

	<p>Chipping Barnet Area Committee 17 May 2017</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Title</p>	<p>Barnet Hospital Area EN5 Parking Consultation</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Report of</p>	<p>Commissioning Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Wards</p>	<p>High Barnet, Underhill</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A – Drawing of proposed parking measures. Drawing No. BC-000743-08-A Drawing No. BC-000743-08-B Drawing No. BC-000743-08-C Drawing No. BC-000743-08-D Drawing No. BC-000743-08-E Drawing No. BC-000743-08-F Drawing No. BC-000743-08-G Drawing No. BC-000743-08-H Drawing No. BC-000743-08-I Drawing No. BC-000743-08-J</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Gavin Woolery-Allen, gavin.woolery-allen@barnet.gov.uk; 020 8359 3555</p>

<p>Summary</p>
<p>This report sets out a number of proposed parking measures in the Barnet Hospital area, and seeks the Committee’s approval to progress these proposals to a statutory consultation.</p>

Recommendations

- 1. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, resolve to authorise the Commissioning Director for Environment and his officers to carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions in various locations as set out in Appendix A to this report.**
- 2. That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultation, referred to in recommendation 1, the committee authorise the Commissioning Director for Environment and his officers to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions.**
- 3. That the Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultation, referred to in recommendation 2, the Commissioning Director for Environment will, in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors, consider and determine whether any of the proposed changes should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Chipping Barnet Area Committee on 26th October 2016 considered the findings of a parking consultation in the Barnet Hospital area and decided, amongst other things, that Officers should design a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in identified roads, and to liaise with Ward Members in relation to developing a number of waiting restriction proposals in the consultation area and some parking amendments with a view to reporting all agreed proposals to a future meeting of this Committee.
- 1.2 This report details the design of the CPZ, and outlines a number of waiting restriction proposals and recommends further action.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Having considered a report outlining the findings of the parking consultation carried out in the Barnet Hospital area in May/June 2016, the Chipping Barnet Area Committee decided that Officers should investigate a number of locations for the provision of waiting restrictions. The locations were those that were highlighted by the local community during the consultation process as problematic locations to travel through.
- 2.2 The Chipping Barnet Area Committee also decided that Officers should design a CPZ in Elmbank Avenue, Wellside Close, Vyse Close and Granville Road and to report the layout to the future meeting of this Committee.
- 2.3 Officers were also instructed to consider whether the parking layout/restrictions can be amended in Ravenscroft Park EN5.

Waiting Restriction proposals

- 2.4 Officers have visited the area and have designed a number of waiting restriction proposals as outlined in Appendix A designed to improve sightlines and general road safety and improve the parking situation for local residents in the vicinity of Barnet Hospital.

CPZ design

- 2.5 Officers have designed a CPZ to include Wellside Close, Wellhouse Lane, Elmbank Avenue, Vyse Close, Granville Road and Argyle Road – the proposed layout is shown across various plans in Appendix A.
- 2.6 Officers consider that a Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm restriction across the CPZ should be sufficient in addressing the issues which are considered to be problematic, which mainly focussed on non-residents that parked in local roads.
- 2.7 Certainly when referring to the responses in the parking consultation carried out last year, the consensus from respondents appeared to suggest that they had difficulties parking in their roads, between 6am and 8pm, Mondays through to Fridays, and to a lesser extent between the same periods on Sundays. There appeared to be less of a problem overnight, and on Sundays.
- 2.8 Accordingly it is considered that the proposed CPZ would, in the main, the issues raised by residents at the times of day when their problems are at their worst.
- 2.9 The CPZ would operate the same time as the existing Chipping Barnet 'C' CPZ, which it will sit adjacent to. However it should be noted that this CPZ would have a separate permit designation to the 'C' CPZ.
- 2.10 The CPZ makes provision for resident permit parking spaces and yellow lines along lengths of kerbside where it is considered general parking should not take place, and in the case of Vyse Close and Wellside Close, a "Permit Holders Only Past This Point" arrangement is proposed, where parking places will not be utilised.
- 2.11 Although, provision is made for on-carriageway parking, a resident of Wellhouse Lane has suggested that part of the grassed area outside their property situated between Wellside Close and Trinder Road should be converted to footway parking which would help improve traffic flow along this section of Wellhouse Lane.
- 2.12 Although a footway parking arrangement is not part of the design outlined in Appendix A, the Committee is asked whether they wish for this to be investigated either as part of the original scheme, or as part of a follow up exercise.

Proposed change to parking restrictions in Ravenscroft Park and Hillside Gardens EN5

- 2.13 As noted in the October 2016 Chipping Barnet Area Committee report, Councillor Longstaff noted that the Charged-for parking spaces in Ravenscroft Park are rarely used.
- 2.14 Officers have noted this and in order to promote improved usage, and to potentially cater for those who wish to park in the area for longer periods, Officers consider that the Short-Stay Charged-for (maximum stay 2 hours) spaces should be converted to Long-Stay Charged-for spaces, with an reduced tariff which is commensurate with the tariff in the nearby Chipping Barnet Town Centre.
- 2.15 It is also considered that similar changes should be made to the Short-Stay Charged-For (maximum stay 2 hours) spaces in Blenheim Road, to make them Long-stay with a revised tariff, and that the revised tariff should also apply to the existing Long-Stay Charged-For/Permit spaces in Ravenscroft Park, so to provide a consistent parking arrangement/tariff in this local area.
- 2.16 A similar exercise was considered in Hillside Avenue, however Officers were concerned that the number of permit holders in the road exceeded the number of dedicated permit spaces, and therefore as some residents may need to utilise the existing Charged-for/Permit holder bay in the street, it was considered that any increase in non-resident parking may be detrimental to resident parking opportunity.

It is considered that the changes outlined above could potentially help local employees and visitors to parking in the area, particularly in light of the proposed new CPZ, which may then in turn help to reduce the pressure parking on street in unrestricted roads in the area.

Request for inclusion – Garthland Drive

- 2.17 Officers have received representations from 16 residents of Garthland Drive, having heard the decision of this Committee in October 2016 that a CPZ should be designed in certain local streets, requesting for their road to be included in any agreed CPZ, as they believe they would be impacted from any displacement of parking, being just outside the proposed CPZ.

Request for inclusion – Sutton Crescent, Lingholm Way and Lexington Way

- 2.18 Residents of Sutton Crescent believe that there were issues with the delivery of the consultation letter, which resulted in many properties not having received a link to the online questionnaire, and therefore not able to partake in the consultation.
- 2.19 Residents believe therefore that the decision made by the October 2016 meeting of this Committee was flawed as they had incomplete information,

although as the delivery was undertaken by an in-house team, who reported no problems with the delivery, Officers believe that a complete delivery took places as planned .

2.20 Residents have made consistent representations about this issue, particularly after the October 2016 Committee meeting and in February 2017 residents carried out their own consultation by way of a door to door survey.

2.21 The findings of the survey was as follows:

	In favour	Not in favour	Neutral/Undecided
Lexington Way	12	0	0
Lingholm Way	5	1	3
Sutton Crescent	51	8	5
Total	68	9	8

2.22 It appears from this exercise that there is a majority in favour of a CPZ.

2.23 Officers have noted the concern from both roads and consider that, now the details, of the proposed CPZ is known, that there may be merit in carrying out a further consultation in further roads to establish the residents/business feelings about having their road included.

Ward Councillor comments

2.24 Officers have consulted the Underhill and High Barnet Ward Councillors on the proposals and issues outlined in this report which fall within their respective Wards and the feedback is as follows:

Underhill Ward Councillor, Councillor Tim Roberts, stated his support for the proposals laid out in the report. He also specified his support for footway parking bays in Wellhouse Lane, and that after the parking measures are implemented, that a further consultation should then be carried out on possible parking controls in Lexington Way, Lingholm Way, Sutton Crescent and possibly part of Garthland Drive.

Underhill Ward Councillor, Councillor Jess Brayne, stated her support for Councillor Tim Roberts' views, and stated that Trinder Road and Bells Hill should also be part of a further consultation. She also suggested that Barnet Hospital should also be consulted and be asked to build sufficient parking such as a multi-story car park.

Councillor Brayne queried whether single yellow lines had been considered as an alternative to a CPZ.

In addition, Councillor Brayne stated her concern about the proposed waiting restrictions on Well Approach and Trinder Road, due to the potential impact on residents.

Councillor Edwards responded that he was broadly in favour of the proposals.

- 2.25 In response to the Councillor's views, Officers note the comments made by the Councillors who responded, and would ask the Committee to decide whether it considers that a further CPZ consultation should take place with additional roads in the community – the extent of which could be determined in discussion with the Ward Councillors.
- 2.26 Furthermore, although single yellow lines would be sufficient in addressing problematic parking, it is considered that their provision would increase demand for the remaining kerbside space – where residents would compete with non-residents. A proposed CPZ seeks to protect kerbside space for residents.
- 2.27 The comments received about proposals for certain locations has also been noted, although it is considered that the proposals seek to address problematic parking, and will be subject to a consultation with the local population prior to any implementation.
- 2.28 Moving forward, Officers consider that the proposals outlined in this report should be subject to a statutory consultation with the public.
- 2.29 If objections are forthcoming, it is considered that they should be considered and resolved by the Commissioning Director for Environment, in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors, using his Delegated Powers under the Council's Constitution for a decision on whether to introduce the measures or not, and if so, with or without modification.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 None in the context of this report.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Officers would seek to carry out a statutory consultation on the agreed proposals with a view to implementing those proposals subject to the outcome of the consultation.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The consultation seeks to establish whether measures are required to particularly help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of “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 £50,000 has been secured as part of Section 106 (S106) agreement for the

Elmbank development towards parking controls in the vicinity of Barnet Hospital, and an additional £10,000 has been secured as part of the same S106 as a contribution in respect of a possible implementation of waiting restrictions at Barnet Road and Galley Lane.

- 5.2.2 The costs of introducing a CPZ in Argyle Road, Granville Road, Elmbank Avenue, Vyse Close, Wellside Close and part of Wellhouse Lane as well as the introduction of waiting restrictions and minor parking bay changes as outlined in Appendix A is estimated to be £30,000. These costs will involve carrying out a statutory consultation, 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.
- 5.2.3 The cost of implementing an option of footway parking bays at Wellhouse Lane is estimated to be an additional £5,000, and the costs of carrying out an additional consultation and associated analysis would be in the region of £5,000.
- 5.2.4 It is envisaged that the costs outlined above should be funded from the S106 funding outlined in paragraph 5.2.1,
- 5.2.5 The works will be carried out under the existing LOHAC term maintenance contractual arrangements
- 5.2.6 Once implemented the costs of maintaining the CPZ (lines and signs) and enforcement will be met from the councils' Special Parking Account (SPA). In addition any income resulting from residents permits and PCNs issued (for non-compliant parking), will also be allocated to the SPA.

5.3 **Social Value**

Not applicable in the context of this report.

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

- 5.4.1 The Council's Constitution 15A (Responsibility for Functions, Annex A) provides that in the area covered by the committee:
- 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. These include but are not limited to local highways and safety schemes.
- 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 the duty.
- 5.4.3 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.

- 5.3.1 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.
- 5.3.3 Council Constitution, Section 15, Annex B – Responsibility for Functions Scheme of Delegated Authority to Officers states that the Commissioning Director for Environment is authorised to make “any decision for the operational effectiveness of...highways”

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 loading and parking facilities in the Town Centre 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. However, for both issues, it is considered that adequate consultation will be undertaken with members of the public so they can have the opportunity to comment to any statutory consultation on any proposed

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

- 5.6.1 The public sector equality duty (PEQD) under Section 149(1) of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the authority, in the exercise of its functions, to have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and person who do not share it.
- 5.6.2 Having due regards means the need to (a) remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are connected to that characteristics (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are different from the needs of person who do not share (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristics to participate in public life in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- 5.6.3 The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs, sex and sexual orientation.
- 5.6.4 Full analysis of the responses and comments to the consultation has not indicated that there are any particular negative equalities/diversity impacts on vulnerable residents in the area.

5.7 Consultation and Engagement

5.7.1 Consultation will be undertaken as described in this report.

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 None in relation to this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1.1 Item 12 of the Chipping Barnet Area Committee meeting of 26 October 2016 - Barnet Hospital Area EN5 Parking Consultation

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=8649&Ver=4>

6.1.2 Item 15 of the Chipping Barnet Area Committee meeting of 6 July 2016 – Barnet Hospital Parking Review

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=8648&Ver=4>

6.1.3 Item 8c of the Chipping Barnet Area Committee meeting of 13 January 2016 – Members' Items

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=8315&Ver=4=4>

6.1.4 Planning Permission reference 15/033343/FUL - The development of the land at Elmbank Barnet Rd Barnet EN5 3HD.

