

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16 February 2017</b></p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Title</b></p>	<p><b>East Finchley CPZ review of the hours of operation in roads in the vicinity of Cherry Tree Wood, N2.</b></p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Report of</b></p>	<p>Commissioning Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Wards</b></p>	<p>East Finchley and Garden Suburb</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Status</b></p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Urgent</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Key</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Enclosures</b></p>	<p>Appendix A – Copy of consultation letter and questionnaire Appendix B – Drawing of consultation area</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Officer Contact Details</b></p>	<p>Gavin Woolery-Allen <a href="mailto:gavin.woolery-allen@barnet.gov.uk">gavin.woolery-allen@barnet.gov.uk</a>; 020 8359 3555</p>

## Summary

The purpose of this report is to advise of the outcome of the informal parking consultation carried out in the East Finchley CPZ and to outline the findings. The report recommends that, having considered the feedback to the consultation, no further action is taken in these roads. 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 East Finchley CPZ review of the hours of operation in roads in the vicinity of Cherry Tree Wood, N2 parking consultation and the recommendation not to take any further action in these roads.

<p><b>2. 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 decision.</b></p>
--

**1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED**

- 1.1 The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 21 October 2015 resolved, as part of a range of issues that they consider to be outstanding, that a feasibility study should take place in respect of parking in the East Finchley Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) near Cherry Tree Wood, N2.
- 1.2 Following Officer and Ward Councillor liaison, it was agreed that a consultation should take place in the area of the East Finchley CPZ to establish the local community's views on the current hours of operation of the CPZ in their road/area.
- 1.3 This report summarises the findings of the consultation and recommends no further action as a result of those findings.

**2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 An informal consultation was carried out in June 2016 with residents and businesses in the area as agreed with Ward Councillors, as outlined in drawing 20495\_8 (Appendix B).
- 2.2 A letter was hand delivered to all residential properties within the consultation area (as indicated in Appendix B), asking the recipient to complete an on-line "SurveyMonkey" questionnaire. The questionnaire asked specifically whether the recipient was happy with the current days and hours of operation of the CPZ in their road, and whether they would like it changed. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix A.
- 2.3 Approximately 920 letters were hand delivered to all 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 22 June 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 213 questionnaires were returned or submitted, a response rate of 23%.
- 2.5 Of these, 14 were considered as duplicates as they were submitted from the same households and included similar and non-contradictory content as questionnaires already included for analysis. A further 19 responses were considered as duplicates as they were submitted from the same households, but the content was different and/or contradictory. 1 response did not state a road name, and 3 responses were from addresses outside of the consultation area. Therefore, for the purposes of analysing the responses, these

responses have been discounted and therefore a total of 176 valid responses have been considered, a response rate of 19% valid responses.

#### Analysis of responses received

2.6 85 (48%) respondents would like the hours/days of operation of the CPZ to be amended, whereas 62 (35%) would not like any change, 26 (15%) were undecided or did not know and 3 (2%) skipped this question.

2.7 On a road by road basis, the results are broken down as follows:

	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Bancroft Avenue	2	0	1	0
Baronsmere Road	8	8	1	1
Cherry Tree Road	8	2	6	1
Deansway	3	5	0	0
Diploma Avenue	2	1	1	1
Edmunds Walk	11	3	1	0
Fairlawn Avenue	5	5	1	0
Fortis Green	3	6	4	0
Great North Road/Wellington Place	1	3	0	0
Ingram Road	5	1	2	0
Park Hall Road	8	13	4	0
Summerlee Avenue	16	11	3	0
Summerlee Gardens	13	4	0	0
The Bishops Avenue	0	0	2	0

2.8 Of those residents who wished for the days/hours of operation of the CPZ to be amended, 74 specified specific times and days when they would like the CPZ to be applicable. 61 of these (84%) wished for a reduction in hours/days from the existing 10am and 6.30pm Monday to Saturday restrictions, whereas 13 requested an increase in hours and/or days of restriction.

2.9 In terms of the periods of control, there was a wide range of choices made, with different start and finish times stated as a preference.

2.10 The majority of responses which suggested a change wished for the current periods of parking control to be reduced although there did not appear to be a general consensus about what specific hours/days this should be changed to.

2.11 Of those who wanted change to be made, the majority (48) chose a Monday to Friday restriction and 19 wished to retain a Monday to Saturday restriction. 7 wanted a Monday to Sunday restriction.

2.12 Of those wishing for a Monday to Friday scheme, 43 requested fewer hours of control than what is currently in place. The most popular time period requested was Monday to Friday 2pm to 3pm, with 16 requests.

- 2.13 A Monday to Friday, one-hour restricted period (including the Monday to Friday 2pm to 3pm period) obtained a total of 20 requests while a two-hour restriction obtained 12 requests. Three and four hours obtained 6 requests. There were 5 requests for periods of five to seven hours in duration.
- 2.14 In addition to the questions about the hours and days of operation of the CPZ, a “free text” section allowed respondents to provide further comments on the parking issues in their area.
- 2.15 Focus was placed by residents on a range of issues, the main issues being:
- Intra-CPZ commuter parking/request for separate permit zone from remainder of CPZ: 26 mentions;
  - Parking related to the Phoenix Cinema causing problems in the evenings: 6 mentions;
  - Problematic parking in Brompton Grove, which is a private road.
- 2.16 The roads consulted fall within the southern section of the East Finchley ‘M’ CPZ and are in close vicinity to the businesses on High Road/Great North Road and/or East Finchley Underground Station, also situated on High Road, N2.
- 2.17 The CPZ incorporates approximately 60 streets, and extends to Park Road in the north and Ossulton Way to the west and to the borough boundary with the London Borough of Haringey to the south.

#### Overall conclusions and recommendations

- 2.18 The response rate of 19% makes it difficult for Officers to determine whether the responses are a good representation of residents of the roads consulted.
- 2.19 The results of the consultation is that there was no outright majority view as 48% of respondents wished for change, but 35 % and 15% respectively did not want change or did not know what they wanted. An additional 2% did not specify their preference.
- 2.20 Further analysis indicates that less than 10% of those consulted wished for change, and a total of 7% of those consulted wished for a reduction in CPZ days/hours from the status quo. A total of 7% of those consulted also wished for no change to be made.
- 2.21 With this in mind, although more respondents wished for a change rather than not, the analysis seems to suggest that the most popular type of change - a CPZ days/hours reduction - was as popular a choice as “no change”.
- 2.22 As a consequence, Officers will be recommending to the Committee that there should be no further action taken in respect of reviewing the days and hours of the CPZ in Bancroft Avenue, Baronsmere Road, Cherry Tree Road, Deansway, Diploma Avenue, Edmunds Walk, Fairlawn Avenue, Fortis Green,

Great North Road, Ingram Road, Park Hall Road, Summerlee Avenue, Summerlee Gardens and The Bishops Avenue at this time.

- 2.23 In addition to the CPZ hours/days issue, the issue of intra-CPZ commuting and a request for a separate CPZ permit from the remainder of the 'M' CPZ, was the most prevalent issue raised during the "free text" aspect of the questionnaire, although the number of mentions about this issue from respondents amounted to 14% (26) of those who responded.
- 2.24 The issue of permit holding commuters legitimately driving from roads within, albeit near the boundary of the CPZ, to the roads closest to the station in order to commute to work via the Underground Station, has over the years been reported from residents of various roads in the southern area of the CPZ, particularly roads closest to the entrances to East Finchley Underground Station about this issue. However although reports have been made, they have not been taken further.
- 2.25 It was noted that 10 of the 26 mentions about this commuter issue were from residents of Edmunds Walk which is one of the closest streets to the station, accessible via The Causeway footpath. A further 5 mentions were from residents of Ingram Road, which is one of a group of roads opposite the Station, off High Road N2.
- 2.26 As an area, there appears to be insufficient demand for a change of CPZ designation, although it should be noted that the majority of Edmunds Walk respondents mentioned the permit holding commuters, or requested that Edmunds Walk have its own CPZ (10 out of 15 responses from residents of Edmunds Walk). Despite this, it is considered that out of the 39 households in Edmunds Walk, this equates to approximately 25% which is considered not a mandate for this request to be agreed.
- 2.27 Regarding the issue regarding parking associated with attendees to the Phoenix Cinema situated on the junction of Fairlawn Avenue and High Road, the main problems mentioned were in the evenings. However, the headline of the consultation suggests that the majority of responses were not in favour of an extension of the CPZ period.
- 2.28 The issue of Brompton Grove was highlighted as an issue by 6 respondents, however Brompton Grove is a private road and therefore the Council could not seek to take any action on this road without the landowner's permission.

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

- 3.1 None, as it is considered that the results of the consultation carried out allowed Officers to draw the conclusion that no further action should be taken.

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

- 4.1 Officers would write to all properties previously consulted to advise them of the Committee's decision.

#### **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 £10,000 already committed from the Area Committee budget CIL (approved at the 21 October 2015 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee) for a parking consultation and analysis to take place with a view to reporting back to this Committee.

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

Not applicable in the context of this report.

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

- 5.4.1 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 future proposals.

## **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**

6.1.1 Item 11 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 6 July 2016 – East Finchley CPZ review of the hours of operation in roads in the vicinity of Cherry Tree Wood N2

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8749&Ver=4>

6.1.2 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>