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**Purpose of Report:**

The Council have undertaken a series of parking surveys in order to identify parking pressures within the borough. These surveys form the basis of developing a rolling CPZ consultation programme. This report provides details of the parking surveys and puts forward the proposed rolling CPZ Consultation Programme for 2016/2019 for approval.

1. **Recommended Actions**

1.1. It is recommended that Cabinet:

1.2. Agrees to the proposed rolling CPZ Consultation Programme 2016/2019 as detailed in section 3.14

1.3. Delegate authority to the Director of Environment and Customer Services, to take the necessary steps to deliver and amend the 2016/2019 CPZ Consultation Programme, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport & Environment

1.4. Authorises the Director of Environment and Customer Services, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport & Environment, to implement a CPZ in those areas where the consultation results show a majority in support of a CPZ.
2. **Reason for Decision and Options Considered**

2.1. This report puts forward a list of areas to be considered for the Council’s CPZ Consultation Programme 2016/2019. Through this, the Council will be able to consult local residents and businesses as to whether they are supportive of introducing CPZ regulations in their area. This programme has been developed in line with the Council’s Parking Strategy 2016-2020, as reported elsewhere on the Cabinet agenda. As a result of the service improvement strategies identified by Parking Services in that report, a number of changes and improvements to the Council’s CPZ Strategy are intended to facilitate the delivery of the Council’s CPZ Consultation Programme.

3. **Establishing the Proposed CPZ Consultation Programme 2016/2019**

3.1. In order to identify areas for inclusion on the proposed CPZ Consultation Programme 2016/2019, officers gathered statistical evidence of the parking pressures present across the borough.

3.2. Following initial investigations, officers identified parts of the borough where parking is currently uncontrolled and most vulnerable to parking pressures, and commissioned a parking survey programme. These areas form the first phase of surveys, with subsequent surveys proposed as the basis of the rolling CPZ consultation programme.

3.3. **Parking Surveys - Method**

3.4. The purpose of these surveys is to establish the volume of parking occupancy within an area over the course of a standard working day and where applicable, at weekends. They also seek to establish whether the occupants were residents or visitors.

3.5. To achieve this, an initial site survey is undertaken to determine the approximate parking capacity of each road. For the purpose of these surveys, the capacity is determined on the basis of 1 parking space being a 5m section of road free of waiting restrictions, adjacent to a standard raised kerb. E.g. 50m of unrestricted road = 10 parking bays.

3.6. A first count of occupants is undertaken during the early hours of the morning. At this time it is anticipated that the majority of vehicles present belong to residents.

3.7. During this count, the registration number of each vehicle is recorded. This then allows us to keep track of when resident vehicles depart and visitors/commuters arrive.

3.8. Subsequent occupancy counts are made every two hours between 9am and 7pm. This is considered the most suitable timeframe to capture parking patterns within an area, notably those identified commuting to and from work.

3.9. It is proposed, that where average parking occupancy levels are recorded at 70% or above, an area will automatically be put forward for the proposed CPZ consultation programme. Areas will then be prioritised for consultation in order of occupancy level.

3.10. **Parking Surveys – Data Analysis**

3.11. Following the conclusion of the current survey programme, officers undertook a detailed analysis of the data collected.

3.12. Surveys were undertaken across extensive areas in order to capture as much data as possible. From the information collected, it is then possible to identify core areas of parking concern.

3.13. In many of the regions surveyed, high parking occupancy levels were noted throughout. However, in some cases parking pressure was isolated and sporadic. In such circumstances, officers relied on their experience of the CPZ process and knowledge of the borough, to identify the appropriate boundaries of suitable consultation areas.

3.15. Using the data gathered through the parking surveys, a draft consultation programme was formed and the areas were prioritised in order of the highest average parking occupancy.

3.16. A map was drawn of each of the areas identified. These can be found in Appendix 1*. These show the core areas of parking concern - where the greatest levels of parking occupancy were recorded. These core areas are proposed as the primary focus for consultation. However, the maps also show those outer areas that may be susceptible to parking displacement if a CPZ is introduced in the respective core area. Consultations are also intended for these areas, with residents informed of the CPZ proposals nearby and given the opportunity to be included within the zone should one be introduced.

3.17. *Please note, in some of the maps provided, the outer consultation is absent or may appear irregular. In such instances, it is because some of the proposed consultation areas overlap.

3.18. Officers wrote to each of the Councillors of those Wards where consultations are proposed. Councillors were provided with the plans relevant to their Ward and asked for their comments on the proposals.

- 21 Consultation Areas proposed
- 17 Wards affected by the proposals
- 51 Ward Councillors written to
- 18 responses received

3.19. Officers have evaluated the feedback received from Members and have summarised the most applicable and recurrent suggestions in the table overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment / Suggestion Received</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ward Councillors to be consulted before boundaries formalised                               | The initial programme will be drafted on the basis of a technical evaluation of parking pressures in an area. Officers will then contact the Councillors of the affected Wards in advance of the Cabinet report being finalised. This will allow Members to feed into the process before the programme is considered by Cabinet.  

It is intended that the 3 year rolling programme will be reviewed each year. This is so that it is reflective of any changes to parking pressures across the borough over the course of the year e.g. new CPZs introduced or new building developments. Ward Members will be given the opportunity to contribute towards the finalising the proposed programme each year. |
| Request for consultation in a specific area to be deferred                                  | In some instances there may be justifiable reasons for deferring the consultation proposed within an area.  

Officers have evaluated the responses provided by Members and agree with the reasons given.  

The proposed consultation programme has been amended to reflect this.  

As the rolling programme will be reviewed annually, Members will have further opportunity to suggest revisions to the order of the consultation programme. |
| Suggested changes to the proposed consultation boundary                                       | Officers will evaluate the suggestions changes. If there are appropriate justifications for doing so, the boundaries may be revised subject to discussion with Ward Members and approval by the Portfolio Holder.                                                                                       |
| Flexibility to add individual roads to a CPZ                                                | Such flexibility already exists within the Councils CPZ strategy. Each instance would require consideration based on its own specific circumstances, but if there are appropriate justifications for doing so, individual roads may be added or removed from a CPZ area. |
| Against changes to consultation parameters. One or two residents should not be able to dictate the outcome of a CPZ | The proposed changes to the consultation parameters bring them in line with all other Council and Transport consultations.  

A clear difference between those in favour and those against will always been sought, however where response rates are considered low or the difference between those for and against is marginal, a scheme will be discussed with Members and the Portfolio Holder before any decision is made. |
3.20. Taking into consideration the comments and suggestions received from Members, the draft consultation programme has been revised where there were appropriate justifications for doing so.

3.21. The revised programme is shown in the table below.

3.22. Where the average parking occupancy recorded is greater than 100%, this means that vehicles were observed parking in contravention and beyond what is considered available parking space i.e. across driveways or on waiting restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average Parking Occupancy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>Hanwell Station</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southall Broadway</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Ealing Trees Estate</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenford South</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Ealing</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenford Town Centre</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northolt Station West</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield Avenue West</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanwell Town Centre</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitshanger South</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southall – Western Road</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenford Green</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brentside</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northolt Station East</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northolt Park</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanwell Old Town</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenford - Ravenor Primary</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northolt East</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitshanger North</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drayton Green Station</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.23. **Delivery of the Proposed CPZ Consultation Programme 2016/2017**

3.24. This programme has been developed in line with the Council's Parking Strategy 2016-2020, as reported elsewhere on the Cabinet agenda. As a result of the service improvement strategies identified by Parking Services in that report, a number of changes and improvements to the Council's CPZ Strategy are intended to facilitate the delivery of the Council's CPZ Consultation Programme.

3.25. **Consultation areas will be initially defined by evidence of parking pressure established through parking surveys.**

3.26. The Council's CPZ Programme has traditionally been driven by individual requests received from the public and from Ward Councillors. While officers do evaluate each area identified by the requests, no substantive evidence of parking pressure is acquired prior to forming the programme.
3.27. It is intended that future CPZ consultation programmes will be formed of areas where evidence of parking pressure is obtained before the programme is formalised.

3.28. Where the average parking levels are identified as 70% or above, an area will automatically be considered for inclusion on the rolling programme for consultation. The initial draft programme of proposed consultations, will list the areas in order of the highest identified parking pressure.

3.29. Officers will contact Ward Councillors of the affected Wards in advance of the Cabinet report being finalised. This will allow Members to feed into the process before the programme is confirmed.

3.30. **Consultation areas will be established before the programme is formed and considered by Cabinet**

3.31. Obtaining parking survey data prior to forming the consultation programme not only ensures the programme is formed of areas where parking problems are clearly evident, it also enables officers to establish suitable consultations at an early stage.

3.32. There are a number of benefits to this. Primarily, the delivery time for schemes will be greatly improved, as consultation can commence immediately following Cabinet approval.

3.33. In the event that Ward Councillors suggest changes to the proposed consultation areas, officers will evaluate the proposed alterations and final boundaries may then be revised subject to discussion with Members and the approval of the Portfolio Holder.

3.34. **Consultations Areas: Improve Focus**

3.35. Consultations areas vary in size. They tend to be logically defined and naturally formed by their environment e.g. bordered by main roads, parks or town centres. There is no definitive size of a consultation area but they will be judged to capture the extent of parking problems.

3.36. Consultation areas will not be too small, as a small CPZ will simply usher parking problems into adjacent roads. While displacement is often unavoidable, if a CPZ is of a certain size, the impact of parking displacement can at least be diluted so that individual roads do not inherit the full shift of displaced vehicles.

3.37. However, there have been recent examples of consultation areas being too expansive and ill-defined. If a consultation is too great, the specific views and difficulties experienced by some residents can be overwhelmed and subdued.

3.38. With the assistance of parking survey data, we intend to evaluate the size of consultation areas. Officers will still seek to use the surrounding environment to form logical areas, but survey data will provide the means to apply greater focus on those specific roads where parking pressure is at its heaviest.

3.39. However, in view of any prospective parking displacement, the Council will continue to consult residents in surrounding areas to advise them of the potential impact of a CPZ and to provide them with opportunity to be included in the zone should one be introduced.

3.40. **Greater flexibility will be afforded to implementation and amending CPZ boundaries where there is evidence and justification for doing so**

3.41. Current guidelines generally prescribe that the implementation of a CPZ be treated as ‘all or nothing’. If the consultation results do not meet specific criteria, the scheme does not proceed.

3.42. This approach is intended to be retained, however on occasion a detailed look at consultation results will reveal that the majority of streets were in favour of proposals, but one or two roads were against. The responses received from these streets can often be the difference between a zone being introduced or not.
3.43. The Council does not intend to revert back to street-by-street implementation; it is proposed that greater flexibility be afforded to amending a CPZ area following consultation. If there are a few roads on the periphery of a consultation area that are not in favour of a CPZ, they may be removed if a suitable zone from those in favour can still be formed.

3.44. Similarly, if feasible and there are justifiable reasons for doing so, individual roads may be added or removed from a CPZ.

3.45. **Consultations will be assessed in line with the same parameters used for all other Transport and Council Consultations**

3.46. At present, implementation of a controlled parking zone is considered if the results of consultation meet the following criteria:

- A response rate of 20% or above
- 60% or above, of those consulted should be in favour of the scheme

3.47. These requirements were not designed on the basis of any technical reasoning. Other consultations undertaken by the Council, including those relating to other Transport related projects, are not required to meet the same exacting parameters. Response rates average between 10 & 20% and proceed with a favourable majority.

3.48. It is intend that the consultation parameters will be considered by the same principles as other Transport and Council consultations. There will be no minimum response rate requirement and a threshold of 50% and above in support for the scheme will generally be followed.

3.49. However, where response rates are considered low (10% or less) or the difference between those for and against a CPZ is marginal, a scheme may be referred to the Portfolio Holder for further consideration.

3.50. **Simplified Cabinet reporting process**

3.51. In order to improve the delivery time of controlled parking schemes, where the consultation results for an area clearly reflect the necessary evidential justification for implementation, a further report to Cabinet will not be required. However, where there is some uncertainty or emerging issues within an area as a result of the consultation, a scheme may be reported to Cabinet for further consideration.

3.52. **Existing CPZs will only be reviewed when substantial requests are received and there is evidence and justification to do so.**

3.53. It is currently compulsory to review new CPZs after 12 months of operation.

3.54. However changes to the consultation and design process have improved the delivery of CPZ schemes, meaning they more accurately meet the requirements of the area and its residents. This results in fewer changes being needed or requested.

3.55. CPZ reviews are expensive and often unproductive. It is therefore suggested that unless there are substantial requests and justifiable reasons to do so, compulsory reviews will not be undertaken.

4. **Financial**

4.1. The budget required for the delivery of the first year of the Proposed CPZ Consultation Programme outlined in this report is £150k and will be met by the Parking Places Reserve Account.
5. **Legal**

5.1. The Council has powers to implement Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) pursuant to Section 6 or 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to secure the ‘expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway’. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to the premises and the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.

5.2. The relevant procedures are set out in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The decision on whether to finally introduce controlled parking zones or extensions to them will be taken following a full local public statutory consultation (including advertising the proposed Order in the local press and (in the case of an Order made under section 6) the London Gazette); and consideration of any comments received as a result of the consultation and advertisement).

6. **Value for Money**

6.1. The implementation of schemes are be supervised by the Council’s (now in-house) engineers and carried out by its term contractors, who have won a contract on the basis of competitive tendering process that represents a good value for money.

7. **Risk Management**

7.1. Given that the recommendation is that the scheme should not be changed it is not considered that there are any major risks associated with the recommendation.

10. **Community Safety**

10.1 CPZs are intended to assist in improving the safety of all types of road-user by reducing the potential for accidents due to street layout.

11. **Links to Strategic Objectives**

- **Making Ealing Safer**
  CPZ schemes resolve issues caused by vehicles restricting sight lines at junctions and also improve road safety particularly for pedestrians and cyclist in the area. The proposals contained in the report will enhance the lives of residents, reduce congestion and improve safety of all roads in the areas.

- **Making Ealing Cleaner**
  CPZ schemes formalise parking and make it easier for access especially for refuse vehicles.

12. **Equalities and Community Cohesion**

12.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken. Having regard to the equality duty the recommendations not considered to be of any particular relevance to protected groups because CPZ proposals do not generally target specific categories of protected groups.

13. **Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:**

13.1 None.

14. **Property and Assets**

14.1 None.
15. **Any other implications:**

None

16. **Timetable for Implementation**

16.1 If the Cabinet approves the recommendations of this report, the implementation may be completed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design commencement</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works commencement on site</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works completion</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Proposed CPZ Consultation Plans

18. **Background Information**

Parking Strategy 2016-2020
### Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of consultee</th>
<th>Post held</th>
<th>Date sent to consultee</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments appear in paragraph:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shahid Iqbal</td>
<td>Assistant Director for Highways</td>
<td>12/04/16</td>
<td>13/04/16</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Niles</td>
<td>Interim Finance Business Partner</td>
<td>10/04/16</td>
<td>13/04/16</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Townsend</td>
<td>Executive Director of Environment and Customer Services</td>
<td>14/04/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Bassam Mahfouz</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>14/04/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Adams</td>
<td>Head of Legal (Property &amp; Regulatory)</td>
<td>14/04/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type:</th>
<th>Non-key decision</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorised by Cabinet Member:</th>
<th>Date Report Drafted:</th>
<th>Report Deadline:</th>
<th>Date Report Sent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.:</th>
<th>Report Author and Contact for Queries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
Immediate surrounding areas are already within CPZs, so no outer area proposed.
Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.

Area recently consulted and agrees CPZ proposals. Area is also detached from the proposed areas shown above and will not directly be affected if a CPZ is introduced.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations. Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and portfolio holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations. Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.

Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
This area is industrial and as such not applicable for a CPZ.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations. Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations. Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations. Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.

Members have suggested changes, so final boundaries are subject to change following further evaluation and Portfolio Holder approval.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.
These areas possess different parking pressures and are included as part of the other proposed consultations.