

	<h2>ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS BY OFFICER</h2>
<p style="text-align: center;">Title</p>	<p>Objections to statutory consultation on a proposal to amend an existing designated disabled parking bay in Milesplit Hill NW7</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Report of</p>	<p>Strategic Director - Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Wards</p>	<p>Mill Hill</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A – Drawing No. SCR162 - 12</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Gavin Woolery-Allen, Senior Engineer gavin.woolery-allen@barnet.gov.uk Tel: 020 8359 3555</p>

<h3>Summary</h3>
<p>Statutory consultation has been carried out regarding a proposed amendment of a parking layout to extend the length of a disabled parking place in Milesplit Hill NW7.</p> <p>This report summarises the objections received to the proposal and determines whether the proposals should be introduced or not, and if so, with or without modification.</p>

<h3>Recommendation</h3>
<p>That having considered the objections received to the statutory consultation on the proposals outlined in this report to authorise officers to implement the proposed</p>

measures as shown on drawing no. SCR162 - 12 through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 A request to extend the length of a designated disabled parking bay outside No.36 Milesplit Hill, NW7 was received from the user of the parking bay due to difficulties they are experiencing in accessing and egressing the bay due to parked vehicles either side of the bay.
- 1.2 Accordingly, Officers investigated the concern and considered that the bay could be extended by 0.5 metres, and a proposal was designed which reflected the extended bay and associated reduction of the adjacent permit parking bay of the same distance, for a statutory consultation to take place.
- 1.3 As part of the statutory consultation process the proposal was advertised by way of notices published in the local newspaper and in the London Gazette. In addition, similar notices were erected on-street in the vicinity of the affected roads and letters and a plan outlining the proposal were delivered to premises in close proximity to the proposed amendment.
- 1.4 In response to the statutory consultation, two objections were received to the proposed disabled parking bay extension on the basis that:
 - The user of the designated disabled bay cannot park properly, and that there is plenty of room for them to park in the existing bay.
 - An additional disabled parking bay would cause difficulties in parking for local residents
 - That another disabled parking space is not needed as there are already two designated disabled parking bays near No. 36 Milesplit Hill
- 1.5 Other comments received were as follows:
 - That the disabled bay should be relocated entirely to another part of the road
 - That a grassed area should be removed to provide additional parking opportunity
 - That some disabled badge holders do not use the designated disabled bay and instead use the general ones.
- 1.6 Officer comments to the proposal are as follows:
- 1.7 Milesplit Hill falls within the Mill Hill 'ED' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which operates from 1pm to 6pm on Event Days.
- 1.8 The proposal seeks to amend the parking layout in the road so a designated disabled bay would be extended in length by 0.5 metres, with a subsequent reduction of the same to the adjacent CPZ permit parking bay, which only

operates on days when a relevant event is taking place at the nearby Allianz Park Stadium.

- 1.9 Officer support the extension in length of the designated disabled parking bay as this would provide additional room for the disabled motorist to be able to manoeuvre in and out of the bay – hence improving that motorist’s access and improving their day to day quality of life.
- 1.10 It is acknowledged that the extension of the length of the disabled parking bay would reduce the available kerbside space which would be used by other motorists on both Event Days and non-event days alike.
- 1.11 Notwithstanding this, it appears that some of the objectors have misunderstood the proposal as it appears they consider that another disabled bay will be provided, as opposed to a 0.5 metre extension of an existing designated disabled bay, as clearly shown in the consultation material.
- 1.12 Assuming that the proposed changes are implemented, it is considered that the 0.5 metre amendment would have minimal adverse impact on the overall number of vehicles which could be parked in the road.
- 1.13 With regards to the suggestion of relocating the designated disabled parking bay, these bays are usually located as close as possible to the applicant’s home to meet their mobility needs. Therefore to relocate the bay further away from the applicant’s home than it is currently situated is considered to be detrimental and would not meet the disabled motorist’s needs.
- 1.14 With regards to the request for grassed areas to be changed to create more space, it is considered that this falls outside the remit of the consultation, and should be included for assessment for prioritisation of schemes for future work programmes.
- 1.15 *Accordingly having considered the content of the objections, it is considered that the proposed extension of the designated disabled parking space by 0.5m space outside No. 36 Milespit Hill should proceed.*

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is considered that the measures are required to meet the needs of a disabled motorist in accessing and egressing from the designated disabled bay originally introduced to improve their parking and access near their home.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Alternative options could be to implement the proposal without any modifications; however it is considered that the proposed way forward, having considered the content of the objections received and the local demand for parking spaces as well as the impact on the disabled resident.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 The amendment to a designated disabled bay, if approved, will require the requestor and objectors to be written to, to advise of the outcome, the relevant road markings to be amended, and the relevant Traffic Management Orders amended to reflect the revised layout.

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 introduction of the proposed measures would require amendments to existing Traffic Management Orders (TMO)
- 5.2.2 The costs of amending the designated disabled bay would be met from the 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for Disabled Parking Provision, which has an 18/19 allocation of £0.075m.
- 5.2.3 The works will be carried out under the existing LOHAC term maintenance contractual arrangements.

5.3 Social Value

- 5.3.1 The potential social benefits of making the proposed amendment would include an improved accessibility for a disabled resident to parking in their street.

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.4.1 Article 9 of the Council's Constitution states that Chief Officers have the delegated powers;

'to make decisions and approve expenditure relating to their functions and the functions of their Department... providing (1) that the sum expended is within the approved budget for the Department and/or relevant portfolio, and (2) the amount in relation to any single matter does not exceed £181,302.'

- 5.4.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on local traffic 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 powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders (TMO's) under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.4.4 Statutory consultation with all affected in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 has been conducted.

5.5 Risk Management

5.5.1 It is not considered that the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations as the proposed measures have a specific purpose and benefit which has been outlined within the consultation material.

5.5.2 It is considered that the issues involved in proposing or introducing the measures may lead to some level of public concern from local residents who feel that they do not wish for the measure to be introduced, or from residents/motorists 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 across a sufficient area has ensures that members of the public have had the opportunity to comment in any statutory consultation on any proposed measure which has been considered within this report.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 The 2010 Equality Act outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equalities Duty which requires Public Bodies to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
- Foster good relations between people from different groups

5.6.2 The proposals outlined in this report are designed to improve access for a person with a protected characteristic.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

5.7.1 Not applicable in the context of this report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.8.1 A statutory consultation has been carried out with the local community, and relevant stakeholders.

5.9 Insight

5.9.1 None in the context of this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 None

7. DECISION TAKER'S STATEMENT

7.1 *I have the required powers to make the decision documented in this report. I am responsible for the report's content and am satisfied that all relevant advice has been sought in the preparation of this report and that it is compliant with the decision-making framework of the organisation which includes Constitution, Scheme of Delegation, Budget and Policy Framework and Legal issues including Equalities obligations. The decision is compliant with the principles of decision making in Article 10 of the constitution.*

Chief Officer: JAMIE BLAKE

Signed:



Dated: 11th October 2018

REPORT CLEARANCE CHECKLIST

(Removed prior to publication and retained by Governance Service)

Note: All delegated powers reports must be cleared by the appropriate Senior Officer, Legal, Finance and Governance as a minimum. Report authors should also engage with subject matter experts from other service areas where this is required (e.g. procurement, equalities, risk, etc.). The name and date that the officer has cleared the report must be included in the table below or the report will not be accepted.

Legal, Finance and Governance require a minimum of 5 working days to provide report clearance. Clearance cannot be guaranteed for reports submitted outside of this time.

AUTHOR TO COMPLETE TABLE BELOW:

Who	Clearance Date	Name
Senior Officer – Chief Officer	Jamie Blake	11.10.18
HB Public Law	Patricia Tavernier	23.04.18
Finance	Lucy Hugall	06.09.18
Governance	Paul Frost	16.04.18