

Meeting Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-committee

Date 25 June 2013

Subject **Proposed Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone**

Report of Director for Place

Summary The purpose of this r is to report objections received to the proposal to introduce the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone in a section of Hampstead Way, Asmunds Hill, and Temple Fortune Hill, Hill Close, a section of Meadway and a section of Willifield Way.

Officer Contributors Paul Edmund-Charles - Engineer
Gavin Woolery-Allen – Senior Engineer

Status (public or exempt) Public

Wards affected Garden Suburb Ward

Enclosures Appendix A – Drawing Number CPZCPZ_2013/01(Proposed measures)
Appendix B - Drawing No GSCPZ_2013/02 Identify Parking Layout
Appendix C - Statutory Consultation Analysis

For decision by Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee

Function of Executive

Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in Not applicable

Contact for further information: Paul Edmund-Charles, Engineer, Design Team, Traffic and Development Section 020 8359 3037 paul.edmund-charles@barnet.gov.uk

1. RECOMMENDATION

That the Sub-Committee:

- 1.1 Note the outcome of the statutory consultation relating to the proposed Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).**
- 1.2 note Ward Councillors' concerns,**
- 1.3 determine which roads or section of roads if any should now be included within a Garden Suburb CPZ.**
- 1.4 determine which further roads or section of roads if any should, subject to relevant budget availability, be considered for inclusion within the Garden Suburb CPZ following a statutory consultation.**
- 1.5 subject to and with regard to 1.4 above agree that any written objection(s) received resulting from any statutory consultation carried out as a consequence of the decisions made by this Sub-Committee be addressed by the Director for Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and the relevant Ward Councillors, to decide whether any roads or lengths of road are included within the CPZ or not.**

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

- 2.1 Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee 23 November 2011 Decision No. 8 resolved that subject to the overall costs being contained within available budgets, the Interim Director of Environment, Planning and Regeneration be instructed to arrange a consultation on the possibility of considering the following roads or part roads for inclusion within a CPZ, and bringing a report advising on the outcome to the next appropriate meeting of the Sub-Committee
 - Hampstead Way (uncontrolled section)
 - Willifield Way to Asmunds Hill
 - Temple Fortune Hill
- 2.2 Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee 16 January 2013 Decision No 8 - instructed the Interim Director of Environment, Planning and Regeneration to carry out a statutory consultation on a proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and associated measures in the area.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 Improving parking and traffic conditions in the vicinity of local residents will contribute to the One Barnet Plan and Corporate Plan priority "A Successful London Suburb" by improving the satisfaction of residents and businesses within the London borough of Barnet as a place to live, work and study.
- 3.2 The London Mayor's Transport Strategy also addresses these areas through: "Proposal 30: The Mayor, through TFL, and working with the London boroughs and other stakeholders, will introduce measures to smooth traffic flow to manage congestion (delay, reliability and network resilience) for all people and freight movements on the road network, and maximise the efficiency of the network. These measures will include ...c) "... keep traffic moving ..." , e)

Planning and implementing ... improvements to the existing road network, ... to improve traffic flow on the most congested sections of the network, and to improve conditions for all road users.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 4.1 It is not considered that the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations as the introduction of controlled parking would improve the parking provision for local residents and the introduction of waiting restrictions will improve safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians alike.
- 4.2 It is considered that the issues involved may lead to some level of public concern by 'commuter type' motorists who are customarily used to parking in close proximity to local transportation services, such as train stations or visitors to the town centre. Therefore, the introduction of the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone could lead to displaced parking and/or adverse publicity. However, reducing the opportunity of parking in close proximity to local transportation links, could encourage the use of alternative modes of transport, such as cycles, walking and buses, thereby reducing the number of vehicles travelling through the area, and also restricts higher volumes of vehicles parking in relatively close proximity causing obstruction to other road users.
- 4.3 It is considered that the issues involved may also lead to some level of public concern from local residents who may feel they are losing parking spaces. However, it is considered that there would still be enough resident spaces within the area to accommodate the local needs, and that the revision of the parking layout would lead to increased safety which would result from a more appropriate traffic management.

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

- 5.1 The introduction of waiting restrictions in addition to controlled parking in order to improve traffic flow, relieve congestion and road safety will benefit all road users equally and are not envisaged to disadvantage any member of the wider community.

6. USE OF RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS (Finance, Procurement, Performance & Value for Money, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

- 6.1 Total estimated costs for the necessary road markings and signage for the introduction of the CPZ in the roads included within the proposal are estimated to be £50,000, including advertising printing and all officer time which would be rechargeable, the costs of which can be met from existing Development and Regulatory Services (DRS) capital budgets. Actual costs will depend on the decision the Sub-Committee makes in relation to the extent of the CPZ to be introduced.
- 6.2 Should it be decided that additional consultation or additional roads should be included in the CPZ, there would be further cost implications, which may or may not be able to be fully met from existing DRS capital budgets depending on what is decided. Therefore any decision made for further consultation or inclusion of additional roads should be subject to budget being available.

- 6.3 There will be no staffing, IT, property, sustainability, or procurement issues as a result of the implementation of these measures.
- 6.4 The introduction of the CPZ will require periodic ongoing routine maintenance.

7. LEGAL ISSUES

- 7.1 There is a duty on local traffic authorities under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage their road network 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.
- 7.2 The Council as Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

8. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

- 8.1 The Council's Constitution, Responsibility for Functions – Area Environment Sub-committees perform functions that are the responsibility of the Executive including highways use and regulation not the responsibility of the Council, within the boundaries of their areas in accordance with Council policy and within budget.

9. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 9.1 Following investigations into concerns highlighted by residents regarding ongoing issues being suffered primarily in Hampstead Way NW11 in relation to commuter parking in the vicinity of local transport links, local shops and amenities, the decision of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Environment Sub Committee of 16 January 2013 was to progress to statutory consultation proposals to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Hampstead Way and adjacent roads to improve the parking opportunity for residents and their visitors and improve safety for motorists and pedestrians in the area.
- 9.2 On the 28th February 2013 the council commenced a statutory consultation by way of hand delivered letters to residents of Asmunds Hill, Hampstead Way, Hill Close, a section of Meadway, Temple Fortune Hill, Willifield Way, Hogarth Hill, Wordsworth Walk, Coleridge Close, North Square and South Square NW11. In total 574 letters outlining the proposal were delivered in addition to street notices being erected and similar notices appearing in the local Press and London Gazette informing the public that the council intended to introduce a new CPZ. The CPZ would include the currently unrestricted section of Hampstead Way, Hill Close, Asmunds Hill, Temple Fortune Hill, Willifield Way as well as a section of Meadway between Hampstead Way and Heathgate, and would be known as the Garden Suburb CPZ and would operate between 1pm and 2pm, Mondays to Fridays.
- 9.3 In response to the statutory consultation the council received 321 objections, comments or requests for further information. Of the 322 comments/objections received, 163 responses were in opposition to the introduction of the proposed Garden Suburb CPZ, 95 responses to the HGSRA objection document were received, 62 responses were in favour of

the proposed CPZ , 1 undecided response was received and 1 petition containing 85 signatories was received. For a complete breakdown of the responses on a road by road basis, see Appendix C.

- 9.4 Throughout the objections and comments received, the main issues raised were as follows:
- Displaced parking – where residents of roads on the edge of the proposed Garden Suburb CPZ such as Erskine Hill, Hogarth Hill and Wordsworth Walk are opposed to the proposed CPZ as they consider the introduction of the CPZ would lead to displaced parking in their roads, and further afield.
 - Cost – where the cost of resident parking permits to be expensive, in addition to concerns about the lack of future proofing against further rises in cost of both resident permits and visitor vouchers. It has been said that elderly residents and those on low or no income would find it difficult to afford permits.
 - Tax – where it is believed that the proposed scheme is a way of raising revenue at their expense. It has been said that the council have proposed the measures as a way of taxing residents.
 - Parking Issues – where it is considered there are no existing parking problems, or the CPZ would not improve their parking conditions. A number of residents mainly residents of Willifield Way feel there are few existing parking issues in their roads, that the proposed measures are unfair and that it is unjustified for the council to react to a request for a CPZ because one road suffers from commuters, teachers, employees and visitors to amenities using the available kerb space.
 - Waiting Restrictions/Unwanted street furniture – the introduction of waiting restrictions will put further pressure on resident parking due to the reduction of available kerb space, whilst any introduction of a CPZ will lead to the installation of post with signs on them, lengths of yellow lines and bays marked in the highway which is considered by some of those residents opposed to the measures to be a potential blight on the unique ambiance in the area.
 - Proposed operating hours – where there is concern about the hours of operation (Monday to Friday 1pm to 2pm) as they believe it would not help the residents to park outside or near their homes. Those that mention this as a concern would like to see the hours of operation revised. Two the opposing residents would like to see operating hours between 9am to 11am and 3pm to 5pm.
 - Request to remove Temple Fortune and Golders Green CPZs – where residents consider that the introduction of the Garden Suburb CPZ would make no difference to either congestion or available kerb space to enable residents to park any more freely, and consider that the Temple Fortune & Golders Green CPZs should be removed as they have led to the displaced parking in the area.
- 9.5 The 95 objections received based on the standard document distributed by the HGSRA throughout the area setting out a number of reasons for objecting to the proposal, mainly relating to the issues outlined above.
- 9.6 The petition signed by 85 signatories of Willifield Way and Temple Fortune Hill asked the Council to reconsider its proposal as residents have no parking problems except at school pick up and drop off times, that parking space throughout the road would be reduced, on grounds of costs of permits and

vouchers, that the proposed 1pm to 2pm restriction was at lunchtime when residents would expect visitors would come for lunch and that the character of the suburb would be eroded by the erection of signage and road markings

- 9.7 Of the objections received , 8 were received from the general public from outside the Hampstead Garden Suburb area itself, who were either employed locally or regularly visit the area by car. The objections to the CPZ were on the grounds that parking for them would become extremely difficult if it were to be introduced
- 9.8 During both the informal consultation and statutory consultation processes it has been evident that there has been a differing of opinion within the community relating to the idea of a CPZ being introduced. In Hampstead Way - where the worse problems are based on the July 2012 informal consultation, there appears to be support for a CPZ, while not so much in other roads which is understandable.
- 9.9 It has been acknowledged by Ward Councillors and Officers that the general thrust for action to date has been based on the concerns over a number of years from Hampstead Way residents, although the informal consultation carried out in July 2012, did indicate that some residents of other roads would be in favour of a CPZ being introduced in their roads.
- 9.10 Accordingly in order to relieve parking pressure and improve the current area wide parking and safety conditions, the CPZ was proposed for a wider area than where the direct support existed. Therefore it is possible that the proposed CPZ would cover roads which currently do not have a major parking problem, although the CPZ would protect those roads from any displacement of parking from the roads which do currently have problems.
- 9.11 Residents in the roads outside the proposed CPZ, such as Erskine Hill, Hogarth Hill and Wordworth Walk, are concerned about the possible displacement of parking from those roads which would fall within the CPZ, to those which would fall just outside. However, it is considered that the reasons for proposing the CPZ remain valid, notwithstanding the possibility of displacement impact on the roads adjacent to the CPZ. Due to the road layout etc, it is unclear exactly how many motorists would be displaced from say, Hampstead Way, to an uncontrolled road two or three roads away. Therefore, it is considered that the situation should be monitored to assess the impact should the CPZ be introduced.
- 9.12 It is acknowledged that the introduction of a CPZ would likely reduce the amount of kerbside space utilised for parking, as it would incorporate parking places along stretches of road where it is considered safe for vehicles to be parked, and yellow lines along lengths where it is considered parking should not take place, but where parking may currently occur. Such lengths may include around junctions, across vehicle crossovers, and those which Officers consider should be kept clear to assist traffic flow and movement. It is envisaged however that the net result across the CPZ would be sufficient parking space available for residents and their visitors, due to the CPZ deterring a significant amount of non-resident parking.
- 9.13 Regarding signage and road marking associated with CPZs, it is acknowledged that some people may consider them unsightly, particularly as

the CPZ has been proposed in a conservation area. It should be noted that CPZs exist in conservation areas within the borough, and more specifically locally within the Hampstead Garden Suburb conservation area. Unfortunately, the Council are limited in what it can do in this respect as the signing and lining of parking restrictions, and CPZs are governed by legislation and guidance from the Department for Transport. Should the CPZ be introduced, the Council would attempt to minimise as much as legally possible, the amount of street furniture and paint utilised.

- 9.14 With regard to the comments received about removing the Golders Green and Temple Fortune CPZs, both have been in place for some time, and there has been no real widespread demand from residents/businesses within their boundaries for their removal.
- 9.15 In relation to the cost issue, the Council has standard charges for permits and vouchers which are reviewed periodically, and therefore any introduction of a CPZ would result in increased costs for those living in that CPZ through the requirement to purchase permits and vouchers. This notwithstanding, the impacts on the community were considered as part of the proposals, and it is considered that the probable increased community costs do not override the aims of the proposal.
- 9.16 During the consultation process, a number of specific issues were highlighted where residents had particular concerns in their road. Officers have investigated these concerns, and where it was considered appropriate minor changes have been made to the parking layout to incorporate these. These changes are annotated in Appendix B to this report.
- 9.17 In addition to the objections received, it should be noted that in response to the statutory consultation, the Council received many pieces of correspondence from residents of roads within the proposed CPZ in favour of the proposals although not required to do so, and in the case of certain roads on the periphery of the proposed CPZ, such as Heathgate, requests for similar controls if the CPZ were to be introduced.
- 9.18 In considering the responses received to the consultation, and Officers having looked at the geographical origination of those responses, it is clear there are strong feelings throughout the community about the proposal. Although objections were received throughout the area, it is considered that in Hampstead Way, Asmunds Hill, Hill Close and Meadway they were not in significant number or depth to convince Officers that the proposal should be abandoned for these roads.
- 9.19 Although there were slightly more responses on a percentage basis, objecting to the proposal for Temple Fortune Hill, again it is considered that they were in insufficient numbers compared to the total number of properties to merit the exclusion of Temple Fortune Hill from the proposal, particularly if Hampstead Way and Asmunds Hill were to be included.
- 9.20 Willifield Way had a significant number of objections to the CPZ, including petition signatories focussed on the section between Finchley Road and Temple Fortune Hill – and more concentrated between the sections of Asmunds Hill and Temple Fortune Hill. In itself, it was considered that there may be merit in acceding to the objectors and omitting Willifield Way from the

proposal, although it is acknowledged that displacement may occur should the CPZ be introduced in other roads, and potentially make the situation worse for residents of the road.

- 9.21 It should be remembered that there are particular traffic flow and road safety issues which the CPZ would potentially address. Asmunds Hill, Temple Fortune Hill and Willifield Way are narrow roads, where oncoming motorists struggle to pass each other, and in the case of Willifield Way the problems are exacerbated as it served by a bus route which is frequently delayed due to congestion. In addition, residents have raised the issue of, and officers have observed speeding taking place by vehicles, as motorists try and travel along these roads as quickly as possible before their travel is 'obstructed' by an oncoming vehicle. The CPZ would include the introduction of lengths of yellow lines on Willifield Way, designed to assist traffic movement in the road, and give confidence to motorists travelling along the road that there would be an option to 'pull over' along certain lengths to enable the oncoming vehicle to pass.
- 9.22 Overall, it is considered that although a number of objections have been received to the proposal, given the location and nature of the objections, there are not sufficient to override the original aims of the proposed CPZ, which was to relieve parking pressures primarily in Hampstead Way, Asmunds Hill, Temple Fortune Hill, and Meadway while mitigating against displaced parking in Willifield Way.
- 9.23 Discussions have taken place between Officers and two of the three Garden Suburb Ward Councillors regarding the detail of the responses to the consultation, the geographical spread of where the responses originated from, and the information they have received from their constituents. Ward Councillors agreed that there was merit in introducing the CPZ although they expressed their concern about the weight of objections in Willifield Way, and considered that the length of Willifield Way between Asmunds Hill and Temple Fortune Hill should be omitted from the CPZ.
- 9.24 Ward Councillors were also concerned about the apparent omission of the length of road around Willifield Green. Council records indicate the road is called Willifield Green although the properties on it are Willifield Way addressed properties.
- 9.25 Due to its narrow width, and issues relating to damage motorists cause to the green itself and to the kerb separating the green from the highway, Officers have been considering how to best address parking in the road. It is clear that motorists, including residents, park in the road – usually with two wheels on narrow footway on the property side of the road.
- 9.26 It is considered that if a CPZ were to be introduced, Willifield Green should be also included, although its width and general layout would make introducing marked out bays difficult. It is considered that the nature and layout of the road means it meets the Department for Transport's criteria for "Past this point" controls, which essentially means that CPZ controls could apply although no road markings would be necessary and signage would be at each end of the road. It is considered therefore that if the adjacent length of Willifield Way is included in the CPZ, then Willifield Green should be included with "Past this point" CPZ controls. This is shown in Appendix B.

- 9.27 In addition, Ward Councillors noted that there were representations from Heathgate about wishing to join the CPZ if the CPZ were to be introduced in Meadway, and were keen that residents of Heathgate be consulted on whether they wished for the road to join the CPZ, before any CPZ was introduced.
- 9.28 In response Officers consider that should any length of Willifield Way be excluded from the CPZ, there is potential for the road to be subject to the displaced parking which has affected Hampstead Way, and if any length of Willifield Way was to be excluded, then at the very least, waiting restrictions which were proposed to improve safety (eg at junctions) or improve traffic flow, should be introduced, although this would affect parking opportunity in the road further.
- 9.29 Regarding Heathgate, it is clear that there was concern from these residents of the possible effect on their road should Meadway be included. Therefore, it is considered that residents' views be sought, although this could be done post-implementation of the CPZ. Should the Sub-Committee determine that Officers should establish the feeling within Heathgate and potentially other roads, depending on the decisions made, prior to the CPZ being introduced; this would delay the CPZ implementation for potentially a number of months while the consultation and subsequent decision making processes are completed.
- 9.30 Officers consider that there is merit in introducing the Garden Suburb CPZ as originally proposed in Hampstead Way, Asmunds Hill, Temple Fortune Hill, Hill Close, and Meadway, with the relatively minor layout amendment outlined in Appendix C. Should this occur, it is also considered that Willifield Way should be included in the CPZ on traffic management grounds, although the strong views of the Ward Councillors are noted.

10. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 None.