues, it is considered that adequate consultation will be undertaken with members of the public so they can have the opportunity to comment to any statutory consultation on any proposed

## **5.6 Equalities and Diversity**

5.6.1 The public sector equality duty (PEQD) under Section 149(1) of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the authority, in the exercise of its functions, to have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and person who do not share it.

5.6.2 Having due regards means the need to (a) remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are connected to that characteristics (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are different from the needs of person who do not share (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristics to participate in public life in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

5.6.3 The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs, sex and sexual orientation.

5.6.4 Full analysis of the responses and comments to the consultation has not indicated that there are any particular negative equalities/diversity impacts on vulnerable residents in the area.

## **5.7 Consultation and Engagement**

5.7.1 Consultation was undertaken as described elsewhere in this report.

## **5.8 Insight**

5.8.1 None in relation to this report

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 6.1 Item 11 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 21 October 2015 – An update on the review of Area Committee Actions (2015-2016)  
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8265&Ver=4>
- 6.2 Item 7 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 2 July 2015 – Matters referred from the Finchley and Golders Green Area Residents Forum  
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8263&Ver=4>
- 6.3 Item 14 of the Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum of 2 July 2015  
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s24382/Finchley%20and%20Golders%20Green%20-%20Issues%20list%20with%20responses.pdf>