

	<h2>Hendon Area Committee</h2> <h3>28 February 2018</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>Colindale Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Informal Consultation Results</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Commissioning Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>Burnt Oak, Colindale and Mill Hill</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 - Colindale CPZ Informal Consultation Area Plan Appendix B - Consultation Results Tables by Area Appendix C - Proposed Colindale CPZ Areas Appendix D – Proposed Permit Fees and Tariff Charges</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Caroline Stanyon, caroline.stanyon@barnet.gov.uk Tel: 020 8359 3555</p>

Summary

This report sets out the results of the recent consultation on proposed additional Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) in the Colindale Area and seeks approval to progress the recommended proposals for the introduction of new CPZ's and extension of the operational hours and boundary of the existing Colindale CPZ to statutory consultation.

Recommendations

1. That the Hendon Area Committee notes the results of the consultation and resolves to authorise the Strategic Director for Environment and his officers to;
 - (a) Carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions operational Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm in Area 1 as set out in Appendix C to this report

- (b) Not proceed with any proposals for the introduction of a CPZ in Area 2 in response to comments received.**
- (c) Investigate and carry out statutory consultation of the introduction of 'At any time' double yellow line waiting restrictions in Area 2 identified as a result of comments received during this consultation**
- (d) Carry out statutory consultation on proposals to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions operational Monday to Friday 9am to 4pm in Area 3 as set out in Appendix C to this report**
- (e) Carry out statutory consultation on proposals to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions operational Monday to Friday 9am to 4pm in Area 4 as set out in Appendix C to this report**
- (f) Not proceed with any proposals for the introduction of a CPZ in Area 5 in response to comments received**
- (g) Investigate and carry out statutory consultation on the introduction of 'At any time' double yellow line waiting restrictions at selected locations in Area 5 identified as a result of comments received during this consultation**

2. That the Committee agree to the proposed charging tariff set out in Appendix D to this report.

3. That the Hendon Area Committee notes the results of the consultation undertaken in November 2016 to review the existing Colindale CPZ and resolve to authorise the Strategic Director for Environment and his officers to carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to:-

- (i) extend the operational hours of the existing CPZ parking and waiting restrictions from Monday to Friday between 2 and 3pm to operate Monday to Friday between 8am to 6.30pm**
- (ii) extend the boundary of the existing CPZ to include Kestrel Close and Swan Drive**

4. That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultations referred to in recommendations 1, 2 and 3 the Committee authorise the Strategic Director for Environment and his officers to introduce the proposed CPZ, parking changes and waiting restrictions.

5. That the Committee agrees that, if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations referred to in recommendations 1, 2 and 3 the Strategic 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.

6. That the Committee agrees that approximately 6 months after introduction officers can undertake a review of any CPZ parking and waiting restrictions implemented as a result of recommendations 1, 2 and 3 in:

(a) Areas 1 – 5;

(b) the existing Colindale CPZ; and

(c) surrounding roads in Burnt Oak

1. WHY IS THIS REPORT NEEDED

- 1.1 Colindale is one of London's fastest growing areas with over 10,000 new homes and new retail, commercial and community facilities set to be delivered over the next 10 to 15 years.
- 1.2 Due to the scale of regeneration careful consideration is required to safeguard the parking needs of local residents, businesses and visitors to the area. As a result, the Council has carried out an informal consultation with the local community on proposals to both review the existing Colindale CPZ and introduce additional CPZs in the Colindale area.
- 1.3 This report presents the results of these two consultations, details the extent and design of the proposed new CPZs and changes to the existing Colindale CPZ.

2. CONSULTATION FORMAT

- 2.1 An informal consultation was carried out between September/November 2017 with residents and businesses in the area in agreement with Ward Councillors, as shown in the consultation pack in Appendix A.
- 2.2 Approximately 7,700 consultation packs were hand delivered to all properties within the consultation area, asking the recipient to complete an online 'Survey Monkey' questionnaire. Given the extent of the consultation area five separate geographical areas were identified by officers.
- 2.3 The questionnaire asked the recipients a range of questions concerning parking including whether or not they would support the introduction of a CPZ in their road and if they were in favour of the proposed operational days and hours of Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm.
- 2.4 Recipients were also given the opportunity to suggest alternative days and hours of operation based on the specific parking issues in their road and make any additional comments on the proposals.
- 2.5 Finally, they were asked to indicate if their overall level of support or opposition for parking controls on a range of "strongly support" through to "strongly oppose".
- 2.6 A web page was also set up on the Council's Engage Portal containing details of the informal consultation and link to the online questionnaire. Paper copies of the questionnaire were also made available on request for residents or businesses if they were having difficulties or were unwilling to complete the

questionnaire online.

- 2.7 Feedback was also welcomed from residents who lived outside the area or who visited the area, even if they did not have access to a vehicle or were a non-driver via a separate online questionnaire.
- 2.8 In addition residents were invited to come along to one of four drop-in sessions held where they could view the plans in full and give views. These were manned by Council staff available to discuss the plans, answer any questions and offer help with completion of the questionnaire.
- 2.9 The closing date for the consultation was 27 October 2017 but due to the level of interest generated by this consultation the consultation end date was extended and responses were received up to and including 12 November 2017.

Consultation results

- 2.10 A total of 847 online and paper responses were received by the extended closing date of 12 November 2017.
- 2.11 Following removal of multiple responses from individual households/properties, incomplete responses, where respondents did not answer all of the necessary questions and responses, where respondents answered the questions for the incorrect area i.e. as an address outside of the proposed CPZ areas rather than within, a total of 150 responses have been discounted.
- 2.12 As a result, the total number of responses received has reduced to 697, with 528 responses received from residential and business properties within the CPZ consultation area.
- 2.13 A further 181 questionnaires were received as feedback from addresses outside of the consultation area. After removal of duplicates and responses from residents from either within the existing CPZ or proposed CPZ areas who completed the incorrect questionnaire in error, this figure reduced to 169.
- 2.14 The 528 responses received from approximately 7,700 properties in Areas 1-5 shown in Table 1 overleaf equates to an overall response rate of 7%.

Table1 – Consultation responses from Areas 1 to 5

Area	No. of properties	No. of responses	Response rate
1	810	64	8%
2	2,315	258	11%
3	1,747	61	3%
4	2,565	116	5%
5	263	29	11%
Totals	7,700	528	7%

n.b. 186 properties in Area 4 (Great Field and The Concourse are currently unoccupied)

- 2.15 These response rates are considerably lower than would be expected for a consultation of this kind i.e. average response rates in excess of 20-25% can

usually be expected. One reason for this might be a lack of community interest in the proposals.

- 2.16 In addition several petitions were also received both for and against the CPZ proposals which were reported to the Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23 January 2018.
- 2.17 Overall, the majority of respondents 323 (61%) did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road. Similarly the majority of respondents from outside of the CPZ also indicated that they strongly opposed the introduction of proposed CPZs in the Colindale area, although not all respondents completed these sections of the questionnaire.
- 2.18 Closer analysis of the consultation responses has indicated that support for or against the introduction of a CPZ varied from area to area and from road to road within that particular area.
- 2.19 It is apparent that in some streets parking pressure is already at an unacceptable level and introduction of parking controls in the form of a CPZ are supported. However, in other streets, there are no current parking problems and residents do not view the introduction of a CPZ would be of benefit to them or their visitors at this time.
- 2.20 As a result, for the purpose of this report, the consultation responses received are presented in summary form on an area by area and street by street basis in the following paragraphs.
- 2.21 Tables showing more detailed analysis of responses from Areas 1 – 5 can be found in Appendix B. Responses from outside of the consultation area are summarised later in this report.

Area 1

- 2.22 A total of 64 responses were received from residents and businesses within this area. Of these 64 responses, 52 (81%) supported the introduction of a CPZ in their road, 12 (19%) did not.
- 2.23 Of the 14 roads consulted:-
- Respondents from 8 roads supported the introduction of a CPZ.
 - *Greenway Close, Greenway Gardens, Millfield Road, Playfield Road, Portman Gardens, Silkstream Road, Southbourne Avenue and The Greenway*
 - Respondents from 2 roads were opposed to a CPZ
 - *Montrose Avenue and The Hyde (n.b. it should be noted that only one response was received from 154 properties on The Hyde).*
 - Nil returns were returned from 4 roads
 - *Barnfield Road, Gaskarth Lane, Market Lane and St Alphage Walk.*
- 2.24 In response to the question which asked what days and hours of operation respondents would prefer if a CPZ were to be introduced in their road, the

majority, 46 (73%) and 41 (65%) respectively, indicated that they would favour the proposed operational days of Monday to Friday between 8am and 6.30pm

- 2.25 A number of parking issues, some already mentioned in previous correspondence, highlighting support for a CPZ included:
- Parking on both sides of narrow roads obscuring sightlines and blocking access for the emergency services and refuse collection
 - Obstructive parking across driveways
 - High levels of commuter parking associated with users of Burnt Oak Underground station and staff from businesses on Edgware Road, particularly car dealerships
 - Visitors to events at St Alphage Church Hall
 - Parent parking at school drop-off and pick-up times
 - Overnight commercial vehicles i.e. lorries and vans overnight
- 2.26 Very few respondents made specific requests for amendment to the proposed parking bay layout. However, those that were received will be investigated and where possible, incorporated into the final scheme design, should the current proposals proceed to statutory consultation.
- 2.27 Several respondents mainly from Greenway Close, Millfield Road and Portman Gardens, also commented on parking problems associated with the nearby Cavendish Banqueting Suite operating on Edgware Road.
- 2.28 This venue, popular for weddings and able to accommodate in excess of 400 guests, had very limited onsite parking. As a result, patrons often use the nearby residential streets to park in and regularly park inconsiderately across drives and on footways. Therefore, it was suggested that to discourage this behaviour, parking controls could be extended to operate later in the evening and at the weekends.
- 2.29 It is understood that activities such as those described in paragraph 2.28 may cause distress and inconvenience to residents. However, it is considered that the imposition of more restrictive evening and weekend controls should not be pursued at this time, given the negative impact they would have on both residents and their visitors in roads within the area, especially those where these problems do not currently occur.
- 2.30 In addition it is likely that the introduction of parking places and yellow line waiting restrictions may draw the attention of non-residents to the residential nature of the roads and lead to them parking in a more considerate manner.
- 2.31 It is therefore recommended that the Committee note the results of the the consultation and authorise officers to proceed with a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce a CPZ operational Monday to Friday between 8am and 6.30pm in Area 1 as shown in Appendix C.

Area 2

- 2.32 A total of 258 responses were received from the residents and businesses within this area. Of these 258 responses, 193 (75%), did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road.
- 2.33 Of the 27 roads consulted:-
- Respondents from 14 roads did not support the introduction of a CPZ.
 - *Colin Crescent, Colin Drive, Colin Gardens, Colindeep Lane, Court Way, Crossway, Hillfield Avenue, Lynton Avenue, Manor Way, New Way Road, Poolsford Road, Rookery Close, The Hyde and Zenith Close*
 - Respondents from 5 roads supported a CPZ
 - *Colin Close, Colin Park Road, Rookery Way, Sheaveshill Avenue and Silkfield Road.*
 - Support for a CPZ was split 50:50 in 5 roads
 - *Beaulieu Close, Clovelley Avenue, Rushgrove Avenue, The Loning and Woodfield Avenue*
 - Nil returns were returned from 3 roads
 - *Deerfields Close, Edgware Road and Orchard Gate*
- 2.34 In response to the question which asked what days and hours of operation respondents would prefer if a CPZ were to be introduced in their road, 149 (61%) of respondents indicated a preference for Monday to Friday operation.
- 2.35 In respect of operational hours, 58 (66%) of the 88 respondents who suggested alternative hours indicated a preference for shorter hours of control than the proposed 8am to 6.30pm, ideally for only one or 2 hours a day as already in operation in other CPZs in the borough. There was no consensus on whether these shorter restrictions should operate in the morning or the afternoon. These results, on a road by road basis, are shown in Appendix B.
- 2.36 In addition, one petition was received from residents of Colin Crescent, Colin Gardens and Crossway, comprising 84 signatures from a total of 69 properties which was reported Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23 January 2018.
- 2.37 The petition requested that the Council should take residents objections into consideration when making their final decision and reconsider the installation of a CPZ in Colin Crescent and Colin Gardens. Subsequent correspondence further supporting this view and providing information in respect of parking patterns and vehicle numbers has also been received
- 2.38 It is therefore recommended that the Committee note the results of the consultation including the petition and agree not to proceed with the proposed introduction of a proposed CPZ in Area 2 at this time.
- 2.39 Despite no specific CPZ design issues being received, respondents did highlight several areas where it was considered that some form of restrictions were required on bends and at junctions
- 2.40 As a result, it is recommended that the Committee authorise officers to investigate these requests to remove congestion and improve road safety and, if deemed appropriate, proceed to statutory consultation on the introduction of

proposed 'At any time' double yellow line waiting restrictions at certain locations in Area 2.

Area 3

- 2.41 A total of 61 responses were received from residents and businesses within this area. Of these 61 responses, 35 (57%) did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road.
- 2.42 Of the 37 roads consulted:-
- Respondents from 13 roads did not support the introduction of a CPZ.
 - *Acklington Drive, Angus Gardens, Bristol Avenue, Debden Close, Elvington Lane, Fulbeck Drive, Hemswell Drive, Lanacre Avenue, Martlesham Walk, Pageant Avenue, Pocklington Close and Warmwell Avenue.*
 - Respondents from 11 roads supported a CPZ
 - *Booth Road, Boscombe Circus, Bovingdon Lane, Braemar Gardens, Cherry Close, Coningsby Avenue, Dishforth Lane, Gaydon Lane, Heybourne Crescent, Kenley Avenue and Montrose Avenue*
 - Nil returns were returned from 10 roads
 - *Filton Close, Folkingham Lane, Hazel Close, Heywood Avenue, Kestrel Close, North Acre, Shawbury Close, Shellduck Drive, Swan Drive, Tangmere Way, Trenchard Close and Wagtail Close)*
- 2.43 In response to the question which asked what days and hours of operation respondents would prefer if a CPZ were to be introduced in their road, 36 (68%) of 51, indicated that they would favour Monday to Friday operation.
- 2.44 With regard to preferred operational hours, similarly to Area 2, most respondents indicated a preference for shorter hours of controls than the proposed 8am to 6.30pm. The majority of respondents also suggested that operational hours of only one to 2 hours a day, either morning or afternoon would be a suitable alternative.
- 2.45 The above results, on a road by road basis, are shown in the tables in Appendix B.
- 2.46 Many residents viewed the proposals as financially motivated and were opposed to the imposition of additional expense on families in a deprived area of the borough, although they acknowledged that parking could be a problem.
- 2.47 Despite opposition to a CPZ, a number of parking issues were highlighted as needing attention. These issues included:
- Parking on both sides of narrow roads obscuring sightlines and blocking access for the emergency services and refuse collection
 - Obstructive parking and congestion particularly on Booth Road
 - Compromised sightlines on junctions and bends i.e. Kenley Drive junction with Lanacre Avenue and along Heybourne Crescent
 - Introduction of controls in private Housing owned parking areas to deter non-resident parking

- 2.48 In addition a petition has been received from residents of Gervase Road requesting that the boundary of the Colindale CPZ consultation be extended to include Gervase Road and was reported to the Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23 January 2018.
- 2.49 In support of their request, petitioners explained that they continued to suffer from high levels of non-resident parking associated with commuters using Burnt Oak Underground station.
- 2.50 Due to pressure on parking they found that they often could not park close to their home and sometimes had to park in adjacent streets such as Montrose Avenue. They expressed concern that if CPZ controls were introduced the situation would get worse as residents of the new CPZ who did not wish to purchase a permit would be displaced into their road.
- 2.51 Although CPZ controls operating in a single street are not unheard of, CPZs are usually introduced on an area wide basis, in line with Central Government guidance and accepted good practice. By adopting this approach local authorities are more able to ensure availability of space and also limit unacceptable levels of displacement parking
- 2.52 Officers are aware of the current levels of parking stress in roads around Burnt Oak Underground station but with the exception of Gervase Road have received no similar requests for the introduction of parking controls.
- 2.53 The scale of regeneration that will be seen in Colindale over the next 10 to 15 years means that careful consideration is needed to safeguard the parking needs of local residents, businesses and visitors of the area. By ignoring the impact this will have on the local transport network and not taking appropriate action the council could be viewed as being neglectful in its role as the traffic authority.
- 2.54 It is therefore recommended that the Committee notes the results of the consultation and, in light of the previous paragraph, authorise officers to proceed to a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce a CPZ operational Monday to Friday between 9am and 4pm in Area 3 as shown in Appendix C.
- 2.55 With regards to the petition from Gervase Road, it is recommended that the proposed CPZ consultation boundary should not be extended to include Gervase Road at this time.
- 2.56 It should be noted that, if parking problems in Gervase Road persist or worsen as a result of the introduction of additional CPZs in the Colindale area, and subsequently sufficient Burnt Oak residents from surrounding roads approach the Council, this issue could be investigated in the future.
- 2.57 Approval for this proposed course of action in the form of a 6 month review is requested in recommendation 6 (c).

Area 4

- 2.58 A total of 116 responses were received from residents and businesses within this area. Of these 116 responses, 66 (57%) did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road.
- 2.59 Of the 46 roads consulted:-
- Respondents from 16 roads did not support the introduction of a CPZ.
 - *Broadhead Strand, Brooklea Close, Clayton Field, Corner Mead, Coxwell Boulevard, Field Mead, Graham Park Way, Great Strand, Heybourne Crescent, Hundred Acre, Lancaster Close, Little Strand, Satchell Mead, The Concourse, Wardell Close and Wiggins Mead*
 - Respondents from 5 roads supported a CPZ.
 - *Lower Strand, Rivington Crescent, Rowen Way, Valentina Avenue and Wardell Field*
 - Support for a CPZ was split 50:50 in 3 roads
 - *Percival Avenue, University Close and Withers Mead*
 - Nil returns were returned from 22 roads
 - *Avion Crescent, Belvedere Strand, Birch Green, Cobalt Close, Dunn Mead, Edgecumbe Road, Everglade Strand, Five Acre, Great Field, Highlea Close, Larch Green, Linklea Close, Long Field, Long Mead, Near Acre, North Green, Parklea Close, Quakers Course, Ruby Way, Runway Close, South Mead and Willow Close*
- 2.60 In response to the question which asked what days and hours of operation respondents would prefer if a CPZ were to be introduced in their road, the majority, 70 (64%) of 110, indicated that they would favour Monday to Friday operation with most respondents, 71 (63%) of 112, not in favour of controls operating 8am to 6.30pm.
- 2.61 Unlike Area 3, where shorter hours were preferred, a similar numbers of respondents, who suggested alternatives, considered that all day controls or either 1-2 hours would be appropriate. Of those who favoured all day restrictions, 8 or 9 hours a day were considered sufficient.
- 2.62 The above results, on a road by road basis, are shown in the tables in Appendix B.
- 2.63 Despite opposition to a CPZ, residents commented on high levels of non-resident parking from commuters using Colindale Underground station, building contractors vehicles and overnight parking, particularly by residents from properties in nearby Beaufort Park.
- 2.64 Similarly to the previous 3 consultation areas, a number of existing parking issues were highlighted. These included:
- Dumped and illegally parked cars
 - Parking on both sides of narrow roads causing congestion and access issues
 - Obscured sightlines in Clayton Field, Field Mead and University Close
 - Inconsiderate parking and abusive behaviour associated with parents of pupils at Orion School
 - Pavement parking in Graham Park Way and Lower Strand forcing pedestrians to walk in the road into the path of oncoming traffic

- Introduction of controls in private Housing owned parking areas to deter non-resident parking
- 2.65 In addition, over 15 responses were received from Colindale Police Station assumed to be from serving police officers or civilian staff.
- 2.66 The majority of comments made by these respondents opposed the introduction of a CPZ (n.b. for the purpose of analysis, following identification of duplicate IP addresses. these multiple responses have been recorded as two separate responses from an address in Graham Park Way).
- 2.67 The introduction of a CPZ, particularly along Graham Park Way, was viewed to be detrimental to staff who, due to the nature of their job, shift work patterns and lack of suitable public transport, had to travel to work by car.
- 2.68 It should be noted that although no official response was recorded from the Metropolitan Police during the consultation period 27 September – 12 November 2017, a subsequent email was received 12 December 2017 via Councillor Duschinsky enquiring as to the possibility of special arrangements being offered for officers.
- 2.69 In addition a further email was received 8 February 2018 from the Hendon Centre Manager, requesting that the Council consider the issue of special 'Emergency Service Workers' permits, similar to those offered by other local authorities, to some of the 200 staff that were unable to park on site since the recent reduction in size of the Peel Centre.
- 2.70 Extensive regeneration throughout the Graham Park Estate (Area 4) to deliver new homes, retail, commercial and community facilities is ongoing. Experience has shown that in areas where similar growth has taken place, despite associated improvement to existing transport links, there is still a reliance on the private car and pressure on parking does unfortunately occur.
- 2.71 To protect residents from this and, to ensure the viability of the local road network, it is necessary for the Council to consider the introduction of parking restrictions such as a CPZ.
- 2.72 The majority of parking bays provided within the proposed the CPZ will be reserved for the use of residents and their legitimate visitors to reflect the predominantly residential nature of the area.
- 2.73 Electric vehicle charging points are also proposed throughout the Colindale areas as well as car club bays to further promote the use of more sustainable modes of transport and satisfy anticipated future demand.
- 2.74 In addition, at certain locations i.e. around The Concourse, a small amount of short stay "paid for" parking is also proposed to satisfy shoppers and visitor demand to services such as the Housing office, etc.
- 2.75 To cater for non-resident motorists, for whom public transport is not an option and who choose to continue to travel to their place of work by car, it is proposed

that long-stay parking bays would be introduced along Corner Mead, Great Strand and Graham Park Way.

- 2.76 These bays would allow all-day parking for £5 per day through pay by phone and offer the opportunity for cheaper parking than that currently available at nearby off-street car parks such as Mill Hill Broadway Rail and Colindale Underground Stations. In addition to pay by phone parking, businesses within the proposed CPZ areas would also be able to buy business permits.
- 2.77 The current permit structure does not include provision of a special permit for use by emergency services staff as requested in paragraph 2.69 and, would, if supported, require a change in Council policy.
- 2.78 Details of current proposed permit prices and pay by phone tariffs are listed in Appendix D.
- 2.79 In response to concerns raised over the negative impact the introduction of a CPZ would have, officers have met with businesses from Avion Crescent to discuss their operational needs and possible alternative options.
- 2.80 As a result, it is proposed that the parking arrangements in Avion Crescent will be amended to reflect the requests discussed at this meeting. These amendments include removal of the proposed shared-use business and pay by phone parking bays, changes to the extent of the proposed yellow line waiting restrictions and introduction of a loading bay.
- 2.81 In addition, a short stretch of proposed unlimited stay paid for parking on Graham Park Way will be amended to a maximum 3 hour stay to assist with customer parking demands.
- 2.82 In response to an enquiry relating to the redevelopment of St James Catholic High School the proposed parking layout in Great Strand has been reviewed to offer additional paid for parking provision for visitors to the school. These bays could of course be used by any non-residents but are unlikely to be required by teachers for whom adequate on-site parking has been provided.
- 2.83 For schools within the proposed CPZ area where there is insufficient parking to cater for teaching staff demand, the Council will consider the provision of school parking permits, subject to meeting agreed eligibility criteria. All applications are considered on a case by case basis and will require Committee approval.
- 2.84 A petition was received from residents of Wardell Close and reported to the Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23 January 2018 expressing opposition to the introduction of a CPZ in their road.
- 2.85 Residents were of the opinion that due to the geographical location of Wardell Close, situated away from shops, offices and it being a cul-de-sac, introduction of a CPZ was unnecessary.
- 2.86 Wardell Close is situated at the northern boundary of Area 4 which may appear to make it a less attractive option for non-resident parking than those roads

closer to both Colindale Underground station and areas of current residential redevelopment to the south. However, if a CPZ is introduced in these southern roads and other adjacent consultation areas and Wardell Close is excluded from that scheme, this road would most likely suffer from an increase in unwanted displacement parking.

- 2.87 In addition, the nearest bus stop for Route 303, which serves both Colindale Underground and Mill Hill Broadway stations, is less than a 5 minute walk from Wardell Close. Non-residents could opt to park in Wardell Close and then make an onward journey by bus.
- 2.88 It is therefore recommended, after taking all of the above into consideration, that the Committee notes the results of the consultation and authorise officers to proceed with a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce a CPZ operational Monday to Friday 9am – 4pm in Area 4 as shown in Appendix C.

Area 5

- 2.89 A total of 29 responses were received from residents and businesses within this area. Of these 29 responses, 17 (59%) did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road.
- 2.90 Of the 8 roads consulted, 4 roads did not support the introduction of a CPZ (*Aylsham Close, Burnham Close, Fakenham Close and Longfield Avenue*) and 2 roads supported a CPZ (*Brancaster Drive and Tithe Walk*). A nil return was received from Tithe Close.
- 2.91 Of the 13 respondents from Tithe Walk, 11 (85%) were in favour of a CPZ. However, it should be noted that 3 of these respondents also signed the petition mentioned overleaf.
- 2.92 In response to the question which asked what days and hours of operation respondents would prefer if a CPZ were to be introduced in their road, 17 (65%), indicated that they would favour Monday to Friday operation.
- 2.93 With regard to operational hours, 22 (85%) were not in favour of the proposed 8am to 6.30pm operational hours. Of the 13 respondents who suggested alternative hours all favoured shorter hours either one or 2 hours a day morning or afternoon or up to 4 hours over midday.
- 2.94 The above results, on a road by road basis, are shown in the tables in Appendix B.
- 2.95 In addition, a petition was received from residents of Longfield Avenue, Aylesham Close, Brancaster Drive, Briston Mews, Burnham Close, Fakenham Close and Tithe Walk and reported to the Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23 January 2018.
- 2.96 The petition comprising of 88 signatures from a total of 224 properties asked the Council to stop the extension of the proposed parking restrictions of both sides of Longfield Avenue.

- 2.97 An accompanying letter, signed only by the lead petitioner, stated that residents wished to see changes to the parking regulations in order to prevent people leaving their car all day and that these restrictions could operate Monday to Friday between 10am and 11am and between 4pm and 5pm.
- 2.98 Comments received in response to this consultation have indicated that there are some issues connected with vehicles from a nearby car dealership and parents of Orion school, who park and walk through the underpass to Grahame Park Way. However, many respondents consider that they do not currently experience parking problems and will not suffer from any displaced parking as a direct result from the future redevelopment of Colindale due to their geographical location.
- 2.99 As a result, they are of the opinion the current event day CPZ, operational between 1pm and – 6pm on event days only when Saracens play at home games, is the only form of parking restriction required.
- 2.100 Given that 59% of respondents did not support the introduction of a CPZ in their road and 11 of 15 (73%) respondents either tended to or strongly opposed CPZs in the Colindale area, it is recommended that the Committee note the results of the consultation, including the petition, but agree not to proceed with the proposed introduction of an amended CPZ in Area 5 at this time.

Consultation results – Outside the Proposed CPZ Areas

- 2.101 169 responses were submitted from residents and businesses outside of the proposed CPZ areas, although a large proportion failed to provide address details.
- 2.102 Of these 169 responses, 5 were received from properties in Gervase Road, 4 of which who had also signed the petition. In excess of 90 responses commented on the detrimental effect the introduction of controls would have for serving police officers at Colindale Police Station.
- 2.103 The majority of respondents indicated that they visited the proposed CPZ area on most days as a car driver for work purposes.
- 2.104 In response to the question as to what extent they supported or opposed the introduction of the proposed CPZs in the Colindale area, the majority were strongly opposed.
- 2.105 Reasons given for this strong opposition included the view that it was purely a money making exercise and that the introduction of unnecessary parking restrictions would seriously inconvenience workers travelling into the area from outside of the immediate Colindale area.

Colindale CPZ Review – Results of 2016 Informal Consultation

- 2.106 In November 2016 the Council carried out a review consultation with residents and businesses of the existing Colindale CPZ.

- 2.107 A total of 140 consultation responses were received and overall 78 (57%) of 138 respondents said that they and/or their visitors had experienced problems parking within the CPZ.
- 2.108 Despite this figure, 83 (63%) of 132 respondents, were happy with the CPZ and the way it operated, although 40 (48%) of these 83 wanted to see some change.
- 2.109 With regards to the type of change, there was support for both the existing days and hours of operation, currently Monday to Friday 2 to 3pm to be extended, although only 56 and 83 of respondents respectively answered these questions.
- 2.110 Of the 52 respondents who wanted a change of days, 37 (66%) indicated a preference for 7 day a week controls rather than Monday to Saturday. 71 (81%) of 87 said that they felt the hours should be extended, but there was no real consensus of what they should be changed to.
- 2.111 Analysis of the comments received indicated very few specific design requests although many residents were of the opinion that there was insufficient space within the existing CPZ to satisfy demand, although it is not clear if this issue was as a result of too many residents needing to park or pressure from non-resident vehicles.
- 2.112 Also on occasions when they had to park in the unrestricted streets just outside the CPZ, they often found that these were full too and that this was happening more frequently.
- 2.113 In light of the proposals to proceed to statutory consultation for CPZs in Areas 1, 3 and 4, there is a possibility that the level of non-resident parking could increase as residents who do not wish to purchase a permit for the new CPZ migrate to try to find alternative 'free' parking.
- 2.114 Should this be the case it would be necessary to mitigate any additional parking stress that could be experienced in the existing Colindale CPZ and make the current situation worse whilst reducing inconvenience to residents, local businesses and their legitimate visitors.
- 2.115 Therefore it is recommended that the Committee notes the results of the consultation and authorise officers to proceed to statutory consultation on the proposed extension of the existing operational hours of the Colindale CPZ from Monday to Friday 2 to 3pm to Monday to Friday between 8am and 6.30pm
- 2.116 As part of the most recent informal consultation residents of Kestrel Close and Swan Drive, both currently unrestricted roads just outside the northern boundary of the existing CPZ, were also asked for their support for or against the introduction of parking controls.
- 2.117 Despite no responses being received from residents of either of these roads it is possible that the proposed introduction of new CPZs in Colindale and extension of the existing CPZ operational hours could lead to an increase in parking stress and inconvenience to residents and their visitors.

- 2.118 As a result, due to their geographical location and to protect residents from any potential displacement parking, it is recommended, that the statutory consultation to extend the operational hours of the existing Colindale CPZ boundary should also include the extension of the CPZ boundary to include Kestrel Close and Swan Drive.
- 2.119 Possible amendment to existing parking and waiting restrictions within the existing CPZ requested during the consultation will be investigated and could be included in the above mentioned statutory consultation, although initial inspections indicate that there is very little if any scope for the provision of additional parking bays.

Ward Councillor Comments

- 2.120 Meetings to discuss the outcome of the consultation and comment on the proposed recommendations have been held with Ward Councillors from Burnt Oak and Mill Hill wards.
- 2.121 At a meeting on 8 February 2018, Councillor C OMacaulley (Burnt Oak ward) expressed particular concern over the current parking situation in roads surrounding the Burnt Oak Underground Station and the implications for residents of the introduction of additional CPZs in Colindale.
- 2.122 He advised, that in addition to representations from Gervase Road, he was often approached by residents from other roads on similar parking issues.
- 2.123 As a result, although understanding the issues associated with the current Colindale consultation he requested that to alleviate unacceptable levels of parking stress he would like the possibility of a CPZ to be investigated in Burnt Oak as a matter of urgency.
- 2.124 Councillor Khatri (Mill Hill ward) met with officers on 12 February 2018.
- 2.125 He advised that at the July 2017 Hendon Residents Forum a petition was submitted from Tithe Walk regarding “rat running” traffic from the A1 and non-resident nuisance parking by commercial vehicles and nearby car dealerships.
- 2.126 Despite being informed that they would be included in a consultation arising from the Colindale area development and that they would have the opportunity to submit comments as part of this process he expressed concern that residents would have been under the impression that these particular issues would have been addressed in the consultation.
- 2.127 Officers advised that few comments were received relating to these specific parking issues. Although the majority of respondents from Tithe Walk were in favour of a CPZ the low response rate and overall lack of support for the introduction of a CPZ in Area 5 had prompted this recommendation.
- 2.128 With regards to the parking design Councillor Khatri requested that the final bay layout should reflect identified access issues for refuse collection and as a result, prevents parking on both sides of the road outside Nos. 24 & 26 Southbourne Avenue.

2.129 Finally, Councillor Khatri expressed a preference for the installation of pay and display ticket machines rather than the proposed pay by phone system.

2.130 Comments via email were received from Councillor Zubairi (Colindale ward) in connection with parking for Cavendish Banqueting Suite patrons and asked whether the provision of special parking permits had been considered.

2.131 Given that obstructive and inconsiderate parking in roads in the south of Area 1 was highlighted during this consultation it would appear that there may be some conflict between the needs of local residents and their visitors and users of these particular business premises.

2.132 Councillor Narenthira (Colindale ward) made the following observations:-

- Colin Park Road and Sheaveshill Avenue in particular have parking issues and should have a CPZ
- There should be concessionary charges for residents as it is the increasing development impact which is affecting the residents
- The A5 ends of both Rushgrove Avenue and Rookery Way have particular parking issues and should have a CPZ
- Vehicles being used for Uber/Mini Cab purposes (there is a company which hires the vehicles out to Uber drivers) will still be parked in Rushgrove and CrossWay and as a CPZ is not proposed for Area 2 this will remain unaddressed)
- Manned consultation sessions should be held at St Matthias Hall on Rushgrove Avenue

2.133 Councillor Sargeant (Colindale ward) had concerns about the size of Area 4 which could encourage intra-CPZ commuting. She also held the view that in addition to manned consultation sessions in St Matthias Hall, The Concourse, in Grahame Park would be another suitable venue with information placed in Colindale Library.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 Alternative options would be to do nothing and consider a “Reactive CPZ Implementation” at a later date (for example reacting to complaints and road safety issues, including poor visibility and obstructive parking). Due to the legal processes involved i.e. statutory consultation, there could be a lengthy time that residents and other roads users may have to endure the problems, before a CPZ could be introduced. This “alternative” approach is not recommended nor supported by Highways.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

A Statutory Consultation will be carried out to seek the views of local residents on the implementation of parking controls. The Strategic 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

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

5.1.1 The Council's Corporate Plan states that strategic objectives that 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 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 The estimated cost of the formal statutory consultation, and subject to approval, the implementation of the parking controls on the roads specified in Recommendations 1 and 3 of this report is estimated at £130,000, which can be met from the provisions of the Re Colindale Capital programme (highways).

5.2.2 The review of the CPZ can be funded in part by the Re Colindale Capital programme, and from the Section 106 agreement relating to the Peel Centre Development H/04753/14 – of which an initial £12,000 is envisaged to be secured for an initial consultation to take place in local roads.

5.3 Social Value

5.3.1 The benefits would include an improved Council reputation due to proactively seeking to address parking as opposed to waiting for a problem to arise, would be detrimental to local residents.

5.3.2 CPZ's allow for a fair distribution of parking spaces for local residents by removing or reducing commuter parking.

5.3.3 It creates a more pleasant environment with fewer motorists trying to find parking spaces.

5.3.4 Managing the supply of on-street parking is a means of addressing congestion, resulting in reduced pollution.

5.3.5 The Council aims to effectively manage the road network in an effective manner which will improve public transport reliability.

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.4.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 makes provision in relation to the management of road networks and places a duty on local traffic authorities to manage their road network to achieve the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's 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.
- 5.4.2 The traffic authority for a road in Greater London may make an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for controlling or regulating vehicular and other traffic.
- 5.4.3 Statutory consultation with all affected frontages, Ward councillors and relevant stakeholders, together with statutory consultees in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 will be conducted.
- 5.4.4 The Council's charging powers are regulated by the general duty on Authorities under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The Council must exercise the powers (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified in subsection (2) of section 122) so as to secure the expeditions, 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.
- 5.4.5 The Councils Constitution, in Article 7, states that the 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 and parks and trees.

5.5 Risk Management

- 5.5.1 None in the context of this report. Risk management may be required for work resulting from this report if authorisation is issued to proceed with the proposals.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

- 5.6.1 The Equality Act 2010 outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equalities Duty which requires Public Bodies to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate I discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- 5.6.2 The proposals are not expected to disproportionately disadvantage or benefit individual members of the community.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

5.7.1 Not applicable in the context of this report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.8.1 An informal consultation (or a preliminary consultation) has been carried out with the local community, and relevant stakeholders.

5.8.2 The acceptance of any CPZ relies on the support of the local community. These are designed to establish whether there are particular parking issues or pressures encountered by the community, and to establish the perceived need for a CPZ or other parking solutions.

5.8.3 Barnet Council's policy is to carry out "web-based" questionnaires, as opposed to paper copy questionnaires.

5.8.4 Letters outlining the details of the proposal and introducing the consultation with a link to the questionnaire are distributed to properties within the agreed consultation area.

5.8.5 To supplement the consultation, consideration will be given to using additional methods of consultation / publication such as:

- Publishing relevant detail on the Council's website
- Publishing relevant detail in the Council's newsletter which is distributed throughout the borough
- Unmanned and manned exhibitions if it is felt likely to be beneficial

5.9 Insight

5.9.1 Based on feedback to the consultation, officers will seek to design an appropriate CPZ to address known and/or expected issues arising from the ongoing extensive development in the area.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Hendon Residents Forum 23 January 2018

Item1

- 5) Petition: Reconsider CPZ on Colin Crescent NW9 – Colindale
- 6) Petition: Petition for request of boundary for Colindale CPZ consultation to be extended to include Gervase Road.
- 7) Petition: Petition against the proposed parking restrictions on Longfield Avenue, NW7, Mill Hill, CPZ.
- 11) Petition: Objection to CPZ on Wardell Close, NW7, Mill Hill

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/b30593/Hendon%20Residents%20Forum%20is%20list%20-%20with%20responses%2023rd-Jan-2018%2019.00%20Hendon%20Residents%20Forum.pdf?T=9>

Planning Committee 29 July 2015

Item 7 Former Peel Centre, Peel Drive, Colindale, London, NW9 5JE - H/04753/14 (Colindale Ward)

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/mgChooseDocPack.aspx?ID=8300>