



Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee

17 October 2019

Title

**Proposed extension and amendments
to Church End Controlled Parking
Zone (CPZ) – outcome of statutory
consultation**

Report of

Executive Director, Environment

Wards

Finchley Church End

Status

Public

Urgent

No

Key

No

Enclosures

Appendix A – Proposal Drawing Nos. SCR253SP, SCR253-1, SCR253-2, SCR253-3, SCR253-4, SCR253-5 and SCR253-6

Appendix B – Recommended implementation drawing nos. SCR253SPa, SCR253-2a, SCR253-3a, SCR253-4a, SCR253-5a and SCR253-6a

Officer Contact Details

Gavin Woolery-Allen, Senior Engineer, Traffic and Development Section

highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the outcome of the statutory consultation undertaken in respect of proposed extensions to the Church End Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include additional roads or lengths of road, and proposed amendments to the CPZ's hours of

operations in certain roads and lengths of road.

Officers Recommendations

- 1. That having considered the feedback to the statutory consultation undertaken in respect of the proposed extensions of the Church End 'CE' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), the Committee instructs the Executive Director, Environment to introduce the extensions to the Church End 'CE' CPZ into Templars Crescent N3, Cavendish Avenue N3, Stanhope Avenue N3, St Mary's Avenue N3 and Lyndhurst Gardens N3 as originally proposed and as shown on drawing nos. SCR253Spa, SCR253-2a, SCR253-3a, SCR253-4a, SCR253-5a and SCR253-6a, through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders.**
- 2. That having considered the feedback to the statutory consultation undertaken in respect of the proposed amendment of the operational periods of the Church End 'CE' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), the Committee instructs the Executive Director, Environment to abandon the proposal in respect of Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue, and to introduce the amendments to the operational period of the Church End 'CE' CPZ in Dollis Park (between Regents Park Road and Church Crescent) as originally proposed and as shown on drawing nos. SCR253SPa and SCR253-4a, through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders.**
- 3. That the Committee note that the actions outlined in 1 and 2 above, will be funded from the Section 106 (of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) agreement dated 30th March 2012, relating to the approved scheme at Winston House, 2 Dollis Park, London, N3 1HF & 4 Dollis Park, London N3 1HG & 349-363 Regents Park Road, London, N3 1DH (planning permission reference F/00497/11).**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 At the February 2018 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, the Committee considered a report outlining the findings of an informal consultation carried out with properties within and outside the boundary of the Church End Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 1.2 Having considered the results of the consultation, the Committee approved a statutory consultation exercise to take place in respect of extensions to the CPZ to include various roads or lengths of road, and for amendments to be made to the hours of operation of the CPZ in certain roads or lengths of road.
- 1.3 This report outlines the responses received to the statutory consultations and makes recommendations in respect of the way forward, for the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee to consider.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 On 15th February 2018 the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee considered a report outlining the results of an informal consultation undertaken between November 2017 and January 2018 in and around the Church End CPZ, designed to establish whether residents and businesses within the CPZ were satisfied with the CPZ or whether they wished for changes to be made, and whether those living and operating outside the CPZ would like to be included in a CPZ.

2.2 Having considered the report, the Committee decided:

To authorise the Executive Director, Environment and his officers to carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce extended CPZ hours and waiting restrictions, operation Monday to Saturday from 10am to 4pm in:

*Dollis Park (between Regent's Park Road and Church Crescent);
Lichfield Grove (from Regent's Park Road to Sylvan Avenue),
Station Close;
Station Road; and
Sylvan Avenue; and*

To note the results of the consultation in roads outside of the Church End CPZ and petitions received and resolve to authorise the now Executive Director, Environment and his officers to design and carry out statutory consultation on proposals to introduce CPZ parking and waiting restrictions, operation Monday to Friday from 2-3pm, as extensions to the existing Church End CPZ in:

St Mary's Avenue and Templars Crescent

The northern section of Lyndhurst Gardens (between Dollis Park and the entrances to both Finchley Manor Lawn Tennis and Squash Rackets Club and Christ's College Playing Field.

Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue (between East End Road and Mountfield Road)

2.3 Accordingly a statutory consultation was prepared for the increase in operational periods of the CPZ in certain roads and extending the boundary of the Church End "CE" CPZ to include additional roads, as stated above as shown on drawing nos. SCR253SP, SCR253-1, SCR253-2, SCR253-3, SCR253-4, SCR253-5 and SCR253-6.

2.4 A total of 232 responses to the statutory consultation was received, although for the purposes of analysis, the proposals have been split into four separate areas, as follows:

Area A: Proposed CPZ extension – Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue

Area B: Proposed CPZ extension – St Mary's Avenue

Area C: Proposed CPZ extension – Lyndhurst Gardens

Area D: Proposed CPZ increase in operation – Dollis Park, Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue

Issues arising from the statutory consultation

2.5 The headline data and main issues arising from the consultation are summarised below.

Area A: Proposed CPZ extension – Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue

2.6 63 responses were received in response to the proposed CPZ extension to Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue.

2.7 Of the 63 responses, 45 were objections to the proposal and 18 were in support of the proposals – primarily from residents of the three roads where the CPZ was proposed to be introduced.

2.8 Of the objections, 27 were concerned about displacement into neighbouring roads, with the majority (21) of these citing concerns about the impact on Mountfield Road, Windermere Avenue and Holmwood Gardens.

2.9 10 respondents mentioned that they would support the extension of the CPZ into Mountfield Road and/or Holmwood Gardens and/or Upper Cavendish Road.

Area B: Proposed CPZ extension – St Mary's Avenue

2.10 14 responses were received in response to the proposed CPZ extension to St Mary's Avenue.

2.11 Of the responses received, there were no objections, and 11 were in support of the proposal.

2.12 5 responses, from St Mary's Avenue were all in favour of the proposal, as were 6 responses from neighbouring Cyprus Gardens residents.

2.13 It should be noted that the 6 responses from Cyprus Gardens residents, plus an additional 3 from the same road, outlined a concern about potential displacement that a CPZ in St Mary's Avenue may cause, and all 9 stated that they wished for Cyprus Gardens to be included in the CPZ.

Area C: Proposed CPZ extension – Lyndhurst Gardens

2.14 20 responses were received to the proposed CPZ extension in Lyndhurst Gardens.

2.15 Of these, 12 were objections and there were 7 responses in support including a petition signed by 25 signatories.

- 2.16 Of the responses received 6 outlined concern about the potential displacement that a CPZ in part of Lyndhurst Gardens may cause, particularly in respect of the part of Lyndhurst Gardens which would remain unrestricted.

Area D: Proposed CPZ increase in operation – Dollis Park, Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue

- 2.17 86 responses were received to the proposed increase in operation of the CPZ in Dollis Park (part), Lichfield Grove, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue.
- 2.18 Of the responses received 75 were objections to the proposals and 8 were in support.
- 2.19 Of the objections received, 36 were concerned about displacement, with Church Crescent, Hervey Close, Clifton Avenue and the lower half of Dollis Park cited as being possibly impacted.
- 2.20 23 responses were concerned about the impact on their household in respect of themselves, visitors and tradespeople.
- 2.21 22 responses cited that the proposal would result in increased costs and/or feeling that this was a money-making exercise.
- 2.22 14 responses cited the potential impact on businesses, as the proposal would deter visitors to local businesses and shops.
- 2.23 8 responses cited the impact on the surgery in Lichfield Grove – including a petition signed by [44] people.

Overall proposal – Comments received

- 2.24 39 responses were received in relation to the proposal as a whole, or in relation to more than one of the above proposal areas.
- 2.25 Of these, 36 were objections, with 25 from local organisations/charities (mainly 2 no.) citing the potential impact on workers and volunteers if currently uncontrolled roads were to be restricted in the future.

Officer comments

- 2.26 Officer comments to the objections, comments and concerns raised during the statutory consultation are as follows:

Displacement of motorists into neighbouring roads/requests for further extensions of the CPZ into additional streets – Areas A, B and C

- 2.27 Officers are mindful of the issues raised from the residents of the roads who responded to the consultation, who outlined their concern about the potential displacement that could occur as a result of any CPZ introduction.

- 2.28 This concern is indirectly reaffirmed through the number of employees of the area who objected to the proposed CPZ extensions due to the fact that they would make parking their vehicles more difficult as part of their journey into work
- 2.29 Officers consider that the concern from local employees also demonstrate that the roads where the CPZ extensions were proposed, are currently subject to non-resident parking, hence the reason for the demand in CPZ restrictions to be introduced by local residents.
- 2.30 It is noted that, in the case of some of the roads where there is concern about displaced parking, parking may already be congested, although it is accepted that additional displaced parking could result from the introduction of CPZs in Areas A, B and C, hence increasing the demand and competition for kerbside space.
- 2.31 It is considered however, that the concerns raised do not take away from the local desire for a CPZ to be introduced in Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue (Area A), St Mary's Avenue (Area B) and the northern sections of Lyndhurst Gardens (Area C).
- 2.32 Certainly, with all the proposals to extend the CPZ, there were responses received in support of the proposals, reaffirming the local desire for CPZ to be introduced, noting that the nature of statutory consultations tend to elicit more negative responses than positive.
- 2.33 With regards to any request for the CPZ to be extended into additional streets, such as Mountfield Road, Holmwood Gardens, Windermere Avenue (Area A), Cyprus Gardens (Area B) and the southern section of Lyndhurst Gardens (Area C), it is considered that the requests should be considered and assessed separately along with all other similar requests that the Council receives, with a view to determining the requests that should be included for further investigation in future years' work programmes. This would also allow the impact of any CPZ introduction in Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue and Stanhope Avenue (Area A), St Mary's Avenue (Area B) and Lyndhurst Gardens (Area C) to be assessed.
- 2.34 Furthermore, it should also be noted that the Council are in preliminary discussions with Transport for London (TfL) in respect of the redevelopment of Finchley Central Station, and the Council would be mindful of the current and potential future parking issues in the area when considering any planning applications, and determining whether any Section 106 (of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) contributions would be appropriate.

Cost of permits and vouchers/Money making scheme/Impact on local residents and their visitors/families – Areas A, B, C and D

- 2.35 With regards to the objections relating to parking charges/making money etc, the costs advised to the community as part of the consultation are the Council's standard permit charges that apply across all CPZs in the borough, as agreed and amended as part of its annual Fees and Charges considerations.
- 2.36 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides that surplus income derived from parking activity should be spent on Highways/Parking related activity.

- 2.37 It is acknowledged that the introduction of a CPZ would impact in a variety of ways, and residents would need to adjust to accommodate their families, visitors, tradespeople and other demands.
- 2.38 As part of a CPZ, residents can purchase visitor vouchers which can be then issued to visitors and tradespeople. For longer term work, builders and contractors can apply for a specific permit. People who require ongoing care may be eligible for a specific Carers Permit.

Area D: Proposed CPZ increase in operation – Dollis Park, Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue

- 2.39 The number of responses received indicates the level of interest and concern about the proposal to increase the operational periods of the Church End 'CE' CPZ in certain roads.
- 2.40 A significant number of the responses was in relation to the potential impact that increasing the period of the CPZs of operation could have on local neighbouring roads.
- 2.41 Dollis Park, Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue are situated in close proximity of the Church End/Finchley Central Town Centre and some of the respondents acknowledge that these roads are used for parking by those wishing to visit local businesses and amenities, outside of the current CPZ hour of restriction.
- 2.42 The concern is therefore that roads such as Church Crescent, Hervey Close, Clifton Avenue and the lower half of Dollis Park will be impacted upon through motorists being displaced into the nearest available lesser-controlled roads, although there is a feeling that some motorists would be dissuaded from visiting local businesses, shops and other amenities altogether.
- 2.43 The petition in respect of highlighting the concern about the proposals impacting on patients' access to the surgery in Lichfield Grove, has also been noted.
- 2.44 Officers consider that there appears to be a general view from those living within the lengths of road where the changes are being proposed, and those living elsewhere, that if the changes were to be implemented as proposed it would upset the balance of the area, due to the negative impacts in displacing parking and making it more difficult for motorists to visit the town centre, with the subsequent impact on the businesses and shops and amenities.
- 2.45 With this in mind, Officers consider that the proposal to amend the CPZ restrictions in Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue should be abandoned at this time.
- 2.46 This would address most of the concern about this proposal in respect of the impact of households, whether financial or practical, visitors to properties and the impact on local businesses and local amenities such as the doctors' surgery in Lichfield Grove.

- 2.47 However, it is considered that, given the geographical layout of the road network, the proposal for the section of Dollis Park between its junctions with Regents Park Road and Church Crescent should still be introduced.
- 2.48 This length of highway is immediately adjacent to Regents Park Road and appears to be very attractive for motorists wishing to visit the town centre. Certainly, in the length concerned, there were more respondents (of those who submitted their full address) in favour of the change than against it.
- 2.49 This change may result in displaced parking into immediately neighbouring streets, however, given the recommended abandonment of the proposals for Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue, it is considered that the displacement will be minimal.
- 2.50 With regards to other general comments received, it is considered that these are not in sufficient numbers to amend the proposals further.

Conclusion

- 2.51 In conclusion, having considered the comments, objections and suggestions relating to the proposed CPZ extensions to the Church End CPZ and the proposed increase in operational periods in certain roads or length of road in the Church End CPZ, it is considered that the extension proposals for Templars Crescent, Cavendish Avenue, Stanhope Avenue, St Mary's Avenue and the northern section of Lyndhurst Gardens should be approved and implemented, as shown on drawing nos. SCR253SP_a, SCR253-2_a, SCR253-3_a, SCR253-4_a, SCR253-5_a and SCR253-6_a.
- 2.52 Furthermore, it is considered that given the concern about the proposals to amend the CPZ days/hours of operation in Dollis Park, Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue, that the proposal in so much that it applies to Lichfield Grove, Station Road, Station Close and Sylvan Avenue should be abandoned, and should only be introduced in Dollis Park as proposed. as shown on drawing nos. SCR253SP_a and SCR253-4_a.
- 2.53 It is acknowledged that the extension of the CPZ will impact on those non-residents that have become accustomed to parking in those roads, and may increase competition for kerbside space in neighbouring and nearby unrestricted roads, hence impacting on the residents of those roads. However, it is considered that the long-standing issues arising in the roads where the CPZs are proposed should be addressed now.
- 2.54 The Council is expecting a future planning application from TfL relating to the Finchley Central Station site and, as a result of the consultation exercise carried out, Officers now have a better awareness of the parking issues in the area, and will seek to ensure any current and potential future parking issues in the area are addressed when considering any future planning applications.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Alternative options are not being considered in light of the responses to the statutory consultation carried out.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation will be carried out as soon as practicable, in line with existing work programmes, and all necessary statutory requirements under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulation 1996 (as amended) will be complied with.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 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, inclusive of the free flow of traffic.
- 5.1.2 Effective management of the network is required to ensure the free flow of traffic. Collaborative working across the service area makes this achievable and supports the objectives of the Council.
- 5.1.3 In turn improving safety for all road users, including pedestrians. Additionally, traffic free flow reduces driver frustrations and conflict, making it a pleasant and safer environment.
- 5.1.4 Congestion, hindered access and inconsiderate parking is not desirable. Negative impacts affect public transport services and bus reliability, in addition to an increase in air pollution and other associated environmental impacts.

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

- 5.2.1 The cost of carrying out the implementation of the recommended measures which initially includes writing to all properties in the agreed area, finalising the relevant Traffic Management Orders, advertising, and introducing the necessary road markings and signage is estimated to be £25,000, the cost of which can be met from the Section 106 (of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990), relating to the Winston House, 2 Dollis Park, London, N3 1HF & 4 Dollis Park, London N3 1HG & 349-363 Regents Park Road, London, N3 1DH development (reference F/00497/11)
- 5.2.2 On-going costs related to enforcement and CPZ maintenance will be attributable to the Special Parking Account
- 5.2.3 The necessary parking related road markings and associated signage will require on-going routine maintenance which will be met by the Special Parking Account although it should be noted that no specific budget has been allocated for such purposes and therefore any maintenance costs will negatively impact on the Special Parking Account.
- 5.2.4 Income generated through the purchasing of parking permit, parking vouchers and Penalty Charge Notices issued to motorists who have committed parking contraventions will all be attributable to the Special Parking Account.

5.3 **Social Value**

5.3.1 None in the context of this report

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

5.4.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligation on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements as they consider appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing their duty.

5.4.2 The Council as the Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend TMO's through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.4.3 Traffic Management Orders will be introduced in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

5.4.4 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. The Council's Constitution, Article 7 – Committees, Forums, Workshops and Partnerships, outlines the terms of reference of the Area Committee which includes responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments, parks and trees.

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 parking facilities in the area 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.

5.5.3 In response to this, 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 involving our proposals.

5.6 **Equalities and Diversity**

5.6.1 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 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. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs, sex and sexual orientation.

5.6.3 It is considered that the recommended introduction of the specified extensions and abandonment of other extensions of the Church End “CE” CPZ will not disproportionately disadvantage individuals.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

5.7.1 None in relation to this report

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.8.1 Consultation has undertaken as described in this report.

5.8.2 All households previously consulted will receive an update by way of a letter.

5.9 Insight

5.9.1 None in relation to this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee, 15th February 2018 – Agenda Item 30 “Church End Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) - Parking Consultation Results”
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9274&Ver=4>

6.2 Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum – 23 January 2018 - Petition – “Include Stanhope Avenue and Cavendish Avenue in the next extension of Finchley Church End CPZ”
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=170&MId=8759&Ver=4>

6.3 Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum – 5 July 2017 Petition – “CPZ Lyndhurst Gardens”
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=170&MId=9377&Ver=4>

6.4 Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum – 22 March 2017 Petition – “CPZ on St Marys Avenue N3”
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=170&MId=8748&Ver=4>

6.5 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee – 16 February 2017 – Agenda Item 8 “Petitions (if any)”
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9126&Ver=4>

- 6.6 Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum - 24 January 2017 "Parking petition from the residents of Station Road and Station Close"
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=170&MId=8747&Ver=4>