

	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">2<sup>nd</sup> July 2015</h3>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Results of the Garden Suburb ‘GS’ Controlled Parking Zone review</b>
<b>Report of</b>	Commissioning Director, Environment
<b>Wards</b>	Garden Suburb Ward
<b>Status</b>	Public
<b>Enclosures</b>	<p> <b>Appendix A</b> – Garden Suburb CPZ review questionnaire  <b>Appendix A2</b> – Garden Suburb CPZ outskirts review questionnaire  <b>Appendix B</b> – Garden Suburb CPZ review resident letters  <b>Appendix C</b> – Plan showing Garden Suburb CPZ review consultation area  <b>Appendix D</b> – Response rate to questionnaires  <b>Appendix E</b> – Graphs showing results of the Garden Suburb CPZ review questionnaire.  <b>Appendix E2</b> – Graphs showing the results of the Garden Suburb CPZ outskirts review questionnaire  <b>Appendix F</b> – Proposed “Past this point” parking layout – Hill Close  <b>Appendix G</b> – Proposed Controlled Parking Zone layout - Heathgate         </p>
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	Abai Otah Abai.otah@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 3555

## Summary

The purpose of this report is to advise the outcome of the informal consultation undertaken and makes recommendations on possible future actions as a result of the findings.

The Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was introduced in October 2013 and operates between the hours of 1pm – 2pm, Monday to Friday. In June 2014 the Garden

Suburb CPZ was extended to include the section of Willifield Way between Asmunds Hill and Temple Fortune Hill following a concerns raised by a number of residents living in this section of Willifield Way who originally were not in favour of parking controls being introduced during the initial statutory consultation.

In October 2014 the Council conducted an informal consultation with residents living inside and outside the existing Garden Suburb CPZ. The documentation which residents received advised them to complete a SurveyMonkey questionnaire online so that the Council could obtain their views on their current parking experiences within their area.

## **Recommendations**

**That the Committee note the details contained within this report and approve the following at an estimated cost of £5,000 for item numbers 2, 3, 6 and 8, and £1,500 for item number 4, and £11,000 for item number 7:**

- 1. That the details and results of the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) review are noted;**
- 2. That Officers should carry out a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a “Past this Point” method of parking control in Hill Close, the layout of which is set out in Appendix F to this report;**
- 3. That Officers should carry out a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a CPZ for Heathgate, the layout of which is set out in Appendix G to this report;**
- 4. That Officers should, prior to carrying out the statutory consultation referred to in 3 above, carry out an informal consultation with residents of South Square to establish whether they would be in favour of a CPZ being introduced;**
- 5. That the results of the informal consultation referred to in 4 above should be considered by the Commissioning Director, Environment in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors to decide whether a statutory consultation should be carried out on a proposal to introduce a CPZ in South Square;**
- 6. That subject to the decision by the Commissioning Director, Environment referred to in 5 above, Officers should carry out a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a CPZ for South Square concurrent with the statutory consultation outlined in 3 above;**
- 7. That, subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultations referred to in recommendations 2, 3 and 6 above, that Officers introduce the CPZ in Heathgate and ‘Past this Point ‘ measures in Hill Close through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders;**
- 8. That any unresolved material objections to the statutory consultations**

**referred to in recommendations 2, 3 and 6 above, are reported back to a future meeting of this Committee for consideration, and for a decision on how to proceed.**

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

This report provides the Finchley and Golders Green committee with the outcome to the Garden Suburb CPZ review carried out on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and to consider the recommendations made as a result of the feedback obtained through the consultation and to seek a decision from the committee on how to proceed.

## **2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 In October 2014 the Council conducted an informal consultation with residents of the Garden Suburb area whose properties are located inside and outside the existing Garden Suburb CPZ. The documentation which residents received advised them to complete a SurveyMonkey questionnaire online so that the Council could obtain their views on their current parking experiences within their area.
- 2.2 A total of 502 properties situated on roads within the existing Garden Suburb CPZ - Asmunds Hill, Hampstead Way, Hill Close, Meadway, Temple Fortune Hill and Willifield Way - were asked to complete a questionnaire online titled "Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone parking review". In addition a total of 737 households whose properties were situated on roads outside the existing Garden Suburb CPZ were invited to complete a questionnaire titled "Garden Suburb Controlled Parking outskirts review". Residents who were unable to complete a questionnaire online were given the option of completing a paper copy questionnaire which they were able to return via post in a prepaid addressed stamp envelope.
- 2.3 Having analysed the address details of all those who completed a questionnaire it is apparent that a number of residents living within the Garden Suburb CPZ had completed the questionnaire meant for those residents living outside of the CPZ, and vice versa.
- 2.4 A total of 147 respondents completed the questionnaire meant for those properties within the CPZ. Out of the respondents 86 had completed the correct questionnaire, 21 questionnaires were completed by respondents whose properties were situated within the existing Garden Suburb CPZ, 30 questionnaires were completed by respondents where their address is situated outside the consultation boundary and 10 questionnaires were completed by residents who provided insufficient addresses details.
- 2.5 With regards to the questionnaire meant for those properties outside of the CPZ, 120 households had completed a questionnaire. Out of the households that completed this questionnaire, it was established that 111 had completed the correct questionnaire. 3 questionnaires were completed by households

who properties resided within the existing Garden Suburb CPZ. It was also found that 2 questionnaires were completed by households in which their addresses were situated outside the consultation boundary. 4 questionnaires were completed by residents who provided insufficient address details which meant that the information collated could not be taken into consideration.

- 2.6 It was also established that a number of questionnaires were completed by residents whose addresses were situated outside both the “within CPZ” and “outside CPZ” consultation areas as well as completed questionnaires where insufficient address details were provided. As a consequence, it is considered that the information gathered could not be taken into consideration.
- 2.7 In order to gain a greater understanding from the data obtained from the results of the consultation it was considered the analysis of the report is split into two sections. The first part focuses on the results from roads situated within the Garden Suburb CPZ while the second part of this report focuses on the result from the roads surrounding the existing Garden Suburb CPZ.

#### Road within the existing Garden Suburb CPZ

- 2.8 In Hampstead Way, 33 (22%) out of 152 households situated with the Garden Suburb CPZ completed a questionnaire. Of those who responded 88% were satisfied with the way the CPZ is currently operating. However 66% of respondents felt that the zone was not being enforced properly. It was also felt that there were not enough Civil Enforcement Officers visible on-street during restricted periods.
- 2.9 In Asmunds Hill, 9 (17%) out of 54 households situated with the Garden Suburb Zone completed a questionnaire. Of those that completed a questionnaire 77% considered that the Garden Suburb CPZ is being enforced effectively. In addition three quarter of these households indicated that the CPZ met its objectives of minimising obstructive parking whilst providing adequate parking for residents and their visitors.
- 2.10 In Willifield Way, 33 (19%) out of a 176 completed a questionnaire. Of those that responded 42% felt that they were satisfied with the way in which the CPZ is operating. A few residents raised concerns regarding the parking difficulties they are experiencing during school drop off and pick up times in the mornings and afternoons. The issue of speeding vehicles and congestion were also highlighted as concerns by a few residents.
- 2.11 In Hill Close only 1 (11%) out of the 9 households responded directly to the questionnaire in which they indicated that they are satisfied with the way the Garden Suburb CPZ is currently operating. However, in response to the consultation all the residents of Hill Close signed a letter requesting for the road markings and associate time plates to be removed in preference for a “Past this point” parking zone/layout which is less visually intrusive as it requires less road markings and associated time plates on street.

#### Roads situated outside the existing Gardens Suburb CPZ

- 2.12 Out of the roads that participated in the consultation, Heathgate achieved the highest response rate with 17 (68%) out of 26 households responding directly to the questionnaire. Of those that responded 88% had experienced problems with parking since the Garden Suburb CPZ was introduced. In addition 82% of the respondents indicated that they were in favour of a CPZ being introduced in their road. The main issue appears to be that a significant number of vehicles owned by non-residents park in their road for lengthy periods of time which makes it difficult for residents to find a parking space. Other comments received were in relation to the fact that their road is just beyond the boundary of the existing Garden Suburb CPZ. Subsequent to the consultation the Council received a petition signed by a significant number of resident who have requested for their road to be included within a CPZ. 68% of the respondents confirmed that they owned a minimum of 2 vehicles and 45% stated that their vehicles are parked on street.
- 2.13 In South Square which is situated off Heathgate, 6 (22%) households out of 27 responded to the questionnaire. Out of those that responded all indicated that they are not happy with the current parking in their road and furthermore 83% of these householders have indicated that they had experienced problems with parking since the Garden Suburb CPZ commenced and that they would like the Council to investigate their concerns further. When asked to elaborate respondents from South Square made reference to the fact they have experienced a high number of vehicles parking in their road where some of these vehicles have been abandoned, left by garages who do not have enough space to park all their customers vehicles as well as vehicles left throughout the day by commuting non residents.
- 2.14 When respondents of South Square were asked whether they would like their road to be included as part of a CPZ 83% of the respondents indicated that they would be in favour of these measures being introduced.
- 2.15 Out of the 130 households that received a letter, 27 (21%) participated in the consultation. Of those that responded 80% indicated that they had experienced parking problems with non-residents parking in their road since the Garden Suburb CPZ was introduced. When asked to comment further on this question a number of the responded raised concerns regarding the level of non commuter parking in their road for lengthy periods of time.
- 2.16 Off Erskine Hill are a number of small narrow cul- de-sacs such as Homesfield, Woodside and Chatham Close. Compared to the rest of the roads consulted residents of these roads provided little or no response to the consultation.
- 2.17 It should be noted that 51% of the Erskine Hill respondents indicated that they are not satisfied with the parking situation in their road and 74% would like the Council to investigate their concerns further. In term of vehicle ownership 61% confirmed that they owned 1 vehicle whilst the remainder of the respondents owned 2 vehicles. Of the respondents that owned vehicles it has been established that 90% park their vehicles on the public highway.

- 2.18 In Hampstead Way, 5 (7%) households out of the 67 households situated within the outer consultation zone responded to the questionnaire. Of those that responded whose properties are situated within the Temple Fortune CPZ, three quarters indicated that they are not satisfied with the way the CPZ was operating. When householders were asked to elaborate on the problems that they are experiencing they raised concerns in relation to the fact that the Temple Fortune CPZ only operates until 11am makes it difficult for residents especially those with permits and their visitors to find a parking space. One householder raised concerns regarding the number of vehicles they have observed driving from road to road ultimately waiting until the zone ends.
- 2.19 Out of the 41 properties on Hogarth Hill that were consulted 11 (27%) households responded to a questionnaire. Of those that responded to the questionnaire 70% indicated that they were not satisfied with the parking situation in their road. These householders also raised concerns regarding the parking problems that they are experiencing with non resident parking in their road which in turn has impacted on households and their visitors' ability to find available parking on street close to their homes.
- 2.20 When respondents of Hogarth Hill were asked about vehicle ownership 75% stated that they owned one vehicle which they parked on street and the remaining 25% of the respondents stated that they own two vehicles which they parked on the public highway. A significant number of these households do not have off street parking facilities and out of the residents that responded to the questionnaire 80% indicated that the level of parking in their road was high to very high. This acknowledgement is not surprising as the residents of Hogarth Hill as well as the residents in the surrounding neighbouring roads are unlikely to be allowed to apply for a vehicular access outside their residence due to strict planning guidelines set by the Garden Suburb Trust. However, despite their concerns 54% indicated that they would not be in favour of a CPZ being introduced in their road.
- 2.21 During the consultation a total of 12 (10%) out of the 122 households of Addison Way responded to the questionnaire. Out of the households that responded 54% raised concerns regarding the parking problems that they and their visitors are experiencing as a result of the inception of the Garden Suburb CPZ. Those that elaborated on their parking concerns felt that the problem that they are experiencing is due to commuter parking. 54% of the respondents said that they owned one vehicle whilst the remaining respondents owned two vehicles. When asked where they parked their vehicles all confirmed that they parked their vehicles on the public highway.
- 2.22 Asmunds Place is situated within the Temple Fortune Controlled Parking Zone which operates between the hours of 10am – 11am Monday to Friday. Out of the 57 households that were consulted 11 (22%) responded to the questionnaire, in which 63% said that they were unhappy with the parking situated in their road and 54% of these respondents said that they would like the Council to investigate their concerns. When asked to provide further details of their concerns some responded by saying that they found it difficult to find a parking space after 11am weekdays. It should be noted that Asmunds Place is situated very close to Temple Fortune Town Centre on Finchley Road

where the public highway is currently subject to waiting and loading restrictions as well as Pay by Phone parking facilities which operate during the working day.

- 2.23 Amongst the other roads situated within the south-eastern section of the outer consultation area are small cul de sacs with narrow roads such as Turners Close, Turners Drive, Ruskin Close, Hurst Close and Linnell Close. These roads are private in parts and overall provided very little or no response to the consultation.
- 2.24 Overall it has been established that 71% of respondents living within the outskirts consultation area had experienced problems with non residents parking in their road since the Garden Suburb CPZ was introduced. In addition and not surprisingly it was also found that 63% of these respondents were dissatisfied with the current parking situation in their roads and 55% of these respondents would like their road to be included as part of a CPZ.

#### Conclusions and recommendations

- 2.25 Parking continues to provide a wide and varied view especially with regards to CPZ's. Residents with a reasonable knowledge of parking controls and the layout of their surrounding area are more likely to respond to the questionnaire.
- 2.26 Having analysed the comments received through the questionnaire it is clear that overall residents living with the Garden Suburb CPZ are generally satisfied with the way the zone is operating and therefore it is recommended that no further action is taken regarding its current operational hours. However, the concerns raised by a number of residents regarding the lack of enforcement or visible Civil Enforcement Officer on patrol during restricted periods has been forwarded to the Parking Client Team to investigate and where necessary to take the necessary appropriate action to ensure the Garden Suburb CPZ is enforced effectively. The concerns relating to speeding in roads with the Garden Suburb CPZ consultation area has been forwarded to the Traffic Management team for their attention.
- 2.27 With regards to residents of Hill Close request for a "Past this Point" Parking area layout to be introduced in their road, Officers believe that there is merit in proposing a parking layout of this nature in this small cul-de-sac as it meets the current criteria set by the Department of Transport for such controls. In addition a small section of Willifield Way already has "Past this point" parking controls which appear to be working effectively.
- 2.28 Past this point restrictions are used as a way of increasing the amount of on street parking available for residents on roads with a high demand for resident parking, but which have limited kerb space available to introduce marked bays which would limit the available space utilised for parking for residents. Past this point is indicated only by the positioning of zone entry and exit signs stating the road is 'resident permit holders only past this point'. No bay markings or CPZ single yellow line waiting restrictions are marked.

- 2.29 The provision of “Past this point” controls in Hill Close would also likely result in reduced maintenance costs in future years as there would be a reduction in signage and road markings. However, Officers would point out that if a “Past this point” parking area was implemented in Hill Close, there could be issues regarding the siting of the associated entry plates at the entrance to Hill Close due to its narrow road width and as a consequence motorists visiting the area may not observe these plates which may result in them receiving a Penalty Charge Notice. Furthermore, the removal of the existing parking relating road markings in Hill Close may result in the road being unsightly. In any case, it is believed that residents of the road are aware of this possibility as they have periodically raised the issue since the commencement of the Garden Suburb CPZ in October 2013.
- 2.30 With regards to Heathgate it is clear that residents of this road are unhappy with the current parking levels. Having noted the high response rate, considered the comments and correspondence received during and after the consultation as well as the signed petitions, Officers consider it appropriate to propose extending the existing Garden Suburb CPZ to include Heathgate. Therefore it is proposed to carry out a statutory consultation with the residents of Heathgate on a proposal to introduce parking controls which will operate between the hours of 1pm – 2pm Mondays to Fridays. However, it should be noted that if resident parking controls were introduced in Heathgate it is highly likely to have an impact on parking by displacing parking to neighbouring roads.
- 2.31 In view of the above, it is considered that respondents living within the outskirts consultation area in roads such as Hogarth Hill, Addison Way and Erskine Hill overall are unhappy with the parking situation in their area based on the negative feedback obtained through the consultation. Although these respondents are in favour of their road being part of a CPZ, Officers consider that due to the low overall response rate from many roads within the outskirts consultation area it is considered that there is insufficient justification for the Council to consider introducing parking controls across this area and therefore it is recommended that no further action should be taken.
- 2.32 Officers have engaged with the Garden Suburb Ward Councillors regarding the findings of the consultation, and Councillor Marshall has agreed with the proposal to carry out a statutory consultation to include Heathgate as part of the Garden Suburb CPZ. However, he had concerns about the impact the inclusion of Heathgate in the CPZ may have on available parking in the adjacent South Square, if South Square was not also subject to controlled parking measures. As a consequence, he has suggested that a further consultation should be carried out with residents of South Square to obtain their views on whether they would like their road to join the CPZ in light of the proposal to include Heathgate as part of the Garden Suburb CPZ.
- 2.33 Councillor Marshall also raised the issue of a resident who lives within the Temple Fortune CPZ close to the border with the Garden Suburb CPZ who has parking difficulties he is experiencing after the controlled hours of operation. As a consequence, Councillor Marshall would like the Council to

investigate his constituent's concerns to see if a suitable solution can be found.

- 2.34 Councillor Marshall has requested that a statutory consultation on the recommended parking measures mentioned above should be carried out as soon as possible.
- 2.35 In light of the Councillor concerns about South Square, Officers consider that there is merit in carrying out an informal consultation with residents of South Square in the first instance asking them whether they would like to join the CPZ in light of the weight of support from Heathgate to join the CPZ, which depending on the outcome of the statutory consultation, may result in the CPZ ultimately being introduced in Heathgate.
- 2.36 With regards to parking issues near the boundary of the Temple Fortune CPZ and Garden Suburb CPZ, Officers will consider any solutions as part of its yellow line and minor parking changes programme.

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

- 3.1 None

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

- 4.1 All households initially consulted in October 2014 will be informed of the outcome to the Garden Suburb CPZ parking review by way of a letter. In addition Officers consider that a statutory consultation should be carried out with residents of Heathgate and some of the neighbouring roads on a proposal to introduce Controlled Parking Zone measures in Heathgate. It is also considered that a further statutory consultation will be carried out with residents of Hill Close on a proposal to introduce "Past this Point" parking measure in Hill Close. 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 Heathgate and effectively managing the traffic movement throughout the local road network contributes to the Corporate Plan priority "A Successful London Suburb" and contribute to strategic objectives of "keeping Barnet moving through the efficient management of the roads and pavements network" by improving the quality of life for residents through affording them better parking protection and by improving the traffic and parking conditions, contributing to "The Sustainable Community Strategy for Barnet 2010-2020.

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

- 5.2.1 The costs of carrying out an informal consultation which includes writing to all properties in the agreed consultation area and considering feedback, are estimated to be £1,500 and could be met from the 2015/16 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) allocation for Parking Reviews.
- 5.2.2 The costs of carrying out a statutory consultation which includes drafting the relevant Traffic Management Orders and legal notices, advertising, writing to all properties in the agreed consultation area and considering feedback and objections to the proposed measures, are estimated to be £5,000 and could be met from the 2015/16 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) allocation for Parking Reviews.
- 5.2.3 The estimated costs of introducing a CPZ in Heathgate and South Square as well as converting Hill Close into a 'Past this point' parking area, which require 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 £11,000.
- 5.2.4 Any CPZ's introduced will require new signs and lines work to be met from the TfL funded capital budget for this area of work. 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 Legal and Constitutional References**

- 5.3.1 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.
- 5.3.2 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.
- 5.3.3 The Council's Constitution Responsibility for Functions, Appendix A, sets out within its terms of reference the functions which an Area Committee can

discharge, which includes local highways and safety schemes.

#### **5.4 Risk Management**

- 5.4.1 It is not considered that the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations as any CPZ would improve parking provision for residents and improve the traffic flow by helping to disperse local traffic into the wider network of local roads.
- 5.4.2 It is considered the issues involved proposing or introducing a CPZ may lead to some level of public concern from local residents who do not wish for a CPZ to be introduced, or from residents of other roads in the area concerned about commuter parking being displaced into their road or network of roads. However, for both issues, it is considered that adequate consultation across a sufficient area will ensure that members of the public have the opportunity to comment in any informal consultation exercise or to any statutory consultation on any proposed CPZ, which will then be considered before a decision is made on how to progress.

#### **5.5 Equalities and Diversity**

- 5.5.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires a decision-maker to have 'due regard' to achieving a number of equality goals: (i) to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Act; (ii) to advance equality of opportunity between those with protected characteristics and those without; and (iii) to foster good relations between persons with a relevant protected characteristic and those without. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. It also covers marriage and civil partnership with regard to eliminating discrimination.
- 5.5.2 The safety elements incorporated into the CPZ design and resultant traffic movements benefit all road users equally as they would improve safety and traffic flow at those locations.

#### **5.6 Consultation and Engagement**

In October 2014, the Council carried out an informal consultation with residents living within and outside the existing Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone in order to establish their views and concerns regarding parking since the Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone was introduced.

### **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None