Report for: Head of Highways & Traffic following consultation with Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Transport

Title: Minor Works Batch 2025-01

Report authorised by: Matthew Davies, Parking Policy and Projects Manager

Report Author/s: James Grimsdale, Senior Engineer Traffic & Parking

Ward(s) affected: Bruce Castle, Crouch End, South Tottenham and Tottenham Hale

Report for Key/ Non-Key Decision: Non-Key decision

1 Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 To report on the statutory consultation undertaken from 21 January 2026 to 11 February 2026 on the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions and parking place changes at various locations across the borough, as detailed in Table 1 Section 7.1.

1.2 To approve the recommendations outlined in section 3 of this report.

2 Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 N/A.

3 Recommendations

3.1 The Head of Highways & Traffic is asked to, -

3.2 Consider the objections received to the consultation in Appendix 6 attached to this report, including officer recommendations and responses set out in Table 2 in paragraph 6.11.

3.3 Agree that the Council exercise its discretion and not cause a public inquiry to be held for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.14 of this report.

3.4 Approve the making of the traffic management orders pursuant to powers in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984), including its publication regarding its making, to implement the proposals (1) through to (6) as detailed in Table 1 section 7.1, including the amendments to proposals (2) and (3) as detailed in Table 2. The changes comprise the following:

- Introducing parking place changes on the following roads: Beaufoy Road N17, Chesnut Road N17, Tynemouth Road N15, Weir Hall Road N17
- Introducing changes to waiting restrictions on the following roads: Beaufoy Road N17, Chesnut Road N17, Palace Road N8, Park View Road N17, Tynemouth Road N15, Weir Hall Road N17

3.5 Approve the total estimated implementation cost of approximately £3,000, this includes costs for processing traffic orders. This will be funded from the Council's approved Capital Programme within capital scheme 305 – Borough Parking Plan.

3.6 Approve the implementation of a revised proposal for Tynemouth Road as shown in Appendix 2. It is recommended that the proposed shared-use parking bay originally proposed outside 3A–3G Tynemouth Road be redesignated as a Resident Permit Holders Only parking bay. This change will ensure adequate parking provision for the residents of 3A–3G Tynemouth Road. Sufficient shared-use parking capacity remains available on the northern side of Tynemouth Road and outside Tynemouth House on the southern side to accommodate visitors of residential properties and Tynemouth Road Health Centre (which also has off street parking).

3.7 Approve the implementation of a revised proposal for Palace Road as shown in Appendix 2. The amended design reduces the extent of the proposed double yellow line so that it terminates 1 metre west of the property boundary of Nos. 26 and 28, thereby retaining the existing single yellow line outside the dropped kerb of No. 26. This revised layout will prevent vehicles from parking in a manner that obstructs the driveway of No. 30, while still allowing the resident of No. 26 to park outside their property during periods when the single yellow line restriction is not in force.

3.8 Approve adjustments to existing parking place restrictions to enable the introduction of the above changes.

4 Reasons for decisions

4.1 To improve the visibility, sightlines and traffic flow for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users by ensuring changes to the parking restrictions in Haringey meet the requirements of the Traffic Sign Regulations & General Directions 2016 and to make minor changes to parking and loading to meet needs of residents, visitors, shoppers and business owners where possible.

4.2 9 objections and 2 part-objections were received to the 6 proposed changes; a summary of these, and officer recommendations can be found in Table 2 of this report.

4.3 The decision to approve the proposals contained within Table 1 section 6.7, including the amendments to proposals (2) and (3) as detailed in Table 2, will impact on communities living and working in 2 or more wards, however when assessing those impacts officers have concluded that they are not likely to be significant in terms of their effects on those communities. The decision will also not result in significant expenditure being incurred or savings being made nor any virements. The decision to approve the proposal, make the relevant traffic management orders and implement the proposals in Table 1 is not therefore a key decision (article 12.03 of the Constitution).

5 Alternative options considered

5.1 An alternative option was to not implement the proposed restrictions and parking changes in Table 1. This “Do Nothing” approach was not recommended, as it would not meet the Council’s duty to manage safety and access across the network.

6 Background

6.1 The Council receives many requests to introduce new, or to amend existing parking restrictions to address concerns relating to parking pressures including inconsiderate and obstructive parking. These concerns may originate from a variety of sources such as residents, businesses, elected representatives, community groups and other public service providers, or the emergency services.

6.2 Inconsiderate and obstructive parking can be a cause of concern to road users of all types. As well as affecting other motorists, it can result in reduced sight lines contributing to an increased risk of collisions impacting on the road safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Poorly parked vehicles may impede access and contribute to road congestion. This can impact on

the movement of emergency services, public transport, waste collection and larger delivery vehicles.

6.3 To address safety at junctions, the council is embarking on a junction protection programme which involves installing double yellow lines providing additional visibility at all junctions where deemed necessary.

7 Proposals

7.1 Table 1 below lists 6 locations where changes are proposed, and these have undergone statutory consultation. See **Appendix 1** for detailed drawings:

Table 1

Reference	Location	Description	Reason for proposal and operation hours	Changes to waiting restrictions required? (Y/N)
(1)	Beaufoy Road, N17	To replace the shared use permit holders/pay by phone bay opposite No.68/70 with single yellow line (operating CPZ hours) and relocate the bicycle parking storage hangar opposite the flank wall of No.1 Tenterden Road southwest by approximately 12 metres.	Traffic Safety/ obstruction to large HGVs. Mon-Sat, 8am-6.30pm & event days Mon-Fri 8am-8.30pm, Sat 8am-8pm and Sun 12 noon-8pm.	Y
(2)	Palace Road, N8	To convert single yellow line to double yellow lines outside No.26 to No.30.	To improve access to residential driveway At any time	Y
(3)	Tynemouth Road, N15	To install shared use resident permit holders/pay by phone parking (maximum stay & no return period of 2 hours) operating at CPZ hours from outside No.3a to No.3g.	To improve parking availability for residents and visitors of Tynemouth Road Health Centre	Y

Reference	Location	Description	Reason for proposal and operation hours	Changes to waiting restrictions required? (Y/N)
(4)	Weir Hall Road, N17	To shorten existing permit holders only bays by 5 metres on the west side of the carriageway by extending the adjacent double yellow lines outside No.35 and opposite Devonshire Hill Primary School/between access roads to The Weymarks (bay to be shortened at 5 metres at southern end and northern end).	To accommodate access to Devonshire Hill Primary School entrances. At any time.	Y
(5)	Chesnut Road/ Park View Road, N17	To install double kerb blips (no loading at any time) on the existing double yellow lines outside and opposite No.131, continuing on both sides of the carriageway south-eastwards to the CPZ entry signs/TFL red lines (adjacent to Walter Tull House)	To prevent vehicles parking at the junction and obstructing visibility following a post-completion safety audit. At any time.	Y
(6)	Chesnut Road, N17	To revoke the permit holders only bay on Chesnut Road N17 outside No.131 and replace it with double yellow lines.	Removed to facilitate junction re-design. At any time	Y

8 Statutory Consultation

8.1 Statutory notification commenced on 21 January 2026 for periods of 21 days. The process consisted of Notice of Proposals being published in the London Gazette, Enfield and Haringey Independent and street notices being placed in each of the affected streets. The closing date for representations and comments was 11 February 2026.

8.2 In addition, letters outlining the proposed changes were hand-delivered to all properties likely to be affected, particularly at locations where multiple residents or businesses may be impacted. Copies of the letters are provided in Appendix 3.

8.3 See **Appendix 4** for a copy of the statutory 'notice of proposal' advertised. As part of the statutory process, the views of the following statutory bodies were also sought, some as required by the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ("LATOR"):

- AA
- London Transport
- Police (local)
- Fire Brigade
- London Ambulance Service
- Freight Transport Association
- Road Haulage Association
- RAC
- Metropolitan Police (traffic)
- London Travel Watch
- Haringey Cycling Campaign

*See Appendix 5 for a copy of e-mail sent to the above.

9 Responses to Statutory Consultation

9.1 The Legal requirement of statutory consultation was followed with the instalment of street notices and newspaper adverts to notify the public of the statutory consultation and how they could object should they wish to. A total of 9 objections and 2 part-objections were received towards all of the proposals in Table 1. The objections received to the statutory consultation, along with officer recommendations, can be found in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Reference	Objection Theme	Officer Recommendation	Officer Response
Item (1) Table 1 Beaufoy Road N17	1 part objection – Response from Headcorn Tenterden Residents Association, commenting on behalf of residents of Penshurst Road, as they are affected by traffic and parking issues on Beaufoy Road. They comment that Beaufoy Road is a critical access route for several cul-de-sacs and for stadium event traffic. Penshurst Road is described as unsuitable due to poor visibility, temporary one-way operation during events, and narrowing caused by parking bays and e-bike docking. The response comments that a single yellow line will still allow parking (e.g. blue	Officers have considered the objections; however, they have not been upheld. If double yellow lines were to be introduced, this would result in a loss of overnight parking capacity for both residents and visitors. The proposed single yellow line offers a more balanced approach, providing adequate protection to prevent access issues during peak	The objectors have been notified via e-mail that their objections/comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the reporting process. The outcome of the decision report will be available to share with the objectors once a decision has been taken.

Reference	Objection Theme	Officer Recommendation	Officer Response
	badge), preventing two-way flow. They advocate for double yellow lines with kerb markings (no waiting/no loading) to keep the road clear at all times.	periods while still allowing parking outside of CPZ operational hours for visitors and those living outside the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Therefore, the Council should proceed with the implementation of the proposal.	
Item (2) Table 1 Palace Road N8	3 objections – Residents state that there is no evidence of traffic flow problems or safety hazards that justify double yellow lines and that the section of road in question is rarely used for parking and poses no operational issues. All three objections highlight frequent recent alterations (disabled bays, parking bay changes, partial bay removal, yellow line amendments). Residents emphasise that families rely on the single yellow for unloading children, groceries, and supplies and elderly or mobility-impaired visitors use the single yellow for brief, essential stops.	Officers have considered the objections, and the objections have been partly upheld. It is recommended to reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow line so that it terminates 1 metre west of the property boundary of Nos. 26 and 28, thereby retaining the existing single yellow line outside the dropped kerb of No. 26. This revised layout will prevent vehicles from parking in a manner that obstructs the driveway of No. 30, while still allowing the resident of No. 26 to park outside their property during periods when the single yellow line restriction is not in force. Residents will also be permitted to undertake loading and unloading activities on the double yellow lines for a maximum	The objectors have been notified via e-mail that their objections/comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the reporting process. The outcome of the decision report will be available to share with the objectors once a decision has been taken.

Reference	Objection Theme	Officer Recommendation	Officer Response
		duration of 40 minutes. Therefore, the Council should proceed with implementing the proposal, incorporating the amendment outlined above.	
Item (3) Table 1 Tynemouth Road N15	4 objections and 1 part objection– Residents of Tynemouth Road unanimously object to the proposed conversion of resident-only parking bays to shared/general use. Key concerns include loss of privacy and personal safety due to the bays being only ~3 metres from their front windows; increased noise, pollution, and traffic; and a likely reduction in property value. Residents argue the health centre has ample unused parking and that the proposal is unnecessary and harmful to residential amenity. Overall, the objections highlight significant and consistent residential opposition with no perceived community benefit.	Officers have considered the objections, and the objections have been partly upheld. It is recommended that the proposed shared-use parking bay outside 3A–3G Tynemouth Road be redesignated as a Resident Permit Holders Only bay. This change will ensure adequate parking provision for the residents of 3A–3G Tynemouth Road. Sufficient shared-use parking capacity remains available on the northern side of Tynemouth Road and outside Tynemouth House on the southern side to accommodate visitors of residential properties and Tynemouth Road Health Centre (which also has off street parking). Therefore, the Council should proceed with implementing the proposal, incorporating the	The objectors have been notified via e-mail that their objections/comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the reporting process. The outcome of the decision report will be available to share with the objectors once a decision has been taken.

Reference	Objection Theme	Officer Recommendation	Officer Response
		amendment outlined above.	
Item (4) Table 1 Weir Hall Road, N17	2 objections - Feedback indicates resident opposition to the proposed parking restrictions, with concerns that current parking is already limited and that further reductions—especially new yellow lines—would significantly worsen daily parking pressures. Residents report that earlier changes, including the removal of pavement parking, have already reduced capacity and disrupted traffic flow, and they argue that previous arrangements had worked effectively for many years. They also question the need for further measures, suggesting issues occur mainly during school or event days rather than routinely. Overall, residents view the proposals as unnecessary, poorly justified, and likely to increase inconvenience without resolving underlying access concerns.	Officers have considered the objections; however, they have not been upheld. The double yellow lines have been extended to ensure unobstructed access to the school for emergency services, essential maintenance works and deliveries. Vehicles parked in these locations could prevent emergency vehicles from reaching the site safely. The extension of the double yellow lines is therefore necessary to maintain clear access at all times and to support the safe operation of the school. Therefore, the Council should proceed with the implementation of the proposal.	The objectors have been notified via e-mail that their objections/comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the reporting process. The outcome of the decision report will be available to share with the objectors once a decision has been taken.

9.2 After considering the comments received to the statutory consultation officers recommend that two alterations are made to the six proposals listed in **Table 1.**

9.3 It is noted that regulation 9 of LATOR provides local authorities with the discretion of whether or not to hold a public inquiry prior to the making of a TMO. This report does not include the recommendation to hold a public inquiry on account of the effect of the order, that the proposals will contribute towards achieving a number of policy objectives and that holding a public inquiry would lead to expense and delay.

9.4 Officers also do not consider that the proposals will impact on peoples' human rights and their enjoyment of their possession/use of their home.

9.5 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 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. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters: -

- The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenities.
- The national air quality strategy.
- Facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.
- Any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

9.6 Section 122 and the Council's network management duty involve a balancing exercise which officers need to consider when implementing the minor parking proposals recommended in section 3 of this report.

9.7 The proposals are aimed at enhancing the local highway network. Officers consider that the factors which have pointed in favour of making permanent these proposals are the improvement of visibility, sightlines and traffic flow for all road users including pedestrians and cyclists and to ease parking pressures. These factors are also the factors that officers considered will secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its road network as required under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

9.8 In determining whether paid parking places should be designated on the highway, the Council is required, under section 45(3) of the RTRA 1984, to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, regard must be had to the need to maintain the free movement of traffic, to ensure reasonable access to premises, and to consider the availability of off-street parking in the vicinity or the extent to which its provision may be encouraged. The factors set out in paragraph 9.7 support the introduction of the proposed resident permit holder only bay on Tynemouth Road. Furthermore, it is considered that there remains sufficient on-street parking capacity on Tynemouth Road to accommodate visitors to nearby residential properties and Tynemouth Road Health Centre.

10 Contribution to strategic outcomes

10.1 The minor parking changes recommended in this report align with the Council's Theme 2: Responding to the climate emergency in the Corporate Delivery Plan –2024-2026. We are committed to ensuring a just transition, where the shift towards a more sustainable and low-carbon economy is fair and equitable for all. This theme sets out our ambition to reduce carbon consumption, improve our climate resilience, and improve the quality of air that we breathe.

It also contributes to high-level outcomes contained within the "Responding to the Climate Emergency" theme:

- High Level Outcome "A zero carbon and climate resilient Haringey"
- High Level Outcome "A Greener Haringey"

10.2 The improvements also contribute to wider Transport Strategy 2018 outcomes, including reducing carbon emissions (see paragraph 11) and creating a safer, better-maintained street environment for all users.

11 Carbon and Climate Change

11.1 Parking controls contribute positively to carbon emission reduction and mitigate climate change in the following ways:

- **Reduced vehicle emissions**: managed parking reduces congestion.

- **Modal change**: Managed parking arrangements can also support modal change. When motorised access is restricted, motorists may choose alternative transportation modes, reducing the number of vehicles on the road and associated emissions. Over time, this can lead to a shift in commuting habits with lasting environmental benefits.

12 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

12.1 This report seeks approval from the Head of Highways & Traffic to implement the proposed waiting and loading restrictions and parking place changes recommended in section 3 of this report.

12.2 The cost to implement the proposed changes is estimated to be approximately £3,000 and this includes costs for processing traffic orders. In determining the classification of this expenditure as capital consideration was given to the totality of enhancement that expenditure within the Borough Parking Plan provides rather than individual “schemes” which on their own could be construed as revenue. Accordingly, the expenditure proposed will be funded from the Council’s approved Capital Programme within capital scheme 305 – Borough Parking Plan.

12.3 Once implemented the future operation cost will be funded from the existing service revenue budgets.

13 Comments of the Director of Legal and Governance

13.1 The Head of Highways & Traffic is asked to consider the objections received following statutory consultation on the proposals summarised in Table 1, and to approve the recommendations set out in paragraph 3, including the amendments to proposals (2) and (3) detailed in Table 2, in order to decide whether to make the proposals permanent by way of traffic management orders.

13.2 The Head of Highways & Traffic is authorised to make this decision under the Council’s Constitution, Part 3, Sections C and E.

13.3 The Council's powers to make permanent traffic management orders in relation to parking, and restrictions on the highway are contained in sections 6, 45,46, 49 of the RTRA 1984. The Council may modify a proposed TMO before it is made whether in consequence of any objections or otherwise, before it is made, pursuant to regulation 14 of LATOR.

13.4 Officers have considered the Council’s statutory duty pursuant to section 122 and section 45(3) of the RTRA 1984 at paragraphs 9.5 to 9.8 and recommend that the permanent traffic management orders be made.

13.5 Before deciding whether to implement the proposals in this report, the Council must undertake consultation in accordance with the LATOR. Officers have carried out statutory consultation as set out in paragraph 8 of this report.

14 Equalities Comments

14.1 The council has a Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

14.2 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty. Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

14.3 The proposal to recommend proceeding with the proposed changes listed in section 7, Table 1 (including a revision of proposals 2 and 3) offer a range of positive impacts on Haringey residents. The changes to improve traffic safety are likely to positively impact on all pedestrians and particularly those who are more vulnerable when crossing the road i.e. children, older people and disabled people. Additionally, the changes to improve congestion will have a positive impact on air quality, in turn benefiting the same groups. It is therefore expected this decision will have a positive impact on equalities in the borough.

15 Use of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Detailed designs showing the extents of the proposals stated in Table 1.

Appendix 2 – Revised proposal plans.

Appendix 3 – Statutory Consultation notification letters delivered to properties

Appendix 4- Statutory Consultation Notice of Proposal, advertising the proposals stated in Table 1.

Appendix 5 – Statutory Consultation notification email sent to statutory bodies stated in section 8.

Appendix 6 – Copy of full objection text with resident details removed.

16 Background Papers

Haringey Parking Strategy

Parking Schemes – Resident Engagement Policy