1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 To report on the feedback received during the public consultation process on the proposed extension of the existing Hornsey South CPZ (areas indicated on the map on Appendix I).
- 1.2 To seek approval to proceed with the recommendations as set out in section 9 of this report.
- 2.0 Background
- 2.1 The council carried out a review of the Hornsey South CPZ in December 2015. As part of this consultation we invited views and comments on parking issues from roads outside the CPZ on the Western boundary, who may have been experiencing parking problems as a result of displacement from existing CPZ's.
- 2.2 Residents in Priory Road originally expressed a preference for no parking controls. However, since the consultation residents from 1-41 Priory Road have written to the Council and asked to be included within any CPZ extension.
- 2.3 Following the consultation, the feedback was discussed with ward councillors who acknowledge the level of support for parking controls in the area.
- 3.0 Public Consultation process
- 3.1 Consultation documents, consisting of background information and freepost envelopes, were delivered by hand to all properties within the consultation area; the deadline for responses was 20th January 2016. See appendix ii for consultation document.
- 4.0 Consultation Feedback (Consultation area)
- 4.1 The feedback from the overall consultation area outside the CPZ showed that 73% of respondents did not want to be included within the Hornsey South CPZ.
- 4.2 However, closer analysis of the results indicated that there was support from Ashford Avenue and Oak Avenue with 90% of respondents in Ashford Avenue and 57% of respondents in Oak Avenue in support of being included within the existing Hornsey South CPZ. Residents from Priory Road responded 60% against being included within Hornsey South CPZ:

Views by Road

				Should roa	d be included i	in Homsey Se	outh CPZ?		
		Yes		Yes No		Condi	Conditional		al
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Road name	Ashford Ave	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10	100%
	Oak Ave	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	7	100%
	Priory Rd	1	10%	6	60%	3	30%	10	100%
	Total	14	52%	10	3796	3	11%	27	100%

4.3 The overall the feedback from Oak Avenue, Ashford Avenue and Priory Road indicates that the majority (52%) of those who responded to the questionnaire are in support of the introduction of parking controls.

4.4 When asked which groups of people are responsible for restricting parking in their street, respondents generally reported that a combination of commuters, local workers and commercial vehicles, in addition to displacement from existing controlled zones:

		Count	*
\$Problems	Commuter parking	13	48%
	Shop customers / visitors	14	52%
	Ivluiti car households	10	37%
	Shop / business staff	9	33%
	Too many driveways	0	0%
	Commercial vehicles / campers	6	22%
	Other non local vehicles	14	52%
	'Displacement' from nearby CPZs	13	48%
	N/A, no problems	7	26%

- 5.0 Chief Finance Officer Comments
- 5.1 Provision for the implementation of the proposed measures to the CPZ was made in the Parking Plan capital budget. Other costs around consultation can be contained within existing budgets.
- 5.2 Associated costs include community engagement, inventory of existing site conditions, design and implementation (including installation of street signage, notifications etc). Likely costs to be £150 consultation and works notice distribution, £500 design and £1631lining and signing, totalling £2281.
- 5.3 Annual running costs will be maintained by existing staff/budgets.
- 5.4 Annual income is unknown at present but the team are doing work on this in order to identify potential revenue from new schemes based on properties within the area and likely permit sales etc.
- 5.5 Parking controls will be enforced by existing /in house civil enforcement officers (CEO's).
- 5.6 There is a potential loss of capital budget if not spent within the financial year.
- 6.0 Environmental Implications
- 6.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement or amend a CPZ, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA") (as amended) and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (as amended). All representations received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights and equalities law and the relevant statutory powers.

- 6.2 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 9, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 paragraph 8 and 9 of the RTRA.
- 6.3 The power of a local authority to make an order regulating or controlling vehicular and other traffic is contained within the ambit of section 6(1) of the 1984 Act. The power to make an experimental traffic order is contained in section 9 of the same Act. Experimental traffic orders generally have a lifespan of 18 months. During the initial 6 month period the council will register representations received and consider and implement where possible these requests during the second 6 month period, these amendments have a further 6 month period before being considered to be made permanent.
- When determining what paying parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.
- 6.5 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 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:-
 - (a) The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
 - (b) The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
 - (c) The national air quality strategy.
 - (d) Facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.
 - (e) Any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant
- 7.0 Comments of the Head of Legal Services
- 7.1 The legal position and statutory requirements for consultation are set out in Section 5 of the report. Public consultation has been undertaken and due consideration given to representations by the public. As long as the statutory consultation is undertaken and due consideration similarly given to representations made, there is no reason why the Council should not be entitled to proceed with its proposals.

- 8.0 Equal Opportunities
- 8.1 Consultation documents were distributed to all households/ businesses within the area of the proposed scheme.
- 8.2 Information letters were distributed to all households/businesses within the agreed information area.
- 8.3 Any interested party can submit a representation regardless of where they live or work during the statutory notification period.
- 8.4 A translation service for the consultation document was available upon request.
- 8.5 Summary
- 8.6 Regarding operational factors of the CPZ's
- 8.7 From the feedback received during the consultation process, the most favoured option from the consulted roads was for Monday to Friday controls. This is in line with the adjacent existing Hornsey South CPZ which operates from 11am-1pm Monday to Friday.
- 8.8 The feedback from Oak Avenue was that 57% of respondents were in favour of the controls. The feedback from Ashford Avenue was that 90% of respondents were in favour of the controls. The response from Priory Road was 60% against the introduction of parking controls.
- 8.9 As Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue both come off Priory Road and because the existing Hornsey South CPZ is to the north of Priory Road; it would not be possible to extend the Hornsey South CPZ into Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue, without including Priory Road.
- 8.10 It should be noted that since the consultation, residents from 1-41 Priory Road have asked to be included within the Hornsey South CPZ because many of them currently park in Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue. If parking controls were introduced into Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue but not Priory Road, residents from Priory Road would only be able to park in Priory Road or other uncontrolled roads. Therefore, there would be limited opportunity for residents from Priory Road to park locally.
- 8.11 While it is accepted that Priory Road initially responded against parking controls, it is recommended that 1-41 Priory Road is included within Hornsey South CPZ.
- 8.12 We recommend the parking controls to be implemented under an experimental Traffic Management Order. This gives the Council the opportunity to review the scheme after 6 months and possibly make amendments if we receive representations which suggest residents prefer different operational times or wish for the CPZ boundary to be changed.
- 9.0 Recommendations

- 9.1 Following consideration of the consultation results and further to discussions with ward Councillors and representations from local residents, it is recommended that the Head of Service:
- 9.2 Notes the feedback of the public consultation set out in this report.
- 9.3 Approves parking controls to be introduced (subject to statutory consultation) to Oak Avenue, Ashford Avenue and 1-41 Priory Road indicated on the plan attached in Appendix III.
- 9.4 Approves the controls be introduced as an extension to the existing Hornsey South CPZ and therefore for controls to operate:
 - Hornsey South CPZ (HS) Monday to Friday, 11am 1pm
- 9.5 Approves the controls to be introduced under experimental Traffic Management Order(s).
- 9.6 Approves the scheme be subject to a review after six months.
- 9.7 Approves that residents / traders in these roads be informed of this decision. This will be done via written works notification letters distributed throughout the area(s).

APPENDIX IV

Map of the proposed Hornsey South Extension CPZ

APPENDIX II

Public consultation documents

Traffic Management

Ann Cunningham: Head of Traffic Management



11 December 2015

Public Consultation

Possible Extension of Hornsey South Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue

Dear Resident or Business.

You may recall we carried out a review of Hornsey South CPZ in 2013. At the time, a majority of residents reported that the CPZ had helped and that they were generally satisfied with the current operating days and times which are weekdays (Mon-Fri) 11am to1pm.

We are not suggesting any changes to the existing CPZ but, following requests from residents and after discussions with local ward councillors, we are considering extending the CPZ controls to include Ashford Avenue and Oak Avenue.

We would like to hear your views on the proposal to include these two additional roads and would appreciate it if you would fill in the brief questionnaire overleaf and return it to us in the enclosed freepost envelope. With the approach of the Christmas holiday season we are allowing extra time for the consultation. The closing date for receipt of completed questionnaires is 20 January 2016.

We will contact you again in the New Year to explain the outcome of this consultation. Detailed consultation results will also be published on the current parking consultations page of the website.

If you have questions about the consultation, email us at frontline.consultation@haringey.gov.uk or contact Greville Percival on 0208 489 1326.

With thanks for your attention, we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Ann Cunningham

daningham!

Head of Traffic Management

Traffic Management Level 5 Alexandra House 10 Station Road, Wood Green London N22 7TR

020 8489 1000

Possible Extension of Hornsey South Controlled Parking Zone: Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue

Are v	you responding as		
Ī	Resident	Business	
Do y	ou use a car or oti	her motor vehicle?	
ļ	Yes	L No	Occasionally
is is	Is it difficult to par	rk in your road?	
[Yes	No	Sometimes
Do a			pad? (Tick those that apply)
Ļ	Commuter parki		Shop customers / visitors
Ļ	Multi car househ	nolds	Shop / business staff
Ļ	Too many drive	vays	Commercial vehicles / 'camp
Ļ	Other non local	vehicles	Displacement' from nearby (
Ĺ	N/A, no problem	s	
Do w	ou think your road	should be included in U.	ornsey South CPZ (which cu
	ates weekdays 11a	m to 1pm)	msey South CP2 (Which cu
opera	tes weekuays ila	□No	

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Now please return it in the prepaid envelope

Frontline Consultation



REPORT

Public Consultation:

Possible Extension of Hornsey South Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Oak Avenue and Ashford Avenue

The consultation commenced 11 December 2015 and the closing date for receipt of completed questionnaires was 20 January 2016

RESPONSES

Q3 Are you responding as a resident or business?

		Count	7
Are you responding as:	Resident	25	93%
	Business	2	7%

Q4 Do you use a car or other motor vehicle?

		Count	%
Do you use a car or other motor	Yes	24	89%
vehicle?	No	2	7%
	Occasionally	1	4%
	Total	27	100%

Q5. Is it difficult to park in your road

			ls it	difficult to pa	ark in your roa	d?	
		Yes		N	0	Some	imes
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Road name	Ashford Ave	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%
	Oak Ave	4	57%	1000	14%	2	29%
	Priory Rd	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%
	Total	17	63%	5	19%	5	19%

Q6. Do any of these parking problems affect your road?

		Count	*
\$Problems	Commuter parking	13	48%
	Shop oustomers / visitors	14	52%
	Multi car households	10	37%
	Shop / business staff	9	33%
	Too many driveways	0	0%
	Commercial vehicles / campers	6	22%
	Other non local vehicles	14	52%
	'Displacement' from nearby CPZs	13	48%
	N/A, no problems	7	26%

Q7. Do you think your road should be included in Hornsey South CPZ?

		Count	7
Should road be included in Homsey South CPZ?	Yes	14	52%
	No	10	37%
	Conditional	3	11%
	Total	27	100%

Responses marked 'conditional' have been so classified because they register support for inclusion in the CPZ but the support is conditional upon other factors being in place.

Views by Road

				Should roa	d be included i	in Homsey So	outh CPZ?		
		Ye	S	N	0	Condi		Tot	al
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Road name	Ashford Ave	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10	100%
	Oak Ave	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%		
	Priory Rd	1	10%	6	60%	- 3		- 1	100%
	Total	14		40		3	30%	10	100%
	roter	14	52%	10	37%	3	11%	27	100%

Q8 Comments

Road name	Should	Comments
	road be	
	included in	
	Hornsey	
	South	
	CPZ?	
Ashford Ave	Yes	
Ashford Ave	Yes	Drivers leave vehicles for long periods e.g. weeks and there are arguments with residents
Ashford Ave	Yes	This road is used as a car park Commercial vans are often left for 2 weeks with the owners clearly taking advantage of free parking
Ashford Ave	Yes	I often have to park on Priory Rd to collect a disabled relative because people from Crouch End CPZ park here all day to avoid charges and P&D
Ashford Ave	Yes	11 - 1pm is not enough. People park here after 1pm and stay overnight. CPZ needs to run to e.g. 6:30pm. Also Saturdays are a problem as some people leave their cars from Friday pm until Sunday.
Ashford Ave	Yes	
Ashford Ave	Yes	Parking is a nightmare. Please introduce permit controls
Ashford Ave	Yes	I don't have a car - There are constant wars here over parking - and some resentment that a cycle hangar takes up a car space! All the cycle spaces have however been taken! Yes Yes Yos to CPZ
Ashford Ave	Yes	Need longer than 1 pm because no resident vehicles come and part in the afternoons regardless of residents' bays
Ashford Ave	No	We think CPZ is just another tax
Oak Ave	No	Don't want the expense and not sure that it would solve our parking problems which vary widely from one day to another. Sometimes we can park here, at other times we have to park 3 roads away
Oak Ave	Yes	
Oak Ave	Yes	Since Middle Lane became CPZ it's usually impossible to find a parking space in Oak Avenue and residents often have to find a space in adjacent streets
Oak Ave	No	Object strongly to the proposal and to the loaded consultation
Oak Ave	Yes	
Oak Ave	No	If I hire a car, what sort of permit to I get? What about carers? Not needed here at all, as you created the problem. WERA are powerfully against your plans
Oak Ave	Yes	Mostly I have to park in other roads. School run, local businesses using us as a free car park. It is so bad that we exchanged a car for a 'smart car', so as to be able to park in a very small space

Priory Rd	No	Local businesses will suffer as customers won't be able to stay long. How will local family businesses park outside our own shops? Residents don't realise they are destroying their own neighbourhood
Priory Rd	Yes	
Priory Rd	No	Just remove all CPZs
Priory Rd	No	
Priory Rd	No	How much would it then cost?
Priory Rd	No	
Priory Rd	Conditional	Yes - as long as residents on Priory Road can have a permit.
Priory Rd	No	CPZ would be a hassle, particularly when friends and family visit
Priory Rd	Conditional	The only road I can park in is Oak Ave because I live on the main road. Would I be included with a parking permit or would I have to struggle even more than at present?
Priory Rd	Conditional	Parking is one element of a wider strategy needed to develop a busy successful Hornsey High StreetIncreasing to these roads will just cause displacement to Rectory Gdns etc.

