



## Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee

8 October 2020

<b>Title</b>	<b>Park View Road and neighbouring streets – Informal Parking Consultation Results</b>
<b>Report of</b>	Executive Director - Environment
<b>Wards</b>	Woodhouse and West Finchley
<b>Status</b>	Public
<b>Urgent</b>	No
<b>Key</b>	No
<b>Enclosures</b>	Appendix A – Informal Consultation document Appendix B – Drawing No. BC/001544-05-01(Rev A)
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	Bethuel Willy – Parking Design Engineer <a href="mailto:Bethuel.Willy@barnet.gov.uk">Bethuel.Willy@barnet.gov.uk</a> 020 8359 3509

### Summary

This report details the results of informal parking consultation carried out in Park View Road N3 and neighbouring streets. It seeks the Committee's approval to progress the design of an extension of the Church End 'CE' Controlled Parking Zone and to carry out a statutory consultation on the proposals.

### Recommendations

1. That having considered the feedback to the informal consultation undertaken as set out in this report, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee gives instruction to the Executive Director, Environment to design and carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to extend the existing Church End 'CE' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include: -
  - a. Park View Road
  - b. Park Avenue
  - c. Etchingam Park Road (between Holdenhurst Avenue and Squires Lane)
  - d. Park Crescent

2. That subject to no objection being received to the statutory consultations, the Committee authorise the Executive Director for Environment and his officers to introduce the proposals.
3. That the Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, the Executive Director for Environment will, in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors, consider and determine whether the proposed changes should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.
4. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree to allocate the funding in the sum of £6,000 for the recommended actions outlined in 1 above from the 2019/2020 CIL Area Committee budget.
5. That the proposed design of the scheme to be agreed with the Ward Members.

## **1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED**

- 1.1 This report presents the Committee with the outcome of the informal consultation carried out with the residents and businesses of Park View Road N3 and neighbouring streets between 18 November 2019 and 9 December 2019, seeking their views on the current parking situation in the area.
- 1.2 The report asks the Committee to consider the consultation results and the recommendations and seeks a decision of the Committee on how to proceed.

## **2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Background**

- 2.1 The residents of Park View Road signed a petition raising concerns regarding the high levels of parking on their road by non-residents, which in turn was making it difficult for residents to find available kerbside space. Furthermore, indiscriminate parking was causing motorists problems driving through road junctions. The residents requested for the inclusion of Park View Road into the existing Church End 'CE' Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 2.2 In response, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee at its meeting on 17 October 2018 resolved and approved a funding of £3,000 for an informal parking consultation with residents and businesses of Park View Road and neighbouring streets on whether they would wish for their roads to be included in the Church End CPZ.

### **Consultation Process**

- 2.3 An informal consultation was carried out between 18 November 2019 and 9 December 2019 with residents and business in the consultation area agreed by the Ward Councillors as shown in Appendix A.

- 2.4 Consultation packs consisting of letters and a plan of the consultation area were hand delivered to 254 residential and business properties in Park View Road, Park Avenue, Etchingham Park Road (Holdenhurst Avenue to Park View Road), Park Crescent and Holdenhurst Avenue. The letter asked the residents to complete an online questionnaire available on the Council's Engage Portal. It also gave the opportunity for the recipient to request a paper copy of the questionnaire.
- 2.5 The local Ward Members were sent copies of the consultation documentation prior to consulting the residents and businesses.
- 2.6 The questionnaires asked a range of questions concerning parking in their area. This included whether the respondent would like their road to be included in the Church End 'CE' CPZ. The questionnaire also asked the respondents' preferred CPZ operational hours and days.
- 2.7 Residents were also given the opportunity to make any additional suggestions.
- 2.8 The deadline of the consultation was 9 December 2019.

### **Consultation results**

- 2.9 A total of 254 properties were consulted resulting in 102 online responses giving an overall response rate of 40.2%. A road by road summary of the consultation response is given in Table 1 below. Note that 20 responses were received from addresses from Etchingham Park Road, falling outside the consultation area, which is noted separately.

**Table 1: Summary of consultation response for each road**

<b>Road Name</b>	<b>No. of Properties Consulted</b>	<b>No. of Responses</b>	<b>Response Rate (%)</b>
Park View Road	35	10	28.6%
Park Avenue	33	12	36.4%
Etchingham Park Road	52	16	30.8%
Park Crescent	36	22	61.1%
Holdenhurst Avenue	98	42	42.9%
Etchingham Park Road*	n/a	20	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>40.2%</b>

*\*responses from outside the consultation area, not included in the total*

- 2.10 The questionnaire asked whether the respondent would wish for their road to be included in an extended Church End 'CE' CPZ. The roads with most of the respondents wishing to be included in the CPZ were Park View Road (90%), Etchingham Park Road (62.5%) and Park Crescent (59.1%). Slightly less than

half of the respondents of Park Avenue (41.7%) wished to be included in the CPZ while most of those from Holdenhurst Avenue preferred to remain outside the zone. The response is summarised in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Do you wish for your road to be included in the proposed extended Church End CPZ?**

Road Name	Do you wish for your road to be included in the proposed extended Church End CPZ?					
	Yes		No		Not Sure	
Park View Road	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
Park Avenue	5	41.7%	7	58.3%	0	0.0%
Etchingham Park Road	10	62.5%	4	25.0%	2	12.5%
Park Crescent	14	63.6%	7	31.8%	1	4.6%
Holdenhurst Avenue	8	19.0%	33	78.6%	1	2.4%
Etchingham Park Road*	16	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>45.1%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.9%</b>

*\*responses from outside the consultation area, not included in the total*

2.11 In response on their preferred hours of operation, most respondents said they would prefer 2–3pm, which is the same as the operational hours of the existing Church End ‘CE’ CPZ. Most respondents of Holdenhurst Avenue did not indicate their preference saying they did not wish for their road to be included in the proposed CPZ. The response summary of preferred hours of operation is given in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: If the CPZ were to be introduced, what hours of operation would you prefer?**

Road Name	If the CPZ were to be introduced, what hours of operation would you prefer?					
	2-3pm		Don't know/ none		Other	
Park View Road	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
Park Avenue	7	58.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.4%
Etchingham Park Road	9	56.3%	4	25.0%	3	18.7%
Park Crescent	16	72.7%	5	22.7%	1	4.6%
Holdenhurst Avenue	13	31.0%	27	64.3%	2	4.7%
Etchingham Park Road*	12	66.7%	2	11.1%	4	22.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.9%</b>

*\*responses from outside the consultation area, not included in the total*

2.12 Similarly, the questionnaire asked what days of operation respondents would prefer. Again, most respondents, except in Holdenhurst Avenue preferred Monday to Friday, again matching the current Church End 'CE' CPZ operation. The summary of the response for the preferred days of operation is shown on Table 4 below.

**Table 4: If the CPZ were to be introduced, what days of operation would you prefer?**

Road Name	If the CPZ were to be introduced, what days of operation would you prefer?					
	Mon-Fri		Don't know/ none		Other	
Park View Road	10	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Park Avenue	9	75.0%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%
Etchingham Park Road	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%
Park Crescent	19	86.4%	1	4.5%	2	9.1%
Holdenhurst Avenue	12	28.6%	29	69.0%	1	2.4%
Etchingham Park Road*	13	72.2%	4	22.2%	1	5.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.9%</b>

*\*responses from outside the consultation area, not included in the total*

2.13 The residents were also asked to make suggestions/comments regarding parking in their road and any parking issues in the area relating to the questionnaire. The most frequent comments are summarised below.

**Table 5: Comments most frequently mentioned by road**

Road	Comments	No. of mentions
Park View Road	Provide CPZ even if the other roads don't agree	8
	Commuter parking is a problem/ road safety risk	6
	Provide visitors to Victoria Park with a short time parking	2
Park Avenue	Indiscriminate parking is a road safety risk	1
	Commuter parking occurs but is occasional	3
	Include Etchingham Park Road (between Park Avenue and Squires Lane) in proposed CPZ	2

Road	Comments	No. of mentions
Etchingham Park Road	CPZ should cover the whole or south part of Etchingham Park Road	13
	Commuter parking is a problem/vehicle left for long periods	10
	Provide visitors to Victoria Park with a short time parking	2
Park Crescent	Indiscriminate parking is a road safety risk	4
	Provide double yellow lines at the junctions	4
	Commuter parking occurs but is occasional	7
Holdenhurst Avenue	CPZ not needed on our road	25
	This is a money-making exercise	3
	Bad for environment as would result in requests for more carriageway crossings	3

- 2.14 There is a general view that commuter parking is a problem especially in roads bordering Victoria Park. The extension of the CPZ would increase kerbside parking opportunities for local residents as it would deter commuter parking and long-term non-resident parking.
- 2.15 Indiscriminate parking has also been mentioned as causing road safety concerns especially at the junctions where many pedestrians visiting the park cross the roads. It should be noted that the gates to the park are situated close to the road junctions.
- 2.16 There were several requests by the respondents to include the section of Etchingham Park Road that was not consulted in any proposed CPZ. Despite not being within the agreed consultation area, questionnaires were received from this section of the road with the majority in favour of inclusion in a CPZ.
- 2.17 The views from these respondents did not however form part of the analysis as they are outside the consultation area.
- 2.18 Most respondents including from Park View Road and Etchingham Park Road requested for provision of short term parking for visitors to Victoria Park in any proposed CPZ.
- 2.19 Respondents from Park View Road have requested to be included in the CPZ even if the neighbouring roads are not in favour of the proposal. The respondents from Park Avenue, whilst acknowledging that commuter parking occurs, indicate it is manageable. Those from Holdenhurst Avenue advised that commuter parking is not an issue on their road.

- 2.20 The results indicate that the majority of respondents of Park View Road, Etchingam Park Road and Park Crescent were in favour of their roads being included in the Church End 'CE' CPZ. Park View Road in particular, where the petitions originated, had the highest proportion of respondents in favour while slightly less than half of respondents from Park Avenue were in favour. The responses from Holdenhurst Avenue indicated a very low support for a CPZ.
- 2.21 Most respondents indicated that if the CPZ was to be introduced, they would prefer the restrictions to operate 2pm to 3pm Monday to Friday, which is in line with the existing Church End 'CE' CPZ.
- 2.22 If a CPZ was introduced in those roads where there was support, it is considered that both Park Avenue and Holdenhurst Avenue, who were not in support, would likely experience increased parking through motorists being displaced from the controlled roads.
- 2.23 The consultation has resulted in an overall response rate of 40.2% which is considered to be good for this type of consultation, and considering the respondents' views and comments, Officers are of the view that there are sufficient grounds to progress the scheme to the next stage.
- 2.24 Having considered all the views presented, it is recommended to proceed with the design and statutory consultation on the extension of existing Church End 'CE' CPZ as shown on the revised drawing No. BC/001544-05-01(Rev A) to include the following roads:
- Park View Road
  - Park Avenue
  - Etchingam Park Road (between Holdenhurst Avenue to Squires Lane)
  - Park Crescent
- 2.25 It is recommended not to include Holdenhurst Avenue due to a very low level of support for the proposals that was received from the road.
- 2.26 It is recommended that the CPZ extension operates 2pm to 3pm Monday to Friday, in line with the existing Church End 'CE' CPZ.
- 2.27 If the recommendations of this report receive the Committee's approval, Officers will progress the scheme design and statutory consultation, which would involve letters and drawings outlining the proposals being sent to the local community, along with notices being published in local newspapers and the London Gazette, as well as being erected on-street.
- 2.28 The design of the scheme will be agreed with the Ward Members. The consultation results would be reported to a future meeting of this Committee for consideration and determination on the way forward, including approval of funds for implementation.

### **3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED**

- 3.1 The alternative options would be “do nothing” or to introduce the measures solely in the roads that overwhelmingly supported the proposals. However, by not having parking controls, there would be an on-going parking issues in the roads most affected by commuter parking to the detriment of residents’ ability to park near their homes. It should be noted that if the measures are introduced in some of the roads there is a great likelihood of displaced parking occurring on the roads with no parking controls.

### **4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.1 Officers will seek to design proposals and then carry out a statutory consultation on the agreed proposals with a view to implementing those proposals subject to the outcome of the consultation.
- 4.2 Subject to approval, all necessary statutory requirements under the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedures) (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, 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., 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.
- 5.1.3 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 designing a scheme and carrying out a statutory consultation in Park View Road and neighbouring streets has been estimated at £6,000. The cost will be funded from Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee’s Community Infrastructural Levy (CIL).

### **5.3 Social Value**

- 5.3.1 The benefits of the parking controls would 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 CPZ would increase parking opportunities for local residents by minimising commuter parking and encourage use of more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, cycling and walking.
- 5.3.3 The measures would improve vehicular access especially emergency and refuse vehicles, reduce inconsiderate parking and congestion and improve road safety.
- 5.3.4 The parking controls would contribute to air quality by reducing the time drivers spend driving around searching parking space.

### **5.4 Legal and Constitutional References**

- 5.4.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places an obligation on Highway Authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements and take action as they consider appropriate in performing the duty.
- 5.4.2 The Council as the Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.4.3 The 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 powers are regulated by the general duty on Authorities under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA). The Council must exercise the powers (in so far as practicable having regard to the matters 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 Council's Constitution Article 7, Area Committee Terms of Reference, Part 1 states that Area Committee may take decisions within their terms of reference provided it is not contrary to Council policy and can discharge various functions, with specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotment, parks and trees, within the boundaries of their areas in accordance with Council policy and within budget.

### **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 new parking restrictions could result in some level of public concern from local residents who do not wish 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 The Public Sector Equalities Duty (PEQD) under Section 149(1) of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the authority, in exercise of its functions, to have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons 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 the 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 belief, sex and sexual orientation.

## **5.7 Consultation and Engagement**

- 5.7.1 An informal consultation (or a preliminary consultation) has been carried out with the local community.
- 5.7.2 The acceptance to changes to the existing CPZ operational hours and days and other parking proposals relies on the support of the local community. The questions are designed to establish whether there are issues or parking pressures encountered by the community.
- 5.7.3 Barnet Council's policy is to carry out on line questionnaires as opposed to paper copy questionnaires.
- 5.7.4 Letters outlining the details of the consultation and of how to access online questionnaires were distributed to the properties in the consultation area.
- 5.7.5 The relevant consultation details were published on the Council's Engage Portal.

## **5.8 Insight**

- 5.8.1 Based on the consultation feedback, officers will make recommendations on whether to proceed with design proposals and carry out statutory consultation on a proposed CPZ extension.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 6.1 Item No. 26C of the Finchley & Golders Green Area Committee meeting of 17th October 2018 – Members' Items – Area Committee Funding Application (if any)

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9742&Ver=4>