



Chipping Barnet Area Committee

03 October 2019

Title	Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Meadway area EN5 – outcome of statutory consultation
Report of	Executive Director, Environment
Wards	High Barnet
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	Appendix A - CPZ Respondents Appendix B - Consultation Drawing No.SCR283a Appendix C - Consultation Drawing No.SCR283b Appendix D – Implementation Drawing No.SCR283aV2 Appendix E – Implementation Drawing No.SCR283bV2
Officer Contact Details	Lisa Wright – Traffic and Development Manager highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 3555

Summary

The investigation into non-resident parking in Meadway Close EN5 and the surrounding area was initially identified as part of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) work programme, following a prioritisation of requests received from members of the public in previous years.

Whilst the feasibility study in respect of parking in Meadway Close and a wider area was being carried out, the Chipping Barnet Area Committee in July 2017

decided that Officers should carry out a consultation exercise in relation to potential parking solutions in respect of commuter parking in the Meadway and surrounding roads, and to report the results back to this Committee.

The Committee reviewed the feasibility results in March 2019 and subsequently granted approval to proceed to Statutory Consultation. This report asks Members of the committee to note the results of the formal consultation and agree to progress with modification.

Officers Recommendations

- 1. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, notes the feedback from the consultation in July 2019, inclusive of unresolved material objections as set out in Appendix A and B to this report.**
- 2. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, notes the officer responses as set out in Appendix B to this report.**
- 3. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, consider and authorise The Executive Director for Environment to introduce parking restrictions in various locations with modifications as set out in Appendix C and D to this report.**
- 4. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee note the request and agree to allocate £19,500 from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget to carry out the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) implementation.**
- 5. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee authorise The Executive Director for Environment to undertake a further statutory consultation exercise in respect of additional restrictions in Meadway EN5 as set out in paragraphs 2.53 to 2.60.**
- 6. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee note the request and agree to allocate £2,000 from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget to carry out the further consultation exercise in the Meadway EN5.**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Chipping Barnet Area Committee on the 27th March 2019 considered the findings of a feasibility study and noted the that the now Executive Director, Environment had already taken a decision in respect of the way forward.
- 1.2 However, contrary to the decision of the now Executive Director, Environment's Chief Officer Decision, the Chipping Barnet Area Committee decided that Officers should report

the feedback obtained through the future statutory consultation back to the Committee for it to make a decision on how to proceed.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 A statutory consultation was undertaken with residents of the Meadway EN5 area whose properties are located inside the extent of the proposed CPZ so the Council could obtain their views on the proposed CPZ.
- 2.2 The consultation commenced on the 4 July and concluded on the 1 August 2019. It was undertaken by means of the proposal being publicised in a local newspaper and in the London Gazette and on notices erected on-street, information being published on the Council's consultation portals (engage.barnet.gov.uk and barnettraffweb.co.uk), letters outlining the proposal to properties directly affected by the proposals, and correspondence sent to formal consultees and Ward Members.
- 2.3 A total of 282 properties situated on roads in the Meadway, Meadway Close, King Edward Road, Kingsmead, Hillary Rise, Burnside Close, Martins Mount and St Mark's Close received the consultation material which consisted of a letter, proposed drawings and a FAQ's document.
- 2.4 The public had multiple ways of submitting their responses to the proposal inclusive of sending a letter via Royal Mail, emailing Parking Consultations, submitting an enquiry to Highways Correspondence or via the barnet traffweb portal.

Address analysis

- 2.5 The consultation generated 46 responses in total covering various issues detailed within Appendix B. An assessment of these responses is provided below.

Analysis of responses

- 2.6 Appendix B provides officer comments in response to specific issues and a summary is provided below.
- 2.7 Burnside Close: In Burnside Close, none (0%) of the 18 households responded.
- 2.8 Hillary Rise: In Hillary Rise, none (0%) of the 14 households responded.
- 2.9 King Edward Road: In King Edward Road 2 (8%) out of 26 households responded. Of those who responded 1 (50%) were in favour and 1 (50%) objected to the proposal.
- 2.10 Kingsmead: In Kingsmead 13 (26%) out of 50 households responded. Of those who responded 6 (46%) were in favour, 2 (15%) did not specify and 5 (38%) objected to the proposal.

- 2.11 Martins Mount: In Martins Mount 1 (17%) out of 6 households responded. Of those who responded 1 (100%) of the respondents were in favour and 0 (0%) objected to the proposal.
- 2.12 Meadway Close: In Meadway Close 3 (11%) out of 28 households responded. Of those who responded 3 (100%) of the respondent were in favour and 0 (0%) objected to the proposal.
- 2.13 Meadway: In Meadway 18 (15%) out of the 117 households responded. Of those who responded 7 (39%) of the respondents were in favour, 7 (39%) did not specify and 4 (22%) objected to the proposal.
- 2.14 St Mark's Close: In St. Mark's Close 1 (4%) out of the 23 households responded. Of those who responded 1 (100%) of the respondents objected to the CPZ proposals.
- 2.15 Resident (unknown location): The Council received 2 responses from individuals residing within the proposed CPZ area but they did not confirm their geographic location. Of those 1 (50%) of objected to the proposal and 1 (50%) did not specify.

Overall percentages

- 2.16 In total 18 (6%) were in favour of a CPZ, 10 (4%) did not specify, 12 (4%) objected and 242 (86%) did not respond.

Feedback from outside of the proposed CPZ area

- 2.17 The Council received 6 responses in total from individuals residing outside of the proposed CPZ area (but within close proximity), inclusive of 1 non-resident (commuter). Locations include Bosworth Road (1 objection), Norfolk Road (did not specify), Potters Road (2 objections), Potters Lane (1 objection) and Non-resident; Commuter (1 objection). Of those 5 (83%) objected and 1 (17%) did not specify.

Issues arising

CPZ Area / Extent

- 2.18 Concerns expressed by individuals residing outside of the CPZ area regarding the easy pedestrian cut-through from Bosworth Road to Burnside Close. It is felt that the introduction of the proposed CPZ would result in commuters parking their vehicles in Bosworth Road, and that additional parking in Bosworth Road and Norfolk Road would impact negatively.
- 2.19 In response to this, Officers understand that with the introduction of any CPZ, there may be potential parking displacement concerns and issues. As a result, it is often desirable to assess and include surrounding roads in a CPZ proposal as opposed to only addressing the "problematic" location in isolation.

- 2.20 In this respect Officers consider that the extent of the proposed CPZ as shown in Drawing Nos.SCR283a and SCR283b would sufficiently deter commuter parking.
- 2.21 However, should the CPZ be introduced and there be parking issues identified in nearby streets, there is an annual programme of parking/traffic related work which is currently agreed each year by the council's Environment Committee, and new requests can be considered for inclusion in future years' work programmes after being assessed and prioritised accordingly.

Controlled Times

- 2.22 In total 9 (20%) of respondents requested a change to the proposed controlled time(s) and this equates to 3% of all households within the area.
- 2.23 It has been suggested that the restricted hours (10am-11am and 2pm-3pm) are excessive and unnecessary. A 1-hour time restriction has been requested.
- 2.24 Additionally, the Council acknowledges alternative suggestions such as 12 midday - 1pm, 11am-1pm, 8am-6pm and an extension in the afternoon including 2pm-3:30pm to reduce congestion around school pick-up times in the Meadway EN5 and a CPZ operational Monday to Sunday.
- 2.25 It should be noted that a parking survey was undertaken to understand more about the current parking trend and demand in the area and Officers utilised the information recorded to inform the initial CPZ proposal.
- 2.26 It is considered that two separate time restrictions between the hours of 10am-11pm and 2pm-3pm will discourage a greater number of non-residents from parking, increasing the overall effectiveness of the scheme. It is also understood that an increasing number of individuals work flexibly. Therefore, parking opportunities for residents will increase and a reduction in both congestion and driver frustration is envisaged as a direct result.
- 2.27 Visitor vouchers, inclusive of virtual permits are valid for the entire day. Therefore, individuals may not be significantly as financially inconvenienced by the two 1-hour restricted periods, as opposed to if there was only one 1-hour period. Additionally, Officers consider that in creating more parking opportunity for residents and their visitors, through the deterrence of full or partial-day commuters would be of overall benefit.
- 2.28 In conclusion, Officers consider that there is overall insufficient support for a change of restrictions, and it is believed that the benefits of the proposed CPZ timings outweigh the number of concerns raised.

Single yellow lines protecting driveway locations

- 2.29 Concerns were expressed regarding the limited number of on-street parking bays provided. This is mainly due to the proposed single yellow lines in front of many residential properties in the area.

- 2.30 Marked bays on-street can reduce the overall number of parking spaces provided (known as capacity). Parking places have only been proposed along lengths considered appropriate for the Council to allow vehicles to be parked. There are a number of vehicle crossovers and in some cases, insufficient kerbside length in between them to provide parking places.
- 2.31 Protecting inappropriate parking locations prevents driveway obstruction (especially by vehicle overhang), increases visibility, allows sufficient space to manoeuvre and improves the free flow of traffic.

Disabled parking provisions and carer permits

- 2.32 A number of disabled individuals reside in the Meadway area. On-street parking is desirable within close proximity of their property and concerns expressed regarding parking opportunities for carers within controlled areas.
- 2.33 A number of permits are available including residential permits, visitor vouchers and carers' permits.
- 2.34 Additionally, "virtual" visitor vouchers will be made available for use in CPZs shortly, to further improve council services.
- 2.35 Carers permits are issued free of charge to residents living within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), who require essential home visits by a doctor, district nurse, similar healthcare professional or voluntary carers. Residents can pass their carers permit to such visitors to enable them to park in a 'Resident Permit Holders Only' or 'Permit Holder Only' parking place during the controlled hours.
- 2.36 Applications for a new carer permit can be made by completing the Carers Permit Application Form. Section B of this application form must be completed and signed by a GP.
- 2.37 The council provides disabled parking places, subject to meeting set criteria. However, a resident with insufficient kerbside space outside their property would not necessarily receive approval for a disabled bay immediately outside the property.

Permit holder "past this point" requests

- 2.38 In total 5 (38%) of respondents requested a change to the proposals in Kingsmead to include a "past this point" layout as opposed to the proposed conventional CPZ "bays and lines" layout. In addition, concerns were raised regarding the lack of parking bays in the neighbouring King Edward Road and the use of a single yellow line waiting restriction where insufficient kerbside space prevents a parking bay.
- 2.39 The Council acknowledges the request for a permit holder only scheme "past this point", mainly to increase the number of on-street parking availability and to enable individuals to continue to be able to park unhindered outside of their properties.

- 2.40 Initial proposals include “past this point” in Burnside Close, Hillary Rise, Meadway Close, Meadway (spur road), Martins Mount and St Mark’s Close. “Past this Point” controls do not rely on the traditional parking bays and signage to denote the restrictions – rather signage is placed at the entrance to the roads that state that parking is only for “Permit Holders Only”. Deciding factors to utilised “past this point” controls include current parking trend, vehicle ownership vs number of potential kerbside spaces, off-street parking provisions and road type, including road hierarchy.
- 2.41 With regards to Kingsmead, it is understood that a new crossover application has been approved, resulting in the removal of a parking bay from the proposed CPZ layout.
- 2.42 Understanding that there is multiple vehicle ownership in the road, and a desire for residents, some of which mobility is impaired to park near their home. A modification to include “past this point” is deemed appropriate in Kingsmead. “Past this point” is further supported by the likely traffic reduction and implementation of double yellow lines at junctions.

Parking bay removal in King Edward Road

- 2.43 Concerns regarding the junction of King Edward Road and Kingsmead and a request to convert a parking bay into a yellow line restriction to further restrict both commuter type and parking of “non-residential” vehicles.
- 2.44 The limited number of properties at the end of King Edward Road is acknowledged, however, it is desirable to maximise kerbside space where possible, noting that the introduction of a CPZ would reduce commuter parking in any case. The junction is protected with a double yellow line restriction and it is considered that the proposed parking place will not have a negative impact, therefore should remain.

Speed Measures

- 2.45 Concerns expressed regarding vehicle speeds in the area and it has been suggested that Meadway requires speed reduction measure to solve this problem as part of this exercise.
- 2.46 The scope of work on this occasion does not include speed measure considerations in Meadway Area, EN5.
- 2.47 For traffic and parking related schemes there is an annual programme of work which is agreed each year by the council’s Environment Committee. This means that any new requests for work are unlikely to be funded in the current financial year (April 19 to March 20) but can be considered for inclusion in future years programmes. Officers will therefore identify this request to be considered for inclusion in next year’s programme. Further work will be done to assess priority later this financial year.
- 2.48 Additionally, residents concerned about speeding may be interested in an initiative that has been rolled out in Barnet by the Police and TfL called Community Roadwatch. This allows local residents to work with Community Support Officers and use speed detection equipment to identify speeding vehicles in the local area. Warning letters will be issued

where appropriate, and the information can help to inform the future activity of local police teams. To take part in Community Roadwatch, or to suggest a residential area of concern residents can contact CommunityRoadwatch@met.police.uk stating their borough. The enquiry will be forwarded to the Police Safer Transport Team for the local area, who will be in touch about the initiative.

Bus stops in the Meadway

- 2.49 Concerns expressed regarding the removal of an existing bus stop outside No.53 and No.55 Meadway. It is utilised frequently and local residents would like it to remain.
- 2.50 This bus stop was excluded in error in Drawing No.SCR283a and Officers can confirm that all bus stops will remain in their current location in Meadway EN5, inclusive of the one situated outside No. 53 and No.55..

Traffic issue in Meadway (spur road)

- 2.51 Drivers unfamiliar to the area access the Meadway spur road to avoid congestion at the top of the hill in the Meadway, EN5.

The Council acknowledges traffic difficulties in the Meadway spur road. As such, a new signpost and no through road sign has been request to be installed at the entrance to the spur road, which when installed will fully resolve this concern.

Highway maintenance, including road markings

- 2.52 There were a number a number of requests for carriageway maintenance. The scope of work does not include maintenance and certain sections of lining may not be included in this scheme. As such, we will log the request via Highways Correspondence to ensure it is prioritised accordingly, by the appropriate officer.

Meadway EN5 parking and moving traffic issues

- 2.53 In total 19 (41%) of respondents requested a change in Meadway, specifically to address moving traffic and congestion issues at the weekend. The following has been suggested;
 - a) a weekend restriction on the left-hand side (south) is supported by 7 respondents
 - b) double yellow lines on one side is supported by 4 respondents
 - c) Conversion of the single to a double yellow line is supported by 3 respondents
 - d) CPZ operational 7 days is supported by 2 respondents
 - e) A single yellow line between No.59 and No.85 is supported by 1 respondent
 - f) Double yellow lines near the traffic island is supported by 1 respondent
 - g) Difficulties experienced by vehicles parking on the SYL at weekend, but did not put a suggestion forward, received by 1 respondent
- 2.54 In response, it should be noted that the initial concern about parking in the area was focussed on the Monday to Friday period, when roads in the area are impacted upon by commuters parking due to their proximity to the High Barnet Underground Station.

- 2.55 However, having noted the concerns raised, it appears that there is an additional problem that takes place on weekends. Whilst the CPZ will assist and address many outstanding issues, it will not solve any congestion issues that take place during the weekend.
- 2.56 Accordingly, Officers consider that there may be the need for restrictions to be in place in certain lengths in Meadway EN5 at weekends, hence being beneficial in keeping the improving traffic flow, particularly on a bus route.
- 2.57 It is acknowledged that the introduction of weekend restrictions would reduce the amount of kerbside space which motorists have become accustomed to parking their vehicles along, hence reducing capacity and opportunity, and likely encouraging displacement to other lengths of road.
- 2.58 However, given the concern, it is considered appropriate to consider more stringent waiting restrictions along Meadway, particularly the stretch on the southern side between the Meadway cul-de-sac and the High Street, which currently has a Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm restriction. Although it is considered that the lengths should be carefully designed and consultation undertaken with the Ward Councillors before any statutory consultation is undertaken, so to ensure the minimum possible impact on nearby lengths of road.

Proposed Modifications as a result of this consultation

- 2.59 Following review of all feedback received to the statutory consultation, Officers consider that the following modifications should be made to the proposal as shown on Drawing No.SCR283a V2 and SCR283b V2:
- a) Permit holders only “past this point” in Kingsmead
 - b) Include the “existing” bus stop marking outside No.53 and No.55 Meadway
- 2.60 Furthermore, it is considered that additional investigation and engagement with Ward Councillors should take place in respect of revising the restriction of existing yellow lines in Meadway as outlined in paragraph 2.58.

Conclusion and recommendations

- 2.61 Many respondents raised concerns regarding traffic flow in Meadway as opposed to negatively commenting on the CPZ proposal and it is felt that there is a general acceptance, albeit with modification.
- 2.62 It should be noted that the nature of statutory consultations are that they tend to elicit more negative comment than positive, and some residents who may have been in favour of the proposals may not have responded.
- 2.63 Whilst we appreciate the CPZ will not resolve all issues in the Meadway, it should be included in the CPZ to prevent parking displacement and improve bus reliability. Additionally, all existing bus stops appear in the revised drawing in the current location.

- 2.64 Kingsmead is a cul-de-sac and a reduction in vehicle movement is envisaged as a direct result of the CPZ. Therefore, a modification to include “past this point” is deemed appropriate to increase capacity, with a more relaxed approach.
- 2.65 It is recommended that Officers conduct additional investigations and engage with Ward Councillors in respect of revising the restriction of existing yellow lines in Meadway.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 The only other option would be to take no further action but this would not address the concerns of the local residents.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 All households initially consulted in July 2019 will be informed of the outcome to the Meadway Area EN5, CPZ proposal by way of a letter. In addition, Officers consider that a separate statutory consultation should be carried out with residents of Meadway and some of the neighbouring roads on a proposal to amend waiting restrictions subject to discussion with Ward Councillors. Should a statutory consultation be carried out all necessary statutory requirements under the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulation 1996 (as amended) will be complied with.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 Improving parking and traffic conditions in Meadway Area EN5 and effectively managing the traffic movement throughout the local road network contributes to the Corporate Plan priority “A Successful London Suburb” and delivery objectives of a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, inclusive of the free flow of traffic.
- 5.1.2 Effective management of the network is required to ensure the free flow of traffic. Collaborative working across the service area makes this achievable and supports the objectives of the Council.
- 5.1.3 In turn improving safety for all road users, including pedestrians. Additionally, improved traffic movements reduce driver frustrations and conflict, making it a pleasant and safer environment.
- 5.1.4 Congestion, hindered access and inconsiderate parking is not desirable. Negative impacts affect public transport services and bus reliability, in addition to an increase in air pollution and other associated environmental impacts.

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

- 5.2.1 The cost of carrying out the implementation which initially includes writing to all properties

in the agreed area, finalising the relevant Traffic Management Orders, advertising, and introducing the necessary road markings and signage is estimated to be £19,500, the cost of which is requested from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget.

- 5.2.2 In addition, the costs of finalising a design, liaising with Ward Councillors and carrying out a statutory consultation and subsequently amending the parking layout in respect of additional restrictions in Meadway is estimated to be in the region of £2,000, the cost of which is requested from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget.
- 5.2.3 The current area committee balance for Chipping Barnet is £0.175m, any scheme to be approved for 2019/20 will come from this balance.
- 5.2.4 On-going costs related to enforcement and CPZ maintenance will be attributable to the Special Parking Account
- 5.2.5 The necessary parking related road markings and associated signage will require on-going routine maintenance which will be met by the Special Parking Account although it should be noted that no specific budget has been allocated for such purposes and therefore any maintenance costs will negatively impact on the Special Parking Account.
- 5.2.6 Income generated through the purchasing of parking permit, parking vouchers and Penalty Charge Notices issued to motorists who have committed parking contraventions will all be attributable to the Special Parking Account.

5.3 **Social Value**

- 5.3.1 The benefits include an improved Council reputation due to proactively seeking to address parking as opposed to waiting for further problems to arise, would be detrimental to local residents.
- 5.3.2 The permit holder parking only bays will allow for a fair distribution of parking spaces for local residents by the removal of commuter parking.
- 5.3.3 Increasing capacity for local residents' and their visitors will create a more pleasant environment with fewer motorists trying to find parking spaces, especially during busy periods and managing the supply of on-street parking is a means of addressing congestion, resulting in reduced pollution.

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

- 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 their duty.
- 5.4.2 The Council as the Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend TMO's through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.3.1 Traffic Management Orders will be introduced in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

- 5.3.2 The Council's charging powers are regulated by the general duty on Authorities under Section 122 of the RTRA. The Council must exercise the powers (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified in section 122(2) so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

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 parking facilities in the 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.
- 5.5.3 In response to this, it is considered that adequate consultation and engagement has been undertaken with members of the public, allowing sufficient opportunity to comment on the Meadway Area EN5, CPZ.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

- 5.6.1 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. 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 relation to this report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

- 5.8.1 All households previously consulted will receive an update by means of a letter as described in this report in respect to statutory obligations and local policy, inclusive of the following correspondence methods;

- sending an email to highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk
- by writing to the Design Team
- by visiting Engage Barnet

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 None in relation to this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1 Item 11 of the Chipping Barnet Area Committee March 2019 “Meadway Area, EN5 – Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)”
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=9537&Ver=4>
- 6.2 Item 14 of the Chipping Barnet Area Committee July 2017 “Members Items – Applications for CIL Funding (if any)”
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=9306&Ver=4>

