

	<p>Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</p> <p>14 November 2017</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>Temple Fortune Area NW11 - Proposed Waiting Restrictions</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Strategic Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>Garden Suburb , Golders Green</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A – Proposed Waiting Restrictions Appendix B – Recommended Waiting Restrictions for implementation</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Karen Grinter Karen.grinter@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 3555</p>

<h2>Summary</h2>
<p>This report summarises the comments and objections received to a statutory consultation on proposed waiting restrictions in a number of locations in the Temple Fortune area, and seeks the Committee’s approval to implement, not implement or modify the proposals as appropriate.</p>

<h2>Recommendations</h2>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, having considered the comments and objections received to the statutory consultation, resolves to authorise the Strategic Director for Environment to instruct Officers to implement waiting restrictions (yellow lines) in various locations as set out in Appendix B to this report, through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 30 November 2016 considered the findings of a parking consultation in the Temple Fortune, NW11 area following concerns regarding parking highlighted by residents. The Committee decided, amongst other things, to liaise with Ward Members in relation to developing a number of waiting restriction proposals in the consultation area to address the highlighted concerns, with a view to reporting all agreed proposals to a future meeting of the Committee.
- 1.2 Accordingly, a number of proposals were developed and the matter was reported to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 27 April 2017, where it was decided to
- carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce Waiting Restrictions (yellow lines) in various locations in the Temple Fortune area;
 - introduce the proposed waiting restrictions where no objections are received to the consultation;
 - allow the Strategic Director for Environment in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors in instances where objections are received to the consultation, to consider and determine whether the proposed changes should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.
- 1.3 However, due to the number and nature of objections received it has been determined that the matter should be reported back to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee to make the relevant decisions on the way forward.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Having considered a report outlining the findings of the parking consultation carried out in the Temple Fortune area in May/June 2016, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee in November 2016 decided that Officers should investigate a number of locations for the provision of waiting restrictions.
- 2.2 The locations were those that were highlighted by the local community during the consultation process as problematic locations to travel through.
- 2.3 Officers visited the area and designed a number of waiting restriction proposals in order to deter obstructive parking and improve sightlines and general road safety.
- 2.4 In June 2017 a statutory consultation commenced on proposals to introduce a number of yellow line waiting restrictions throughout the Temple Fortune area, as per the drawings in Appendix A.

2.5 As part of the statutory consultation process the proposals were advertised and published in the local Press newspapers and in the London Gazette. In addition, similar notices were displayed on-street in the affected roads and letters together with an associated plan outlining the most local proposal(s) were delivered to properties situated in close proximity to each proposal.

Comments and objections received

General

2.6 In response to the consultation a total of 51 pieces of correspondence were received. An overall summary of the comments and objections received are as follows, noting that comments mainly focussed on the proposals in the locality of the respondents:

- That the proposed restrictions would have an adverse effect on residents' ability to park/that the proposed restrictions would make parking in the area more difficult (35 mentions);
- That the proposed restrictions are not required (12 mentions);
- That there was a need for a CPZ (8 mentions);
- That the proposed restrictions would encourage speeding and 'rat-running'/that parked vehicles act as a traffic calming feature and slow traffic down (8 mentions);
- That the proposed restrictions were welcomed (2 mentions).

2.7 Additional mentions included that parked vehicles act as a safety barrier of sorts outside a local Synagogue (5 mentions) and that signage associated with the restrictions would be unsightly (1 mention).

Proposal SCR156-01 – Cranbourne Gardens NW11 junction with Oakfields Road.

2.8 2 responses were received regarding the proposal outside Nos. 37 Cranbourne Gardens to No. 24 Oakfields Road, on the basis that it is not required, would make parking more difficult and that it would encourage speeding. A further response questioned the need for additional restrictions as existing ones are not enforced.

Proposal SCR156-02 – Cranbourne Gardens NW11 junctions with Leaside Crescent and Grosvenor Gardens, and Grosvenor Gardens NW11 junction with Eastville Avenue.

2.9 1 response was received regarding the proposal for Cranbourne Gardens/Leaside Crescent junction as the resident in question did not want the proposal to extend across their vehicle crossover. A further mention was made regarding the proposal at the Cranbourne Gardens/Grosvenor Gardens junction, as this would increase parking problems further down those roads.

Proposal SCR156-03 – Princes Park Avenue NW11 junction with Leaside Crescent

- 2.10 3 responses were received regarding the proposal with 3 mentions that the proposed restrictions would impact on residents' ability to park near their homes/make it more difficult to park on-street.

Proposal SCR156-04 – Woodlands and Woodlands Close NW11

- 2.11 10 responses were received regarding the proposals, with 7 mentions that the proposed restrictions would impact on residents' ability to park near their homes/make it more difficult to park on-street.

Proposal SCR156-06 – Bridge Lane NW11 junctions with Hillcrest Avenue, Cranbourne Gardens, Decoy Avenue and Princes Park Avenue

- 2.12 11 responses were received regarding the proposals, with 10 mentions that the proposed restrictions would impact on residents' ability to park near their homes/make it more difficult to park on-street. There were 3 mentions that the restrictions were not needed. 1 mention suggested making the proposed lengths shorter and 5 mentions suggested that parked vehicles created a protective barrier from potential attacks on a Synagogue.

Proposal SCR156-07 – Bridge Lane NW11 junctions with Ashbourne Avenue, Hallswelle Road, Hayes Crescent.

- 2.13 2 responses were received regarding the proposals with 1 mention that the proposed restrictions would make it more difficult to park on-street. 1 mention welcomed the restriction and requested another length of waiting restriction across the alleyway between Nos. 65 and 67 Bridge Lane.

Proposal SCR156-09 – Addison Way NW11 junction with Hogarth Hill

- 2.14 7 responses were received regarding the proposal with 2 mentions that the proposed restrictions would make it more difficult to park on-street. A further 6 mentions considered that the proposed restrictions would encourage speeding and 'rat-running'/that parked vehicles act as a traffic calming feature and slow traffic down. 1 mention considered that the proposed restrictions were not needed.

Proposal SCR156-11 – Erskine Hill NW11 junction with Asmunds Hill

- 2.15 3 responses were received regarding the proposal with 2 mentions that the proposed restrictions would impact on residents' ability to park near their homes. A further mention considered that the proposed restrictions were not needed.

Proposal SCR156-13 – Erskine Hill NW11 junction with Temple Fortune Hill

- 2.16 6 responses were received regarding the proposal with 5 mentions that the proposed restrictions would make it more difficult to park on-street. A further

mention welcomed the proposal, and all 6 responses mentioned their need for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Erskine Hill.

Other comments received

- 2.17 5 responses were received where the origin or location mentioned was not clear. These responses considered that the proposed restrictions were not needed (1 mention), would make parking difficult in the area (1 mention) and would impact on residents' ability to park near their homes (2 mentions). 1 mention was an objection to the proposals although no specific reason was specified.

Officer comments

General

- 2.18 The comments and objections received have been noted, and it is acknowledged that the introduction of the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions would reduce the amount of available kerbside space which is currently used by motorists to park their vehicles. This in turn is likely to have an impact on motorists who have become accustomed to parking at particular locations, particularly along the lengths where the restrictions are proposed.
- 2.19 It is also acknowledged that the introduction of restrictions would result in greater competition along the remaining available kerbside space which would make it more difficult for motorists to park, particularly in the roads which have many vehicles parking.
- 2.20 However, it is generally considered that the proposed restrictions are required in order to deter obstructive parking which would in turn improve traffic flow, sightlines and road safety in the vicinity of the relevant lengths of road.
- 2.21 With reference to other comments and objections received, although 8 mentions were concerned that if the proposals were implemented, this would result in increased speed of traffic, it is considered that as the proposals are generally focussed on deterring motorists from parking at junctions, this would not necessarily result in greater speeds at the relevant locations as motorists would still need to observe general road regulations such as giving way at junctions. The concerns highlighted to do with a perceived lack of enforcement of restrictions have also been noted and will be raised with the parking enforcement team accordingly.
- 2.22 It is acknowledged however that the implementation of more stringent restrictions would make the junctions more pleasant to drive through which may result in making the roads more attractive for motorists to travel upon.
- 2.23 The issue raised about the existing situation outside a synagogue, in that some respondents consider that parked vehicles form a barrier of sorts is noted. However this does not take away the fact that parked vehicles at the location – a junction – creates a potential dangerous situation which Officers consider needs to be resolved.

Controlled Parking Zone(CPZ) request

- 2.24 Within the responses received there were 8 mentions that a CPZ was required in their respondents' immediate area, and it is noteworthy that 6 of those mentions were made by those residing in the section of Erskine Hill, between its junctions with North Square and Temple Fortune Hill (within the Garden Suburb Ward).
- 2.25 Officers are aware that residents of this section of Erskine Hill have been campaigning for a CPZ, particularly in light of the extension of the nearby Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ into South Square and Heathgate in May 2017.
- 2.26 It is considered that, although the proposed waiting restrictions are necessary and that they should be implemented, however in light of the ongoing interest and concern, there may be merit in holding off on the actual implementation until the outcome of the CPZ request is known.
- 2.27 Officers are due to undertake post-implementation parking surveys in the area following the Garden Suburb 'GS' CPZ extension and the results of this will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.
- 2.28 Therefore, in relation to drawing number SCR156-13a, it is recommended that Officers should liaise with the Garden Suburb Ward Councillors to agree the best time to implement the restrictions.

Conclusion and recommendation

- 2.29 Therefore it is considered that in the main, the proposals still have merit, however, having noted the comments and objections received Officers have reviewed each location to consider whether any modifications could be made to the proposal to alleviate the concern, and potential impact on kerbside space.
- 2.30 Accordingly it is considered that the following proposals should be implemented without modification:
- Proposal SCR156-03 – Princes Park Avenue NW11 junction with Leaside Crescent.
 - Proposal SCR156-05 – Cranbourne Gardens NW11 junction with Park Way
 - Proposal SCR156-06 – Bridge Lane NW11 junctions with Hillcrest Avenue, Cranbourne Gardens, Decoy Avenue and Princes Park Avenue.
 - Proposal SCR156-07 – Bridge Lane NW11 junctions with Ashbourne Avenue, Hallswelle Road, Hayes Crescent.
 - Proposal SCR156-08 – Eastside Road NW11 junctions with Ashbourne Avenue, Hillcrest Avenue, Decoy Avenue and Hurstwood Road
 - Proposal SCR156-10 – Erskine Hill NW11 junction with Addison Way
 - Proposal SCR156-11 – Erskine Hill NW11 junction with Asmunds Hill

- Proposal SCR156-12 – Erskine Hill NW11 junctions with Denman Drive and Woodside

2.31 Furthermore it is considered that the following modifications should be made to the proposals as follows:

Proposal SCR156-01a – Cranbourne Gardens NW11 junction with Oakfields Road

- Non progression of proposed restriction outside No. 37 Cranbourne Gardens and Nos 24 and 26 Oakfields Road.

Proposal SCR156-02a – Cranbourne Gardens NW11 junctions with Leaside Crescent and Grosvenor Gardens, and Grosvenor Gardens NW11 junction with Eastville Avenue

- Reduction of proposed restriction outside No. 2 Leaside Crescent.

Proposal SCR156-04a – Woodlands and Woodlands Close NW11

- Extension of proposed restriction by side of No. 78 Woodlands;
- Non progression of proposed restriction outside Dolphin Court, Woodlands.

Proposal SCR156-09a – Addison Way NW11 junction with Hogarth Hill

- Reduction of proposed restriction outside No. 43 Addison Way;
- Relocation of proposed restriction from outside Nos. 28 to 30 Hogarth Hill, to outside Nos. 32 to 36 Hogarth Hill.

Proposal SCR156-13a – Erskine Hill NW11 junction with Temple Fortune Hill

- Reduction of proposed restriction on Asmunds Hill by side of Nos. 51 and 53 Temple Fortune Hill;
- Potential hold on implementation until outcome of CPZ request is known – liaise with Ward Councillors regarding timing of implementation

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Traffic and road safety issues were identified during an informal parking consultation with residents and Ward Councillors and it was considered that action should be taken and therefore a do nothing option was not considered appropriate. Given the nature of the concerns being addressed in this report, the recommended action is considered to be the preferred option.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Officers would seek to implement the waiting restrictions in early 2018, through the relevant line marking and signage works, and making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders.
- 4.2 Officers would also seek to liaise with Ward Councillors regarding the timing of the implementation of the Erskine Hill/Temple Fortune Hill proposal.
- 4.3 All objectors would be written to in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The Council's Corporate Plan states in its strategic objectives that it will work with local partners to create the right environment to promote responsible growth, development and success across the Borough. In particular the Council will maintain a well-designed, attractive and accessible place, with sustainable infrastructure across the borough. The plan also acknowledges that the future success of the Borough depends on effective transport networks.

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

- 5.2.1 £20,000 has been committed from the F&GG Area Committee budget funded from CIL (approved at the 13 January 2016 F&GG Area Committee) for a review of parking to take place in the Temple Fortune area It is not envisaged that any further funding will be required for the implementation of these measures to take place.

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, in Article 7, states that that Area Committees: "In relation to the area covered have responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments" parks and trees.
- 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.

5.5 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 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 measure which has been considered within this report

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 The public sector equality duty (PEQD) under Section 149(1) of the Equality 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 regard 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 has been undertaken as described in this report.

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 None in relation to this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Item 13 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting on 27 April 2017 - - Temple Fortune Area NW11 – Proposed Waiting Restrictions
<https://barnetintranet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MIId=>

[9313&Ver=4](#)

- 6.2 Item 8 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 30 November 2016 – Temple Fortune Area, NW11 Parking Review
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9085&Ver=4>
- 6.3 Item 13 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 6 July 2016 – Temple Fortune Area, NW11 Parking Review
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8749&Ver=4>
- 6.4 Item 11 of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 13 January 2016 – Progress update on Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee Actions.
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8266&Ver=4>