



Chipping Barnet Area Committee

6 October 2020

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Title | Normandy Avenue and Bedford Avenue, EN5 – Outcome of informal Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Consultation |
| Report of | Executive Director, Environment |
| Wards | Underhill |
| Status | Public |
| Urgent | No |
| Key | No |
| Enclosures | Appendix A – Informal Consultation Letter Appendix B – Questionnaire Appendix C – Parking Review Plan |
| Officer Contact Details | Gavin Woolery-Allen - Senior Engineer highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 3555 |

Summary

The purpose of this report is to advise on the outcome of the informal consultation following a review of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Normandy and Bedford Avenue, EN5 and to outline the findings. The report asks Committee to note the results of the informal consultation and agree to the recommendations made in this report.

Officers Recommendations

1. That the Chipping Barnet Committee, considers the feedback from the informal consultation on the review of the Controlled Parking Zone in Normandy and Bedford Avenue in April 2020, summarised in this

report and: -

- (a) Notes the results of the consultation**
- (b) Agrees not to proceed with changes to the days, hours or permit designation of the CPZ in Normandy Avenue and Bedford Avenue at this time**

2. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, consider and authorise the Executive Director for Environment to: -

- (a) conduct a secondary informal consultation on a CPZ review, with the timing of such to be agreed with Ward Councillors; and**
- (b) report the results of the consultation referred to in 2(a) above to a future meeting of this Committee**

3. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee, consider and authorise the Executive Director for Environment to: -

- (a) investigate, design and carry out a statutory consultation on parking restriction changes to accommodate 'D' resident permit holders in the parking bays in Newlyn Road**
- (b) obtain agreement with Ward Councillors regarding the design mentioned in 3(a) above**
- (c) subject to the Ward Councillor agreement mentioned in 3(b) above, carry out a statutory consultation on agreed proposals**
- (d) obtain agreement with Ward Councillors regarding the timing of the statutory consultation mentioned in 3(c) above**
- (e) consider any objections to the statutory consultation outlined in 3(c) above using his Delegated Powers, and decide whether to introduce the proposals or not, and if so, with or without modification**
- (f) introduce the proposed measures, if any are required following the decision made in accordance with 3(e) above and if no objections are received to the statutory consultation mentioned in 3(c) above, through the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders and implementation of the relevant signage**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 At the Chipping Barnet Area Committee meeting on 23 January 2020, a Member Item was raised by Councillor Brayne in respect to parking in the road.
- 1.2 Residents of Normandy Avenue find themselves unable to park in their road, despite paying for CPZ permits. The number of cars owned by residents on the street far outweighs the number of driveways, and the road includes 20 flats. The current CPZ operates for one-hour, early afternoon, on weekdays. Residents have identified Barnet College employees and students parking in the roads as the issue, as during holidays there are no parking problems.

- 1.3 Residents have conducted a survey of the road and come up with some possible solutions. The following solutions were very popular with survey respondents:
- 1.4 The suggestions were a longer CPZ timeslot; Two different CPZ timeslots, morning & afternoon and changing Newlyn Road to Zone D, to free up more parking for the residents as this road is often empty but falls within the neighbouring CPZ, which their permits are not eligible for.
- 1.5 Councillor Brayne requested that Officers conduct a study of the parking situation in Normandy Avenue and suggest solutions to the issues and report the findings back to Committee.
- 1.6 Councillor Brayne presented the request for CIL funding, explaining the issues being faced by residents and outlining possible solutions. It was suggested that Bedford Road be added to the study.
- 1.7 Having considered the Item, the Committee decided that, with the inclusion of Bedford Road on Highways' Officers' advice, that an informal Officer consultation being carried out and CIL funding of £5,000 being allocated for the feasibility study:
- 1.8 The Committee decided that Officers should report the feedback obtained through the future informal consultation back to the Committee for it to make a decision on how to proceed and funding for the scheme.
- 1.9 This report summarised the findings of the consultation and recommends conducting a secondary consultation on a CPZ review in Normandy and Bedford Avenue, inclusive of selected, directly affected properties in Barnet Hill and High Street. In addition to investigate, design and carry out a statutory consultation on parking restriction changes to accommodate 'D' resident permit holders in the parking bays in Newlyn Road.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 An informal consultation was undertaken with residents of Normandy Avenue and Bedford Avenue whose properties are located inside the area of the CPZ review so the Council could obtain their views.
- 2.2 The informal consultation commenced on the 14 April 2020 and concluded on the 14 May 2020. Residents received a letter via royal mail inviting them to complete the published information on the Council's consultation portal in an online questionnaire at: engage.barnet.gov.uk. Individuals unable to complete the online questionnaire could request a paper copy by calling the Traffic and Development Section or by email at parking.consultations@barnet.gov.uk.
- 2.3 A total of 354 properties situated in Normandy and Bedford Avenue, and adjacent properties in Barnet Hill and High Street, received the consultation material which consisted of a letter containing instructions and a drawing highlighting the review area and nearby Controlled Parking "C" and "D" Zone boundary.

- 2.4 The questionnaire asked the respondent whether they were satisfied with the days and hours of operation of the CPZ in their road/road they had an interest in, and asked them to specify what changes they would like to be made
- 2.5 The letter also clearly stated how the views received from the community will help us understand whether or not the current parking controls meets its needs and will help decide if new measures or changes to existing parking controls would be appropriate in the area.
- 2.6 Whilst majority of individuals accessed and submitted their questionnaire via the portal, the public also had the opportunity to send feedback by sending a letter via royal mail, emailing Parking Consultations or by submitting an enquiry to Highways Correspondence.
- 2.7 The consultation generated 45 responses in total, inclusive of 1 duplicate submitted from the same household where comments had already been received. Therefore, for the purposes of analysing the feedback, a total of 44 valid responses have been considered, a response rate of 12%.

Analysis of responses (individual roads)

- 2.8 In Normandy Avenue, 154 properties received the consultation material and 21 (14%) of respondents submitted comments.
- 2.9 Of the responses received, 11 (52%) were in favour of changes to the CPZ, 8 (38%) did not feel any amendments were needed, however, 6 (75%) of those acknowledged difficulties in certain parts of the road and 2 (10%) of respondents felt unsure about changes to the hours and / or removing Normandy Avenue from Zone "D".
- 2.10 In Bedford Avenue, 135 properties received the consultation material, inclusive of Bedford and Avenue Mansions and 22 (16%) of respondents submitted comments.
- 2.11 Of the responses received, 15 (68%) were in favour of changes to the CPZ, 6 (27%) did not feel any amendments were needed and 1 (5%) of respondents felt unsure about removing Bedford Avenue from the "D" Controlled Parking Zone.
- 2.12 In Barnet Hill, 12 properties received the consultation material and 1 (8%) submitted feedback.
- 2.13 In High Street, 53 properties received the consultation material, inclusive of Court House and Lawn Mansions and 0 (0%) submitted feedback.

Overall percentages (all roads combined)

- 2.14 In total 27 (61%) of respondents were in favour of CPZ changes, including removing Normandy and Bedford Avenue from Zone "D", extending the controlled hours and / or days.
- 2.15 14 (31%) of respondents did not feel any amendments were needed, of which 6 (14%) appreciated the difficulties some residents would encounter in relation to parking.

- 2.16 3 (7%) of respondents expressed their desire for the days to remain the same, but at the same time felt unsure, and therefore did not specify if they wanted their road to be removed from “D” Controlled Parking Zone and changes to the controlled hours.

Normandy and Bedford Avenue - Removal from “D” Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

- 2.17 Residents had the opportunity to confirm whether or not they wished for their road to be removed from “D” CPZ, operational Monday to Friday between the hours of 2pm and 3pm and re-introduced as a separate zone.
- 2.18 In Normandy Avenue, 3 (14%) of respondents were in favour of removing their road from the “D” CPZ and re-introduced as a separate zone, 11 (52%) were not in favour and 7 (33%) did not specify if they wanted to remain in or placed outside of the current zone.
- 2.19 In Bedford Avenue, 7 (32%) of respondents were in favour of removing their road from the “D” CPZ, 10 (45%) were not in favour and 5 (23%) did not specify if they wanted to remain in or placed outside of the current zone.
- 2.20 For information purposes, the response received from Barnet Hill did not specify.
- 2.21 In total (all roads combined), 10 (23%) of respondents were in favour of removing their road from the “D” Controlled Parking Zone and re-introduced as a separate CPZ. 21 (48%) were not in favour and 13 (29%) did not specify.
- 2.22 Re-introducing a new zone can benefit permit holders by reducing the demand for parking. It's an effective way of freeing up valuable on-street parking in areas where displacement is relatively high. It appears that only 23% of individuals would support their road being removed from the existing zone, which is relatively low. The results suggest that permit holders are not the main factor and / or concern.

Existing Controlled Hours - 2pm to 3pm

- 2.23 Presently, permits are required to park in Normandy and Bedford Avenue between the hours of 2pm and 3pm, Mondays to Fridays. In response to the question about whether the population would prefer retaining the existing controlled hours, the results were as follows:
- 2.24 In Normandy Avenue, 11 (52%) of respondents were in favour of retaining the existing 2pm-3pm restriction, 8 (38%) were not in favour and 2 (10%) did not specify.
- 2.25 In Bedford Avenue, 9 (41%) of respondents were in favour of retaining the existing 2pm-3pm restriction, 13 (59%) were not in favour and subsequently wanted change.
- 2.26 The Hillside Mansion respondent reliant in parking in Bedford Avenue did not favour the existing controlled hours.
- 2.27 In total (all roads combined), 20 (45%) of respondents were in favour of retaining the existing 2pm-3pm restriction, 21 (48%) were not in favour or 22 (50%) including responses from Hillside Mansion.

- 2.28 All of those not in favour, apart from one household, suggested an alternative, including longer time periods, a morning and afternoon restriction and an extension to include weekends.
- 2.29 Although a greater number of respondents would like to see a change in Bedford Avenue, in comparison to Normandy, the feedback would appear consistent in relation to potential resolutions such as the operating times (hours and days) and clusters towards to the top end of the road near Barnet Hill and High Street.
- 2.30 As such, permit holders residing in Normandy Avenue, towards its junction with Mays Lane do not experience the same level of disruption and difficulty in parking in comparison to those located at the top end, towards Barnet Hill and High Street.
- 2.31 Properties further away from the High Street end of the roads, benefit from an increase in off-street parking provisions for multiple vehicles. However, a greater number of residents rely on parking on-street towards the top end, resulting in higher demand. Feedback indicates that it is due to its close proximity to shops and other local facilities in the area, including the college.

Preferred CPZ hours

- 2.32 Residents were encouraged to suggest new controlled hours, especially if they did not want the current hours to remain in force.
- 2.33 In Normandy Avenue, 8 (38%) of respondents contributed by suggesting a new time, 12 (54.5%) in Bedford Avenue and 1 (100%) in Barnet Hill.
- 2.34 The above combined which is 21 (47.7%), equates to the total number of responses received to this question out of 44 responses.
- 2.35 The tables below include the suggestions put forward by individuals residing in each road and the total number of respondents in support of each restriction type.

Analysis of results

Normandy Avenue

| <u>Time suggestions</u> | <u>Normandy Avenue No. of respondents in favour out of 21</u> |
|---|--|
| Two separate time restrictions | 3 (14.3%) |
| One longer time restriction | 1 (4.8%) |
| 11am-12:30 & 2pm-3pm | - |
| 7am-7pm weekdays & 10am-5pm Saturday | - |
| 8am-6:30pm | - |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 8:30am-5:30pm | - |
| 8:30am-6:30pm | 1 (4.8%) |
| 9am-6:30pm | 1 (4.8%) |
| 2pm-6pm | 1 (4.8%) |
| Extend existing or two separate times | 1 (4.8%) |
| Total / Respondent % | 8 (38%) |

Bedford Avenue

| <u>Time suggestions</u> | <u>Bedford Avenue</u> <u>No. of respondents in favour out of 22</u> |
|---|--|
| Two separate time restrictions | 3 (13.6%) |
| One longer time restriction | - |
| 11am-12:30 & 2pm-3pm | 1 (4.5%) |
| 7am-7pm weekdays & 10am-5pm Saturday | 1 (4.5%) |
| 8am-6:30pm | 5 (22.7%) |
| 8:30am-5:30pm | - |
| 8:30am-6:30pm | 2 (9%) |
| 9am-6:30pm | - |
| 2pm-6pm | - |
| Extend existing or two separate times | - |
| Total / Respondent % | 12 (54.5%) |

Barnet Hill

| <u>Time suggestions</u> | <u>Barnet Hill</u> <u>No. of respondents in favour out of 1</u> |
|---|--|
| Two separate time restrictions | |
| One longer time restriction | |
| 11am-12:30 & 2pm-3pm | |
| 7am-7pm weekdays & 10am-5pm Saturday | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 8am-6:30pm | |
| 8:30am-5:30pm | 1 (100%) |
| 8:30am-6:30pm | |
| 9am-6:30pm | |
| 2pm-6pm | |
| Extend existing or two separate times | |
| Total / Respondent % | 1 (100%) |

The table below includes a combined total. Please be advised the overall percentage appears lower, in comparison to the above, as a result of being divided by the total number of respondents (all three roads).

| <u>Time suggestions</u> | <u>Total No. of respondents in favour out of 44</u> |
|---|--|
| Two separate time restrictions | 6 (13.6%) |
| One longer time restriction | 1 (2.3%) |
| 11am-12:30 & 2pm-3pm | 1 (2.3%) |
| 7am-7pm weekdays & 10am-5pm Saturday | 1 (2.3%) |
| 8am-6:30pm | 5 (11.4%) |
| 8:30am-5:30pm | 1 (2.3%) |
| 8:30am-6:30pm | 3 (6.8%) |
| 9am-6:30pm | 1 (2.3%) |
| 2pm-6pm | 1 (2.3%) |
| Extend existing or two separate times | 1 (2.3%) |
| Total / Respondent % | 21 (47.7%) |

2.36 The most common time restriction suggested in Normandy Avenue would appear to be two separate time slots with 14.3%, although a combination of "longer/working day" restriction suggestions also amounted to 3 (14.3%). One resident detailed 10am-11am, as their preference in addition to the existing 2pm-3pm controlled hour.

- 2.37 The most favourable time restriction in Bedford Avenue would appear to be 8am-6:30m with 22.7%, with 3 (13.6%) additional suggestions of alternative “all day” restrictions. The second suggestion being two separate time slots with 13.6%.
- 2.38 Normandy and Bedford combined, indicates two separate time restrictions as being the most desirable with an overall percentage of 13.6%. The 8am-6:30pm would appear to be second with an overall percentage of 11.4%.
- 2.39 The current 2pm-3pm controlled hour provides an element of free and convenient parking non-permit holders, including shoppers, students and commuters, impacting negatively on individuals residing locally.
- 2.40 Extending the time restriction would deter a greater number of non-permit holders from parking, increasing the number of parking opportunities in the area for residents and their visitors.
- 2.41 Any time extension is likely to reduce the amount of traffic in the area, resulting in a more pleasant and safer environment.
- 2.42 However, it is felt appropriate to allow a second opportunity for residents to express their concerns to gauge the likelihood of a successful consultation, should proposals progress.

Preferred days of operation

- 2.43 Residents had the opportunity to put forward their suggestion in respect to the days of enforcement, which forms part of the controlled hours. At present the CPZ is operational Monday to Friday.
- 2.44 In Normandy Avenue, Bedford Avenue and Barnet Hill, all 44 (100%) of respondents completed the question. Some of which elaborated further by explaining the reason for their decision.
- 2.45 The tables below include the days presented to the authority and a breakdown of the respondents preferred day in each road;

Analysis of results

Normandy Avenue

| <u>Suggested Days</u> | <u>Normandy Avenue No. respondents in favour out of 21</u> |
|--|---|
| Happy with existing Monday-Friday | 12 (57.1%) |
| Monday-Saturday | 9 (42.9%) |
| Monday-Sunday | - |
| Total / Respondent % | 21 (100%) |

Bedford Avenue

| <u>Suggested Days</u> | <u>Bedford Avenue No. respondents in favour out of 22</u> |
|--|--|
| Happy with existing Monday-Friday | 15 (68.2%) |
| Monday-Saturday | 6 (27.3%) |
| Monday-Sunday | 1 (4.5%) |
| Total / Respondent % | 22 (100%) |

Barnet Hill

| <u>Suggested Days</u> | <u>Barnet Hill No. respondents in favour</u> |
|--|---|
| Happy with existing Monday-Friday | - |
| Monday-Saturday | 1 (100%) |
| Monday-Sunday | - |
| Total / Respondent % | 1 (100%) |

The table below includes a combined total. Please be advised the overall percentage appears lower, in comparison to the above, as a result of being divided by the total number of respondents (all three roads).

| <u>Suggested Days</u> | <u>Total No. respondents in favour out of 44</u> |
|--|---|
| Happy with existing Monday-Friday | 27 (61.4%) |
| Monday-Saturday | 16 (36.7%) |
| Monday-Sunday | 1 (2.3%) |
| Total / Respondent % | 44 (100%) |

- 2.46 Data suggest the most favourable days include Monday to Friday in both Normandy and Bedford Avenue, with 61.4% of respondents in favour.
- 2.47 It is not felt appropriate to consider introducing the CPZ on a Sunday as it would not be welcomed by members of the community.
- 2.48 However, further engagement is required as to ensure residential support in relation to any further formal proposals.

Arising Issues

- 2.49 The feedback to the consultation included additional issues and concerns, both related and unrelated to the consultation, as follows:

Saturday parking and High Barnet Underground station residential development concerns

- 2.50 Concerns expressed by an individual regarding the different issues on a Saturday involving all day parking by visitors using the tube station. The restrictions in Fitzjohn Avenue (Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm) is believed to be a suitable resolution. In addition, addressing concerns of exacerbation as a result of the tube station residential development as the respondent believes that there may be issues arising from the tube station development that would require a review.

Further restrictions not required in a section of Normandy Avenue, towards Mays Lane and parking displacement

- 2.51 That commuter and visitor parking is reported to predominately take place in the top half of Normandy Avenue as indicated. This is likely due to close proximity of local shops and facilities, including the nearby college. Additionally, a higher percentage of properties benefit from off-street parking provisions in the lower end of the road, reducing the requirement for on-street parking.

Restriction increase and financial burden

- 2.52 Concerns expressed regarding additional financial burden that additional periods of CPZ operation could entail, through the need to potentially purchase additional permits and vouchers for visitors.

The section of road outside No.78 & 80 Normandy Avenue

- 2.53 The informal consultation generated feedback from two individuals regarding the single yellow line outside No.78-80 Normandy Avenue. One individual requested a restriction conversion onto a parking bay and the second requested for it to be converted into a double yellow line.
- 2.54 Additional concerns raised include:
- Request to relax visitor voucher maximum, allowing for additional vouchers to be purchased
 - Concerns expressed regarding non-permit holders parking in the on-street parking bays

- Concerns expressed regarding overnight parking of vehicles since the development of Dollis Valley Estate, especially vans taking up resident bays and sections of yellow lines. Occasionally, vans hinder driveway access
- Concerns expressed regarding parking difficulties due to multi-vehicle ownership and individuals from other properties parking outside of the home. The amount of on-street parking is reduced by individuals not parking properly in the marked bays
- Claims of driveway obstruction resulting from previous bay extensions to increase parking in the area
- Concerns expressed regarding the likely success of removing Normandy Avenue from Zone “D” by introducing Zone “C” restrictions and the negative impact on trade and parking provisions for visitors
- Reducing the widening of access points and single yellow line usage will increase the amount of on-street spaces
- Redundant disabled bay in Bedford Avenue
- Concerns expressed regarding pavement and double yellow line parking in Bedford Avenue, at its junction with High Street
- Request for the inclusion of Newlyn Road into the existing ‘D’ CPZ as a means of providing permit holders with additional parking

Officer comments

- 2.55 Having been made aware of concerns from residents, as to the high levels of “non-residential” parking taking place, making it difficult to find available parking, despite paying for Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) permits, an informal consultation was carried out
- 2.56 For a consultation of this nature, given the layout of the roads and original representations which resulted in the Ward Councillor raising the issue at this Committee, a higher overall response rate was expected.
- 2.57 Officers note that the consultation was undertaken in April/May 2020, and prior to the consultation taking place the COVID-19 pandemic and its potential impact on the consultation was considered, however it was felt appropriate for this consultation to continue as given the current situation, many residents would be at home, allowing an opportunity to fully participate.
- 2.58 Understanding and witnessing the parking difficulties first hand, through work carried out previously to introduce additional parking spaces in the road, Officers cannot explain or understand the low engagement rate. However, it is recognised that the closure of schools, colleges and shops, and the change in working and learning habits during this period, that parking issues previously encountered, were likely not experienced as much as before, at the time of the consultation.
- 2.59 The re-opening of facilities and increased reliance on individuals using motor vehicles as opposed to public transport may impact the area once again.
- 2.60 There did not appear to be the desire to amend the days of operation, nor change the permit designation from ‘C’ to ‘D’ or an alternative designation.
- 2.61 Regarding the additional local issues raised during the consultation:

Saturday parking and High Barnet Underground station residential development concerns

- 2.62 Whilst Officers can appreciate parking displacement concerns in respect of new developments, officers can only seek to resolve actual known issues as part of this exercise, as opposed to what may or may not happen in the future. However, to offer reassurance, the likelihood of further reviews/assessments are highly likely to be conducted at the relevant time to reduce any negative impacts.
- 2.63 In the meantime, the community are encouraged to contact the Council's Planning Section should they wish to submit feedback on a planning application.

Further restrictions not required in a section of Normandy Avenue, towards Mays Lane and parking displacement

- 2.64 For enforcement purposes and to provide residents and permit holders with sufficient on-street parking places (known as capacity) the CPZ includes the entire length of Normandy and Bedford Avenue. A consistent approach reduces the risk of parking displacement in the area, and the consultation responses does not give sufficient evidence to suggest "splitting" the road into two, in terms of CPZ restrictions would be supported.

Restriction increase and financial burden

- 2.65 Although the charge in relation to resident permits and visitor vouchers would remain unchanged as part of any changes, it is acknowledged that any increase in restriction could impact the community through the necessity in purchasing permits and voucher to enable vehicles to be parked during periods where no permit/voucher is currently required.
- 2.66 It should be noted that charging is consistent across the borough, in line with council policy. Income received from permits contributes towards the enforcement of the CPZs in the borough.
- 2.67 If funds are generated through CPZs, then the Council is legally obliged to reinvest this in transport related improvements across the borough.

The section of road outside No.78 & 80 Normandy Avenue

- 2.68 With regards to the issue outside Nos. 78 and 80 Normandy Avenue, there was a previous consultation on a proposal to provide additional parking include a parking bay at this location. However, objections were received on the basis a vehicle would hinder visibility at the junction with Newlyn Road.
- 2.69 The geometry of the junction is that is can accommodate a vehicle subject to individual entering/exiting the road with caution. However, due to the level of objection, it is not considered appropriate to re-consult on a proposal to extend the parking bay so soon.
- 2.70 In addition, double yellow lines are not deemed essential. Parking on the single yellow line during quieter periods; outside of the controlled hours, is not considered detrimental.

Other issues

- 2.71 Regarding visitor voucher allocation, Council policy stipulates permit allocation. Eligible properties can apply for up to 4 resident permits per household and a maximum of 200 visitor vouchers per household, per year. Further additional permits cannot be considered without a change in policy.
- 2.72 Non-permit holders are prohibited from parking in permit bays within a CPZ during the controlled hours. Non-compliance can result in being issued with a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN).
- 2.73 However, individuals are not restricted outside of the controlled period - Monday to Friday, 2pm-3pm at present. Further restricting parking by increasing the hours of operation would likely deter a greater number of non-permit holders, increasing parking opportunities for residents, and this consultation seeks to establish whether the local community would be in favour of such a change.
- 2.74 With regards to motorists parking over their own driveway on the existing single yellow line. These areas can and do provide informal additional parking outside of the controlled hours.
- 2.75 An increase in vehicles would be expected in the evening and at weekends. The resident bays remain in force during the restricted hours only, resulting in limited control regarding evening activity.
- 2.76 However, obstruction by other motorists remains a contravention and as such enforcement action can be taken in these instances.
- 2.77 Additionally, there is currently a prohibition on commercial vehicles weighing over 5 tonnes from parking in the boroughs street between 6:30pm and 8am the following morning, with the exception of a few roads where the prohibitions do not apply.
- 2.78 A CPZ offers residents and permit holders priority of parking over non-residents. However, parking is not guaranteed outside of the home, nor can it be always provided.
- 2.79 It is not desirable to mark individual bays. Longer bays typically provide spaces for a greater number of vehicles, however, this is reliant on sensible parking to achieve this.
- 2.80 In 2019 the authority implemented changes to increase parking opportunities as requested by local residents. The layout change involved providing new standalone bays and extensions to existing permit holder bays.
- 2.81 It is understood how this reduced the amount of available space at certain vehicle crossover locations. However, sufficient space to safely manoeuvre a vehicle remains and the single yellow line is designed to protect access locations.
- 2.82 If the CPZ periods were to be increased, a natural reduction in parking would be likely, due to the deterrence of non-permit holders for an extended period.

- 2.83 Parking opportunities remain available in the area for visitors, in addition to three public car parks, privately owner car parks available for public use, and on-street payment parking facilities.
- 2.84 With regards to domestic crossover applications and parking impact. It is acknowledged how it is often desirable for many individuals to apply for a lowered kerb to accommodate a driveway. As a result, officers process applications, conduct reviews and implement successful constructions in line with an approved council policy. In locations where the authority manages parking (enforceable restrictions on the highway), the statutory consultation forms part of that process and it is designed to elicit feedback.
- 2.85 As with most layout changes, the reduction in parking is acknowledged. Officer assessment considers the likely negative impact associated with the change and any parking compensation, if required, so not to add strain to an already pressurised situation.
- 2.86 Regarding Newlyn Road, it is understood how Newlyn Road is underutilised at present. This is likely due to the road not fronting any properties.
- 2.87 Understanding the strain in the area, it is considered appropriate to consult on a conversion to allow 'D' permit holders to park in the parking places in Newlyn Road.
- 2.88 With reference to the comment about a redundant disabled parking bay, Officers will undertake investigations, and where appropriate seek to convert any redundant bays to permit holder only bays.
- 2.89 Regarding enforcement, Civil Enforcement Officers regularly patrol the area. However, Officers will direct these concerns to the Parking Enforcement Team for review.

Conclusions and recommendations

- 2.90 It is not considered appropriate to progress to formal consultation on a proposal to make changes to the operational periods of the CPZ based on the current response rate. Furthermore, the level of majority for such a change was not compelling.
- 2.91 Due to the level of recent disruption due to COVID-19, the Committee may consider it beneficial for another consultation to be undertaken, with the timing of the consultation to be agreed with Ward Councillors.
- 2.92 Many residents suggest increasing the number of on-street bays for permit holders. No suitable kerbside space remains available. However, there is scope to extend the existing zone by amending the existing parking places in Newlyn Road so they also accommodate 'D' resident permits, in order assist with the on-going demand and strain.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 The alternative option would be to take no further action, or to propose changes to the days and hours of the CPZ. However, to do so, given the relatively low response, and in some cases, minimal support, it is considered not viable, and would contradict the response general response.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 All households initially consulted in April 2020 will be informed of the outcome to the Normandy and Bedford Avenue CPZ review by way of a letter.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 Improving parking and traffic conditions in Normandy and Bedford Avenue EN5 and effectively managing the traffic movement throughout the local road network contributes to the Corporate Plan priority “A Successful London Suburb” and 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, improved traffic movements reduce 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 emergency services such as the fire and ambulance services, 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 a secondary informal consultation which initially includes writing to all properties in the agreed area is estimated to be £6,000. The cost of which can be met from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget.

- 5.2.2 An annual allocation of £0.150m is made to each Area Committee. The Chipping Barnet Area Committee current balance for 2020/21 is £0.181m. This takes account the amount allocated for the current year together with under and overspends relating to previous financial years.

- 5.2.3 The cost of conducting a formal statutory consultation and implementing changes to the parking bays in Newlyn Road, which initially includes writing to all properties in the agreed area is estimated to be £3,000. The cost of which can be met from the Chipping Barnet Area CIL budget.

- 5.2.4 As such, the total amount required for both aspects is £9,000 in total.

- 5.2.5 Any future on-going costs related to enforcement and CPZ maintenance will be

attributable to the Special Parking Account.

5.3 Social Value

- 5.3.1 The benefits include an improved Council reputation due to proactively seeking to address parking as opposed to waiting for further problems to arise, which would be detrimental to local residents.
- 5.3.2 The informal consultation provides a further opportunity to collate residents views as to ensure any future proposals are welcomed by local residents.
- 5.3.3 The formal consultation on a proposal to implement parking changes in Newlyn Road allows for a fair distribution of parking spaces for local residents by converting underutilised and redundant restrictions.
- 5.3.4 Increasing capacity for local residents' and their visitors will create a more pleasant environment with fewer motorists trying to find parking spaces, especially during busy periods and managing the supply of on-street parking is a means of addressing congestion, resulting in reduced pollution.

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 Traffic Management Orders through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA").
- 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.
- 5.4.5 The terms of reference for the Chipping Barnet Area Committee under Article 7 of the Council's Constitution includes responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments, parks and trees, consider matters raised at Residents Forums and determine how they are to be taken forward, including whether to request a report for a future meeting, refer to an Officer and/or ward councillors and determine the allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy funding within the constituency up to a maximum of £25,000 per scheme / project in each case subject to sufficient budget allocated to the committee being unspent

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 engagements or 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 and engagement has been undertaken with members of the public, allowing sufficient opportunity to provide comments.

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 regards means the need to (a) remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are connected to that characteristics (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristics that are different from the needs of person who do not share (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristics to participate in public life in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs, sex and sexual orientation.
- 5.6.3 An equality impact screening has been undertaken in respect of the proposals contained within this report. It is considered that the overall equalities impact of the proposals is neutral.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

- 5.7.1 None in relation to this report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

- 5.8.1 All households previously consulted will receive an update by means of a letter as described in this report in respect to statutory obligations and local policy, inclusive of the following correspondence methods;
- sending an email to highways.correspondence@barnet.gov.uk
 - by writing to the Design Team
 - by visiting Engage Barnet

5.8 **Insight**

- 5.8.1 Based on the consultation feedback, officers have made recommendations on whether to proceed with the introduction of a CPZ and other measures set out in paragraphs 2.90 to 2.92 of this Report.

6. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 6.1 <https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=9737&Ver=4>
- 6.2 <https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=27367>
- 6.3 <https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=9737&Ver=4>