



Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee

15 February 2018

Title	Garden Suburb Parking Surveys
Report of	Strategic Director for Environment
Wards	Garden Suburb
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	Appendix A – Plan of survey area Appendix B – Survey findings March 2017 Appendix C – Survey findings November 2017
Officer Contact Details	highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk ; 020 8359 3555

Summary

This report outlines the findings of parking surveys carried out in certain roads in the Garden Suburb Ward, before and after the extension of the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in May 2017.

Officers Recommendations

1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee note the results of the parking surveys carried out in certain roads in the Garden Suburb Ward.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 26 October 2016 considered the findings of a statutory consultation relating to a proposed extension to the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into South Square and Heathgate NW11 and decided that the CPZ extension should be introduced.
- 1.2 In making the decision to introduce the CPZ extension, the Committee also decided that Officers should *“proactively monitor any displacement to surrounding roads after the CPZ is introduced”*.
- 1.3 Accordingly pre-implementation and post-implementation surveys in roads in the vicinity of South Square and Heathgate were arranged.
- 1.4 This report outlines the findings of the surveys for the Committee to consider.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Having considered the outcome of the statutory consultation relating to the proposed extension of the Garden Suburb CPZ into South Square and Heathgate NW11, the Committee, decided that the CPZ extension should be implemented and that there should be a proactive monitoring of any displacement into surrounding roads as a consequence of the CPZ being introduced.
- 2.2 Accordingly, parking surveys were arranged for a period prior to the implementation of the CPZ extension.
- 2.3 The roads included in the surveys were determined as they were a reasonable distance from the CPZ extension, and included the following roads as indicated in Appendix A.
 - Bigwood Road
 - Central Square
 - Meadway Close
 - Meadway
 - Middleway
 - North Square
 - Northway
 - Southway
 - Thornton Way
 - Wildwood Road

Pre-CPZ implementation surveys

- 2.4 Visits were undertaken on a Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday in March 2017. Prior to the surveys being carried out the roads were assessed to establish

capacity – that is, the number of vehicles which could reasonably park in each road taking into account vehicle crossovers, junctions, yellow lines and the width of the road.

- 2.5 The pre-survey assessment identified kerbside space which could accommodate 801 vehicles.
- 2.6 The survey recorded the parking activity at various times of the day to inform the varying kerbside parking levels throughout the day.
- 2.7 The tables in Appendix B shows the number of parked vehicles parked in each road, or section of road as identified, at each survey period.
- 2.8 The survey results indicate the following:
 - On average 51% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Tuesday 7th March 2017
 - On average 52% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Thursday 9th March 2017
 - On average 52% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Saturday 4th March 2017
- 2.9 Furthermore the results indicate that the 6am survey across the three days, were consistent with 397 and 398 vehicles recorded respectively. For the purposes of this exercise, these vehicles are deemed to belong to residents of the area.
- 2.10 On all days, there was an increase in parked vehicles between the 6am survey and the 9am survey, indicating that there was an influx of vehicles into the area after 6am. The largest increase from the 6am survey was on the Saturday, where there was an increase from 397 vehicles to 461 vehicles - a 16% increase.
- 2.11 On the Tuesday and Thursday, there was an overall 9% maximum increase and 10% increase over the 6am position respectively.
- 2.12 Roads which were subject to a significantly higher maximum increase over the 6am position were as follows:

Road	Tuesday	Thursday	Saturday
Central Square	725%	383%	566%
Meadway Close	56%	56%	-
Middleway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way)	40%	45%	-
North Square	-	-	57%
Northway (Central Square to Thornton Way)	-	-	60%
Northway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way)	23%	33%	39%
Wildwood Road	-	50%	36%

Post-CPZ implementation surveys

- 2.13 Visits were undertaken on a Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday in November/December 2017, approximately 6 months after the implementation of the extension of the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ into Heathgate and South Square.
- 2.14 The tables in Appendix C shows the number of parked vehicles parked in each road, or section of road as identified, at each survey period.
- 2.15 The survey results indicate the following:
- On average 55% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Tuesday 28th November 2017
 - On average 54% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Thursday 30th November 2017
 - On average 52% of kerbside space was parked up in the relevant streets on Saturday 2nd December 2017
- 2.16 The results indicate that the 6am survey across the three days, were less consistent than the March survey with the numbers ranging from 381 to 402. Again, the vehicles that were recorded at 6am are deemed to belong to residents of the area.
- 2.17 On all days, there was an increase in parked vehicles between the 6am survey and the 9am or midday survey, indicating that there was an influx of vehicles into the area after 6am. The largest increase from the 6am survey was on the Thursday, where there was an increase from 392 vehicles to 473 vehicles - a 20% increase.
- 2.18 On the Tuesday and Saturday, there was an overall 17% maximum increase and 13% increase over the 6am position respectively.
- 2.19 Roads which were subject to a significantly higher maximum increase over the 6am position were as follows:

Road	Tuesday	Thursday	Saturday
Bigwood Road	23%		63%
Central Square	433%	266%	255%
Meadway Close	52%	44%	40%
Meadway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way)	66%	118%	58%
Middleway (Bigwood Road to Thornton Way)	30%	-	-
Middleway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way)	40%	45%	-
North Square	50%	50%	47%
Northway (Central Square to Thornton Way)	30%	30%	24%
Northway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way)	-	-	21%
Southway (Central Square to Thornton Way)	32%	-	
Thornton Way (Meadway to Northway)	-	-	31%
Wildwood Road	-	50%	36%

Analysis

- 2.20 It is evident from the survey data that there has been a general increase in vehicles being parked in the relevant streets since the extension of the Garden Suburb CPZ.
- 2.21 The maximum number of vehicles parked during the survey period on a weekday increased from 439 (Thursday 9am) during the pre-CPZ implementation survey, to 473 (Thursday 9am) during the post-CPZ implementation survey - an increase of 7%.
- 2.22 On Saturdays the maximum number decreased from 461 (9am) during the pre-CPZ implementation survey, to 431 (12midday) during the post-CPZ implementation survey.
- 2.23 During the March survey, it is clear that certain roads, or sections of road, were subject to higher than average (for the area) increase in parked vehicles after the early morning position.
- 2.24 Specifically Central Square, Meadway Close, Middleway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way), North Square, Northway (Central Square to Thornton Way), Northway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way) and Wildwood Road all were subject to high increases on one or more days.
- 2.25 In the November/December survey, more roads became subject to higher than average increases on one or more days – specifically Bigwood Road,

Central Square, Meadway Close, Meadway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way), Middleway (Bigwood Road to Thornton Way), Middleway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way), North Square, Northway (Central Square to Thornton Way), Northway (Thornton Way to Litchfield Way), Southway (Central Square to Thornton Way), Thornton Way (Meadway to Northway) and Wildwood Road.

- 2.26 This would suggest that the introduction of the CPZ extension did displace motorists onto nearby roads to park their vehicles.
- 2.27 This notwithstanding, it appears that across the area, there generally appears to be the capacity to accommodate the increase in vehicles being parked in local roads.
- 2.28 It should be noted that there does appear in some cases, to be an ongoing risk that if further increases in parking levels occur, certain roads could reach or already has reached capacity, such as Meadway (between Heathgate and Thornton Way), Meadway Close, North Square, Central Square, and Southway (between Central Square and Thornton Way).

Meadway

- 2.29 Officers are aware of discontent about the parking situation in Meadway. A petition signed by 25 people was considered by the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 30th November 2016. The petition stated:

We, the undersigned, protest most vehemently against the extension of the CPZ into Heathgate and Southway in the absence of the CPZ being extended also further into Meadway at least up to Bigwood Road (far enough from walking and public transport convenience for commuters wishing to use Golders Green Station).

The CPZ is pushing daily commuter and longer-term commercial vehicle parking further into Meadway, resulting (among other things) in the following consequences for residents in Meadway between Heathgate and Bigwood Road:

- 1. Continuous, frequent and expensive damage to our parked vehicles*
- 2. Destruction of aspect and ambience of the area*
- 3. Danger for children and pets in crossing the road*
- 4. Damage to pavements*
- 5. Obstruction of driveways*

The CPZ should be extended into Meadway to a point where it becomes inconvenient to walk to public transport links or direct to Golders Green Station.

- 2.30 The survey results for the section of Meadway of concern were mixed. The greatest increase from the 6am position in the pre-CPZ implementation survey occurred on the Saturday (12 midday) from 41 vehicles to 49 vehicles (19%). The Tuesday and Thursday saw no increase from the 6am position.

- 2.31 The post-CPZ implementation surveys indicated that on the Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday there were increases from the 6am position, and all with increased number of vehicles than the pre-CPZ implementation surveys.
- 2.32 This notwithstanding, it appears that along this stretch, there generally appears to be the capacity to accommodate the increased number of vehicles being parked, although with up to an 86% occupancy on a weekday, there is an ongoing risk that the road could become fully occupied if parking levels increase in the future.

Erskine Hill

- 2.33 Officers are also aware of discontent about the parking issues in Erskine Hill. A petition signed by 26 people was considered by the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 30th November 2016. The petition stated:

The residents of upper Erskine Hill (nos1-14) have become increasingly frustrated with parking issues. The problem extends to the rest of Erskine Hill and also Temple Fortune Hill (top end not included in existing CPZ), and North Square. We have seen increasing problems to enable residents to park in the street near their homes. In these roads there is very limited off street parking so residents have to leave their cars on the road and many residents have more than one car.

This will be further exasperated when the new South Square and Heathgate CPZ comes into force. These are the main issues:

- 1. Residents in adjoining CPZ roads who do not wish to pay the charges leave their vehicles in the road.*
- 2. Commercial vehicles including large vans park in the street sometimes for weeks at a time.*
- 3. The street is often so parked up that is difficult for the H2 bus to pass with ease down the road.*
- 4. Commuters park in the road and take the H2 to Golders Green Station.*
- 5. Shoppers/business owners park all day in the street. It is for these reasons that we are keen for a CPZ to be introduced*

- 2.34 It has been noted that pre-CPZ implementation surveys were not undertaken in Erskine Hill. However post implementation surveys have been undertaken.
- 2.35 Although the results of the post-CPZ implementation surveys cannot be compared to the situation prior to the extension, the survey data as well as ad-hoc visits to the road undertaken by Officers have given a good picture of the level of parking taking place in the road.
- 2.36 It should be noted that the Erskine Hill issue was raised before the introduction of the CPZ extension, so although the CPZ extension may have displaced parking onto neighbouring streets such as Erskine Hill, residents already believed the parking levels were intolerable.

- 2.37 On all days, there was a general decrease in parked vehicles between the 6am survey and the latter surveys. The largest decrease from the 6am survey was on the Thursday, where there was a decrease from 156 vehicles to 124 vehicles - a 21% decrease.
- 2.38 Officers have noted that the petition relates primarily to the section of Erskine Hill between North Square and Temple Fortune Hill. Ongoing Officer observation has established that the parking in this section is mixed, with varying levels of parking on different days.
- 2.39 On Officers' more recent ad-hoc observations, variable parking conditions were witnessed, with up to 8 available spaces being seen in the daytime
- 2.40 In terms of residents' requests for this section of Erskine Hill to be included in a CPZ, Officers consider that there could be difficulties with this, particularly as Erskine Hill falls at least one road removed from any CPZ boundary.
- 2.41 For example, its southernmost end has North Square and Central Square between the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ in South Square, and its northern end has Temple Fortune Hill situated between it and the same CPZ.

Conclusions

- 2.42 The surveys that were undertaken show that there has been a general increase in the parking levels in the relevant roads.
- 2.43 This notwithstanding there appears to be sufficient capacity in the relevant roads to accommodate all vehicles who wished to park in the area.
- 2.44 There does appear to be particular pressure on certain roads such as Meadway (between Heathgate and Thornton Way), Meadway Close, North Square, and Central Square, and Southway (between Central Square and Thornton Way), and previous representation has been made by Meadway and Erskine Hill residents for a CPZ to be introduced.
- 2.45 Meadway falls just outside the boundary of the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ so in theory a CPZ extension may not be problematic, although displacement would occur in neighbouring roads, although it appears that, the neighbouring roads could accommodate the displaced vehicles.
- 2.46 The consideration of the inclusion of Erskine Hill into a CPZ could be more problematic. The road does not lay adjacent to a CPZ boundary, and it is not usual to investigate a CPZ in a single road in isolation. Therefore there would be potential implications for residents of other roads such as Temple Fortune Hill, Central Square and North Square.
- 2.47 Officers have also checked the records of correspondence received, and there has not been any CPZ or parking-related representations received from

residents of Meadway Close, Temple Fortune Hill, Central Square and North Square since the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ was extended into South Square and Heathgate in May 2017. Two representations have been received from Erskine Hill in the same period, and one from Meadway.

- 2.48 Officers ask the Committee to note and consider the findings of the survey, and ask the Committee to consider whether they would like to see any further action.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 None. The Committee decided that there should be a proactive monitoring of any displacement into surrounding roads as a consequence of the Garden Suburb CPZ being introduced, and surveys have been carried out, with this report outlining the findings of those surveys.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Officers have asked the Committee to decide what action, if any, they wish to take as a result of the surveys being undertaken.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The Council's Corporate Plan states that strategic objectives that will work with local partners to create the right environment to promote responsible growth, development and success across the Borough. In particular the Council will maintain a well-designed, attractive and accessible place, with sustainable infrastructure across the Borough. The plan also acknowledges that future success of the Borough depends on effective transport networks

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

- 5.2.1 No further action is recommended, however, should the Committee decide that they wish further action to be undertaken, a budget to fund the further action would need to be determined.

5.3 Social Value

- 5.3.1 None in the context of this report

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.4.1 The Council's Constitution, in Article 7, states that that Area Committees: "In relation to the area covered have responsibilities for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments" parks and trees.

5.5 Risk Management

- 5.5.1 It is not considered the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations, however depending on what action the Committee decides additional consideration may need to be given.

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.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

- 5.7.1 None in the context of this report

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

- 5.8.1 Depending on whether the Committee determine that there should be any further action, a public consultation may be considered to be an appropriate course of action.

5.8 Insight

- 5.8.1 None in the context of this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 26th October 2016 – Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Proposed extension into Heathgate and South Square (Agenda Item 9)
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8750&Ver=4>
- 6.2 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 30th November 2016 – Petitions “Erskine Hill CPZ” and “Hampstead Garden Suburb CPZ” (Agenda Item 7)
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9085&Ver=4>
- 6.3 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 14th November 2017 – Temple Fortune Area NW11 – Proposed Waiting Restrictions (Agenda Item 17)
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9275&Ver=4>