

	<h2>Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</h2> <h3>26 October 2016</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Title</b></p>	<p><b>Garden Suburb Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) - Proposed extension into Heathgate and South Square NW11</b></p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Report of</b></p>	<p>Commissioning Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Wards</b></p>	<p>Garden Suburb</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Status</b></p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Urgent</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Key</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Enclosures</b></p>	<p><b>Appendix A</b> – Drawing Number: SCR113-1- Proposed CPZ Heathgate and South Square  <b>Appendix B</b> – Consultation response summary  <b>Appendix C</b> – Drawing Number SCR113-1b – Revised CPZ layout Heathgate and South Square</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Officer Contact Details</b></p>	<p>Gavin Woolery-Allen  gavin.woolery-allen@barnet.gov.uk  020 8359 7545</p>

## Summary

At its meeting on 2 July 2015, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee resolved that officers should carry out a statutory consultation in respect of including Heathgate in the Garden Suburb ‘GS’ Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and prior to the statutory consultation, that an informal consultation with residents of South Square NW11 should take place to establish residents’ views on being included in a CPZ.

Following the informal consultation with South Square, it was decided that the inclusion of South Square in the Garden Suburb ‘GS’ CPZ should be also subject to a statutory consultation concurrent with a revised Heathgate proposal.

This report considers the comments and objections received to the statutory consultation and asks the Committee to consider the Officer recommendations made as a result of those comments and objections received

## **Recommendations**

- 1. That the Committee note the outcome of the statutory consultation as detailed within this report and approve the following, at a total estimated cost of £11,000 for item number 2 below.**
- 2. That the Committee instruct the Commissioning Director for Environment should introduce the extension to the Garden Suburb 'GS' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into Heathgate and South Square NW11 as originally consulted, through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders, with the exception of the modification outlined in (a) and (b) below, and as shown on drawing number SCR113-1b.**
  - (a) That a length of at any time waiting restriction should be provided on the north-west side of South Square outside St Jude's Church; and**
  - (b) That an additional parking place should be provided on South Square in the vicinity of Nos. 19 and 20 South Square.**

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

- 1.1 This report provides the Committee with an update on progress made to date following the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee's decision of 2 July 2015 for a statutory consultation to take place relating the inclusion of Heathgate and potentially South Square in the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ and asks the Committee to note the actions carried out to date, and to make a decision on how to proceed.

### **2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 On 2 July 2015 the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, whilst deciding that a statutory consultation should take place in respect of the proposed inclusion of Heathgate NW11 in the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ, resolved for officers to undertake an informal consultation with residents of South Square NW11 on whether they would also like their road to be part of the proposal for inclusion in the CPZ. The Committee also resolved that the results would be considered by the Commissioning Director for Environment, who would decide the future action.
- 2.2 Accordingly, in May 2016, in considering the results of the informal consultation in South Square, the Commissioning Director for Environment decided, by way of a Delegated Powers Report, that a statutory consultation should take place in respect of South Square's inclusion in the CPZ, concurrent with the proposal for Heathgate. In making this decision, the Commissioning Director for Environment also decided to

revise the proposed parking layout for Heathgate, in that a “Past this Point” layout should be introduced in the southernmost length of the road.

- 2.3 On the 7 July 2016, letters were hand delivered to residents of Heathgate and South Square and nearby streets as part of the statutory consultation process proposing Heathgate’s and South Square’s inclusion in the CPZ. As part of the statutory consultation process, notices outlining the proposal were erected on-street along Heathgate and South Square and Charnwood Close, and a similar notice published in the London Gazette and local newspaper.
- 2.4 As a result of this consultation, 21 responses were received (see Appendix B).
- 2.5 Key headlines resulting from the statutory consultation responses are as follows:
  - 6 were stated objections against the proposed CPZ extension;
  - A further 4 highlighted concerns about the proposal;
  - 11 indicated that they were in favour of the proposed CPZ extension.
- 2.6 The responses to the consultation indicate that the majority of respondents were in favour of the CPZ being extended to include Heathgate and South Square.
- 2.7 It should be noted that the 11 responses in favour of the proposed CPZ extension were from residents of Heathgate and South Square. These residents who have as a collective, in the case of Heathgate residents, through a petition, and in the case of South Square residents, through representations to the Council, have generally indicated over a period of time for a will to join the CPZ.
- 2.8 The objections and concerns received to the proposed CPZ extension can be summarised as follows:
  - Concern over displaced parking into the unrestricted lengths of Meadway NW11 (5 no.);
  - Concern about displaced parking into Northway NW11 (2 no.);
  - Concern about impact on ambience, ethos and character of local area (2 no.);
  - That parking is not problematic in the relevant roads (1 no.);
  - The potential negative impact on visitors to the Heath extension (1 no.);
  - A request for the CPZ to be extended further along Meadway (5 no.);
  - Concern about the extra expense of obtaining a permit to park in the CPZ (1 no.);
  - Concern that the proposed CPZ hours may not be sufficient (1no.);
  - Would like to be able to park outside home without having to get a permit. (1 no.);
  - Would like people to be able to park within reasonable distance of Golders Green Station and buses on Finchley Road to encourage public transport use. (1 no.);
  - Concern about impact on St Jude’s Church car park.

## **Miscellaneous comments and suggestions**

- 2.9 Other comments and suggestions include:
- Concerns about the proposed layout outside St Jude's Church on South Square, requesting to make this length "no parking at any time" (2 no.);
  - Request for access to flats on Heathgate to be double yellow lines rather than single yellow lines (1 no.);
  - Request for double yellow line at the junction of Meadway and Heathgate (1 no.);
  - Request for additional parking near Nos. 19 to 24 South Square.
- 2.10 Officers' comments to the issues raised are as follows:

### **Impact on Meadway and North Square and request for CPZ in Meadway**

- 2.11 Officers are mindful of the concerns raised from the residents of these roads who responded to the consultation. It is noted that, in the case of Meadway in particular, parking may already be congested in these roads, although it is accepted that displaced parking could result from the introduction a CPZ in Heathgate and South Square. It is considered however, that this does not take away from the need and local desire for a CPZ to be introduced in Heathgate and South Square.
- 2.12 With regards to the request for the CPZ to be extended further along Meadway, it is considered that the requests should be considered and assessed separately along with all other similar requests that the Council receives, with a view to determining the requests that should be included for further investigation in future years' work programmes. This would allow the impact of any CPZ introduction in Heathgate and South Square to be monitored.

### **Concerns about impact on ambience, ethos and character of local area**

- 2.13 It is considered that the extension of the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ would not necessarily negatively impact on the ambience, ethos and character of the local area, as the area, whether that be the Hampstead Garden Suburb conservation area or Garden Suburb Ward, already has CPZ restrictions in it. In the case of the Garden Suburb Ward, this has been home to the Golders Green Temple Fortune, East Finchley and Garden Suburb CPZs for a number of years. It should also be noted that the proposal was borne from requests from people who live in the area and presumably understand and have considered the characteristics of the local area.

**That parking is not problematic in the relevant roads, Would like to be able to park outside home without having to get a permit, Would like people to be able to park within reasonable distance of Golders Green Station and buses on Finchley Road to encourage public transport use.**

- 2.16 Reports and petitions received from local people over a period of time and from observations from Council officers suggests that parking is problematic in the relevant roads, likely attributable in instances to those using local buses and other public transport links, and it is those representations which have resulted in the proposed CPZ extension.

#### **The potential negative impact on visitors to the Heath extension**

- 2.17 It is accepted that the introduction of a CPZ may impact on visitors' ability to visit the Heath extension, however it should be noted that the CPZ extension would only operate between 1pm and 2pm Mondays to Fridays, and it is considered that non-residents would still be able to park locally to visit the Heath extension outside of those periods.
- 2.18 Alternatively, visitors to the Heath extension during the 1pm to 2pm period would be able to still visit albeit they may need to park at another entrance, where there are no restrictions, or where the restrictions are not prohibitive at that time of day.

#### **Concern about the extra expense of obtaining a permit to park in the CPZ**

- 2.19 This issue is noted, although it is the Council's policy is to charge for parking permits to park in its CPZs.

#### **Concern that the proposed CPZ hours may not be sufficient**

- 2.20 The existing Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ operates for one-hour per weekday – between 1pm and 2pm, Monday to Friday, and there have been no major issues raised with residents in the CPZ in roads neighbouring Heathgate and South Square in respect of the hours of control being insufficient. It is therefore considered that the proposed CPZ hours should be sufficient.

#### **Concern about impact on St Jude's Church car park**

- 2.21 The car park is private and the Church can manage it as they see fit. The Council has no jurisdiction on the car park.

#### **Miscellaneous comments and suggestions**

- 2.22 An Officer visited South Square recently to discuss the proposed layout and suggested changes with local residents, and it is considered that the proposed layout in South Square should be revised to incorporate the following:
- A length of at any time waiting restriction on the north-west side of South Square outside St Jude's Church;
  - An additional parking place on South Square in the vicinity of Nos. 19 and 20.
- 2.23 With regards to the request for double yellow lines at the junction of Heathgate and Meadway, this is already proposed.

- 2.24 With regards to the request for double yellow lines across the entrance to flats on Heathgate, it is not usual to protect driveways with double yellow lines, and it is considered that the parking layout, in that there would be a single yellow line and bays provided a distance away from the entrance will encourage a better, less obstructive, parking environment.

### **Conclusion**

- 2.24 In closing, the proposed CPZ extension appears to be well received, with minimal general objections from local residents although there was concern relating to displacement of parking in local neighbouring roads such as Meadway and Northway.
- 2.25 Therefore, it is recommended that the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ be extended into Heathgate and South Square as originally proposed with the amendments as outlined in paragraph 2.22 above as shown in drawing no. SCR113-1b (Appendix C).

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

- 3.1 The Council could consider not including Heathgate and South Square in the Garden Suburb CPZ, However, there would be on-going parking issues in these roads which would continue, to the detriment of residents' ability to park near their homes. Therefore it is considered that a do nothing option is not considered viable.

## **4 POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.1 The implementation will be carried out as soon as practicable, in line with existing work programmes, and 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 South Square NW11 and effectively managing the traffic movement throughout the local road network contributes to the Corporate Plan priority "a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic".

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

- 5.2.1 The costs of introducing a CPZ in Heathgate and South Square, including the statutory consultation already undertaken, 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.

5.2.2 The Scheme is funded using the LIP funding 'Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures Programmes, 2016/17 and of the £3,413,000 allocation £100,000 has been identified for the Parking Review Programme.

### **5.3 Social Value**

5.3.1 None in the context of this report.

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

5.4.1 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.

5.4.1 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.

5.4.2 The Council's Constitution, Annex A for Responsibility for Functions, paragraph 2 of Area Committee section states that Area Committees can "Discharge any functions, within the budget and policy framework agreed by Policy and Resources, of the theme committees that they agree are more properly delegated to a more local level and it includes discharge of functions for local highways and safety schemes within the budget.

### **5.5 Risk Management**

5.5.1 It is not considered 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.

5.5.2 It is considered the issues involved proposing or introducing a CPZ may lead to some level of public concern from local residents who feel 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 has ensured that members of the public have had the opportunity to comment to any statutory consultation on any proposed CPZ, which has been assessed and considered accordingly.

### **5.6 Equalities and Diversity**

5.6.1 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.

5.6.2 The safety elements incorporated into the CPZ design and the resultant traffic movements benefit all road users equally as they would improve safety and traffic flow at those locations.

## **5.7 Consultation and Engagement**

5.7.1 Consultation was undertaken as described elsewhere in this report.

## **5.8 Insight**

5.8.1 None in relation to this report.

## **6 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

6.1 Delegated Powers Report of the Commissioning Direction for Environment June 2016 - Informal Parking Consultation - South Square NW11

6.2 Finchley & Golders Green Committee Report 2 July 2015 – Garden Suburb (GS) Controlled Parking Zone Review.

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8263&Ve=4>