

APPENDIX- C

Pinner Road-County Roads – CPZ Proposed Extension

Analysis of Comments

Correspondence No.	Comments	Engineers Response
Cornwall Road		
(1509)	1. Leave thing as they are	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems
(1439)	2. Proposals would have adverse effect on my road	As will all CPZ proposals there will be those that do not wish to pay for parking permits& park on adjacent road.
	3. Proposals would push parking to Cornwall Rd	Agreed there will be some displaced parking if the proposals were to be implemented.
(1478)	4. Purely a means of charging residents to park outside their properties	As 1 (1509) above
Pinner View		
(1464)	5. Taking away the right to park, and is a money making step for the Council	As (1) (1509) above it is necessary to charge residents to be able to control / enforce the parking within the zone.
	6. I will convert my front garden so I Can park off Road	The council has no objection to off road parking subject to meeting the criteria.
Bedford Rd		
(1514)	7. Opposed to double yellow lines as this will take up vital parking spaces.	Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 should there be an emergency.
	8. As (1464)	As (1464)
(1499)	9. A further parking restriction between 5-6pm is required	The proposed consultation is to extend the existing CPZ and currently there are no proposals to include additional restriction outside the existing control periods. This would require a further consultation.
(1447)	10. No parking problems experienced during the day Problems arise in the evening	Noted. The 1 hr restriction only deals with long term commuter parking.
(1554)	11. No Problems experienced with parking	Noted
	12. As (1). above	As (1). above
	13. A (5) (1464) above	A (5) (1464) above
	14. The Borough has not taken into account the residents views but imposed restriction for revenue. We object to further restrictions.	Noted. The Proposals to extend the CPZ have not been agreed. the results/comments together with officers comments will be reported to TARSAP on 29 th Nov. 2012 and the decision will be made by the PH soon after

(1445)	15. Costs for permits would be additional burden	Noted
(1452)	16. Never been a problem end of our road	Noted
(1508)	17. As (16) (1452) and hence do not agree to paying to park on my road	Noted. The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking
(1541)	18. Object to double yellow lines. No problems with passing traffic. motorist give way at the top and bottom of road	Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 should there be an emergency.
	19. As (10) (1447) above	Noted
(1542)	20. As (18) (1541) above	As (18) (1541) above
	21. As (10) (1447) above	As (10) (1447) above
	22. As (7) (1514) above	As (7) (1514) above
(1544)	23. As (7) (1514) above	As (7) (1514) above
	24 As (10) (1447) above	As (10) (1447) above
	25. Can businesses get permits for their vehicles	Businesses can apply for business parking permits as long as the vehicles is registered to the business address and is intrinsic to the business and not used for travelling to and from work.
(1517)	25. As (5) (1464) above	As (5) (1464) above
	26. As (10) (1447) Above	As (10) (1447) Above
	27. Visitors and residents are force to pay dependant on of cars owned £60- £420	Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking.
	28. Residents did not express a desire to have a CPZ who was consulted	Residents and businesses were consulted within the consultation area.
	29. By what means was the extents of the proposed extension judged	CPZ's are proposed encompassing a large area of roads which may be affected by proposed changes to control parking issues where there is a problem of all day commuter parking.
	30. How many residents requested this extension what no of were consulted	Local residents and business had been asking the council to help address parking issues in their area over a number of years. A total of approximated 869 properties were consulted.
Rutland Road		
(1451)	31. Opposed to paying to park on my road	Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking.
	32 1 hr restriction is not applicable to deter all day commuter parking near stations. This is not the case in County Roads	1 hr is normally adequate for preventing long term commuter parking. This was a problem highlighted by many of the residents that responded.

	33. This is a money making exercise.	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems in the county roads
	34. Due to car ownership the roads are already saturated	The proposed CPZ would help to address the car ownership issue. Residents would be forced to reduce the no. of cars they own as they would need to pay more for the permits. Hence they would have to down size.
	36. As (7) 1514 above	As (7) 1514 above
	37. Leave things as they are	Noted
(1483)	38. Objection to CPZ	Noted
	39. No Problem with Parking Before the zone	The existing CPZ was introduced because the local resident/businesses were in favour of parking controls in the area.
	40. CPZ effects businesses	Measures have been proposed for businesses in the area and they can purchase business parking permits as long as they meet the criteria.
	41. The council agreed to large developments in the area and should insist on large increase in parking for the developments	The planning department do take into account parking issues both off and on road before granting approval to a development and if required set out conditions to regulate parking within the development.
	42. As (33) (1451) above	As (33) (1451) above
(1423)	44. As (7) (1514) above	As (7) (1514) above
	45. As (10) (1447) above	As (10) (1447) above
	46. Object to paying for a parking permit when its in force for 1 hr	Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking. The 1 hr restriction would help prevent long term commuter parking.
(1441)	47. As (10) (1447) above	As (10) (1447) above
	48. As (7) (1514) above	As (7) (1514) above
	49. Large vans, pick-us and trucks should be prevented parking on residential streets	As long as the vehicles are taxed the vehicles can park on the residential streets. However vehicles are not allowed to park on residential street which exceed a maximum a 5 tonne maximum gross weight.
(1481)	50. Would like to see consistent enforcement on Pinner Road where vehicles restrict safe entry/exit from side roads	Noted
(1557)	51. I object to the proposed CPZ	Noted. Extending the CPZ would enable better access to residents on their street.
	52. As (7) (1514) above	As (7) (1514) above
	53. Council should increase number of parking spaces	Noted. However, double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7

		should there be an emergency/access issues
	54. Create short stay parking spaces along Pinned Rd utilising the wide footway	Pay & Display bays are proposed on pinner Road. The council is unable to utilise the footway as part of the footway is privately owned.
(1477)	55. As (51) (1557) above	Noted
	56. I object to paying to park on a residential street	Noted. The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking
	57. Businesses need to have a car park to cater for their needs	Businesses can apply for business parking permits as long as their vehicles are registered to the business address and are intrinsic to the business and not used for travelling to and from work.
(1437)	58. As (56) (1477)	As (56) (1477)
	59. Proposed CPZ not necessary	Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking.
(1432)	60. The CPZ will create a cost burden	Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues.
	61. As (18) (1541)	As (18) (1541)
(1443)	62. Introduce full time Permit Parking to prevent commuter parking and passing trade to shops	Not considered as part of the consultation
Oxford Road		
(1467)	63. Currently due to CPZ in area residents cannot park anywhere else	Extending the CPZ would enable better access to residents on their street.
	64. Parking charges can be increased to any level and I do not want wish to pay for the privilege of parking as I already pay road tax.	Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues.
(1454)	65. As (56) (1477)	As (56) (1477)
	66. Congestion problems on Oxford Rd are due to businesses, shops & restaurants.	The proposals will only address long term commuter parking issues in the area.
	67. As (57) (1477)	As (57) (1477)
(1470)	68. objection to initial setting up charges, annual parking charges and subsequent increases	Noted. Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues.
	69. CPZ will not solve parking Issues	The measures will only control long term parking during the day.
	70. If planning department had not allowed so many	Noted. The planning department do take into account parking issues both off and on

	flats in the county roads we would not have the problems with parking	road before granting approval to a development and if required set out conditions to regulate parking within the development.
	71. As (56) (1477)	As (56) (1477)
	72. All new build: Neptune Rd, New cash and Carry with flats have a huge impact on parking in these roads. CPZ would improve ability to park	Noted
(1471)	73. Implement asap	Noted
	74. Increased business around us are a major concern	Noted
(1466)	75. No Problem at the northern end of Oxford but there is a problem at the junction of Pinner Rd due to shops/businesses	Noted. Measures are to be introduced for businesses and Passing trade along Pinner Rd. The proposed CPZ will help prevent long term parking.
	76. As (7) (1514)	As (7) (1514)
	77. Why are there no free parking bays on other county roads	As a result of the public consultation that was carried out the residents of Devonshire Road (western) did not wish to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. Hence were not included in the proposed CPZ extension and Free bays were proposed along that section
	78. My child care arrangements require access for a non resident car to e parked every day during the regulated hours. So “free spaces” would make a difference.	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation.
	79. Fees are too expensive	Noted. Tariffs are set by the committee, and parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. The cost of the resident parking permits increase with the no. of vehicles owned. Environmentally friendly vehicles can park free but require a permit.
	80. You are not proposing any changes along Pinner Rd outside the shops where traffic and visibility issues arise daily and safety if often compromised.	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. However measures are being proposed to introduce Pay & Display on Pinner Road and double yellow lines at the junctions as part of the Phase 1 proposals this financial year.
	81. The proposals will make things worse	Noted. Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce and regulate parking.

(1465)	82. Disappointed one way was not considered	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation.
	83. First permit per household should be free.	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. The charges are set by Committee
	84. As (33) (1457)	As (33) (1457)
(1503)	85. As (33) (1457)	As (33) (1457), The charges are set/agreed by Committee.
(1516)	86. Double yellow lines should be replaced by single lines during the CPZ hours.	Double yellow lines will ensure passing places are available 24/7 should there be an emergency.
	87. Don't want double yellow lines outside my property, and the surrounding roads	Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely.
	88. As (82) (1465) which ensures we don't have issues with passing places	As (82) (1465)
(1436)	89. In favour of proposed CPZ	Noted
(1427)	90. There is no parking problem. Cannot afford to pay every year	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking
(1550)	91. The proposed hrs of CPZ need to be extended with additional evening controlled period added. Non residents and business vehicles are using the county roads for overnight parking.	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation.
(1551)	92. Don't want double yellow lines passing is generally not a problem as drivers wait at the junction of Dorset Road	Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely
	93. 1 hr restrictions will not prevent non permit holders from parking on these roads. They will still be able to park for the majority of the day and overnight without paying. Stopping those with permits from parking there.	Noted. The 1 hr restriction is only aimed at preventing long term commuter parking during the day. To introduce additional restrictions would require the scheme to be re-consulted again.
	94. Why is Sussex Road left out of the CPX proposals?	The residents of Sussex Road did not wish to be included in the CPZ extension hence they were not included in the statutory consultation.
	95. County roads are not close to the tube stations so	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something

	the proposals are a money making exercise for the Council.	about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking
	96. Vehicle would be moved by non residents during the 1hr restriction and then moved back.	Noted.
(1558)	97. Since the initial introduction of the CPZ things have been working well. However this has resulted in areas with no restriction (CPZ) having difficulties finding a place to park.	The proposed CPZ extension will help solve some of the issues with commuter parking.
	98. I am in favour of the CPZ	Noted
	99. There should be additional restriction between 3-4pm Mon-Sat as we are affected by patrons of shops on Pinner Road	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation.
(1440)	100. As (98) (1558)	As (98) (1558)
Devonshire Road		
(1490)	101. I disagree with the proposed double yellow lines outside my garage	The proposed double yellow lines will help to keep the access to the garage clear at all times as well as to provide a convenient passing place (*see note below).
(1528)	102. Objection to free parking bay western side of Devonshire Road.	Free parking bays were proposed because the majority of the residents on the western side did not want to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. Two petitions were received from residents of Devonshire Road. 1 requesting the western side be included in the proposed CPZ extension and 1 objecting to the proposed double yellow lines. (*see note below)
	102. Unless we can apply for permit the residents would not benefit	Noted. This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. Two petitions were received from residents of Devonshire Road. 1 requesting the western side be included in the proposed CPZ extension and 1 objecting to the proposed double yellow lines. (*see note below)
(1538)	103. Unable to park on Devonshire Road as non residents and business use the road as all day car park.	The proposed CPZ extension would help address the problems of long term commuter parking. (*see note below)
	104. Splitting the road in two	(*see note below)

	CPZ and non CPZ will concentrate the problem into one small area. Unfair for those residents who were in favour of the CPZ.	
	105. I am strongly in favour of the revised parking proposals in my section of road	(*see note below)
(1449)	106. I hope the added revenue from the scheme will enable the council to employ a person to police the new restrictions	(*see note below)
(1498)	107. Do not take away 4 parking places to be used as passing places. Those that use the road wait at the top and bottom of Devonshire Road	(*see note below)
	108. If east side is included in the CPZ then why not the western side.	(*see note below)
(1511)	109. As (107) 1498	(*see note below)
	110. People using the roads as rat runs will not know the passing places are there. This has been dealt with by double yellow lines at the top & bottom bends of the road.	(*see note below)
(1549)	111. As (107) 1498 the parking situation will be further exacerbated by developments in the area.	(*see note below)
(1537)	112.As (93) (1551)	As (93) (1551) (*see note below)
	113. Local businesses will reduction in 1hr restriction. Vehicles are parked up in Devonshire Road & Dorset Rd during the day and evening.	Measures have been proposed for businesses in the area and they can purchase business parking permits as long as they meet the criteria. Further restrictions cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	114. Don't want double yellow lines would rather have CPZ 12 to 24 hrs a day.	Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely. Different CPZ times cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below).

(1461)	115. As (69) (1470)	As (69) (1470) (*see note below)
	116. As (97) (1558)	As (97) (1558) (*see note below)
	117. How many residents have asked for a CPZ on Devonshire Rd	Refer to statutory consultation responses for Devonshire Road 2.22 to 2.24. (*see note below)
	118. As (7) (1514)	As (7) (1514) (*see note below)
	119. As (51) (1557)	As (51) (1557). (*see note below)
(1540)	120. The only consultation I received was a questionnaire for the review of changes to existing CPZ. There was no mention of extending the CPZ to include other County Road and no plans were sent	A public consultation was undertaken in July 2011 detailing the proposed extension of the existing CPZ which included plans for ease of reference. The proposals were revised following the public consultation & a subsequent statutory consultation was undertaken all the residents & businesses were consulted on both occasions. (*see note below)
	121. Extension of the CPZ on one side will be unfair to those living on the other side.	Residents (western sides) responded to the Public consultation stating that they do not wish to be in the CPZ (*See note below).
(1456)	122. Don't want double yellow lines which take away valuable parking spaces.	Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely. (*see note below)
	123. The proposals are very restrictive & have an adverse effect on residents	Noted. The proposals were only designed to address long term commuter parking only. (*see note below)
	124. I would be grateful if proposals for double yellow lines could be reconsidered.	Noted. (*see note below)
	125. No need to extend the CPZ with restrictions between 11-12noon. Will only generate income for council.	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking. 11-12noon restrictions will help prevent long term parking. (*see note below)
(1426)	126. Happy with proposed CPZ extension. No objection to paying more.	Noted. (*see note below)
(1548)	127. I object to restrictions/CPZ on Devonshire Road	Extending the CPZ would enable better access to residents on their street. (*see note below).
	128. I object to Passing places	Double yellow lines help ensure passing places are kept clear 24/7 should there be an emergency and to allow vehicles to pass safely. (*see note below)
(1559)	129. As (128) (1559)	As (128) (1559)
	130. I often have to park	Noted.

	outside my house and carry heavy items into the house. Double yellow lines will prevent me from doing this	(*see note below)
(1556)	130. As (127) (1548)	As (127) (1548)
(1552)	131. As (128) (1548)	As (128) (1548)
	132. I object to paid parking spaces at top of Devonshire Rd	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	133. I object to the proposed double yellow lines around junctions	Double yellow lines around the junctions help keep the junctions clear of obstructive parking and allow vehicles to turn into and out of the side roads with relative ease & safety. The highway code states that cars should not be parked within 10m of a junction. (*see note below)
	134. I object to the 11-12noon CPZ restriction which should be longer too stop vehicles parking at night	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	135. I object to free parking places	The residents on the western side chose not to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. Hence no restrictions on that side were proposed. (*see note below)
	136. There should be no restrictions between 7am-10am in the morning as present	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	137. More flats being built top of Devonshire road. I am being penalised for living in the county roads.	Parking controls are necessary to control and enforce parking where there are long term parking issues. (*see note below)
	138. The Council needs to listen to the residents.	Noted. (*see note below)
(1553)	139. As (127) (1548)	As (127) (1548)
	140. It is simply new income revenue for Harrow Council	The proposals were put forward by the residents & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking. (*see note below).
	141. Have the operating hours in the evening	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
(1425)	142. Can restrictions be made longer?	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	143. Make Devonshire Road one way.	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation. (*see note below)
	144. Silly having free bays	The majority of the resident's on western

		side did not wish to be included in the proposed CPZ. (*see note below).
Dorset Road		
(1539)	145. Parking space taken up by commuter parking	Proposed CPZ extension will prevent long term commuter parking
	146. need to address parking/enforcement on Pinner Rd	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation.
	147. Poor visibility turning out of Oxford Road onto Pinner Road due to parked vehicles	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
(1431)	148. two responses received with conflicting views objecting to the scheme if we don't implement the proposed CPZ	Noted
Neptune Road		
(1500)	150. The proposals would severally disrupt our business, be extremely costly and unproductive/detrimental for us	The proposed measures on Neptune Road are designed to accommodate most users. The measures are a direct response to residents and businesses.
	151. Why are we the only business to be penalised.	The proposed measures on Neptune Road are designed to accommodate most users. The measures are a direct response to residents and businesses.
	152. No pay and display only bays. We should have Shared business permits & Pay & Display Bays	The proposed measures on Neptune Road are designed to accommodate most users. The measures are a direct response to residents and businesses.
	153. 20 business permits provide free	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	154. Pay and display revised to 9.30 to 12 noon. Only every day	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
Pinner Road		
(1446)	155. Parking Required for Disabled residents	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
(1442)	156. Objection to CPZ/restrictions unless consideration given to Businesses	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	157. Additional pay & display bays required. Meters should except money before 10am	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	158. The three bays on the	This cannot be considered as part of this

	west side of Devonshire Road are wasted before 10am and after 4pm as they have yellow lines no longer used by the business	consultation
(1457)	159. Current restrictions on Neptune Road are satisfactory. No need to complicate matters.	The proposed measures on Neptune Road are designed to accommodate most users. The measures are a direct response to residents and businesses.
(1455)	160. No justification for extending the CPZ	The proposals were put forward by the residents & businesses to do something about the parking problems
	161. where would people coming into the area for business park	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	162. This may result in business relocating	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	163. Should have facilities to be able to park close to our business	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	164. The consultation is flawed as not all businesses in the area have been consulted (where there is more than one business in one premises)	If the address is registered as having two businesses operating at the address then they both would have been consulted.
	165. When residents leave to go to work businesses can use them and when they leave the residents can use them	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking.
	166. As (140) (1553)	As (140) (1553)
	167. If scheme goes ahead this will make life difficult for the businesses in the area who rely on cars to get to and from work.	Noted
(1424)	168. Proposals will make life difficult	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking.
	169. As (162) (1455)	As (162) (1455)
	170. Why should we pay to visit our own shop?	The proposals were put forward by the residents & businesses to do something about the parking problems and hence charging for permits will help control/enforce parking.
(1455)	171. As (165) (1455)	As (165) (1455)
	172. As (160) (1455)	As (160) (1455)
	173. As (161) (1455)	As (161) (1455)
	174. As (164) (1455)	As (164) (1455)

	175. As (167) (1455)	As (167) (1455)
(1523)	176. The proposals restrict safe entry and exit from our property	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
(1546)	177. I do not have parking offered by my development & will not be able to park near by	Noted. Some free bay will be provided on Neptune Road. However the demand will far exceed the no. of spaces available.
(1460)	178. People will be forced to park further away	The proposals were put forward by the residents & businesses to do something about the parking problems. Where practicable provisions have been provided for both businesses, residents and passing trade.
(1546)	179. What are the benefits for the residents on the County Roads	The restrictions will prevent long term all day commuter parking.
	180. How much will it cost?	This will depend on the final agreed scheme once a decision is made by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.
	181. Why does the council feel that a revised CPZ should be proposed?	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking
	182. What are the benefits to social communities whereby they need to entertain friends and families.	The proposed CPZ will remove long term commuter parking and that from residents who live inside an existing CPZ but prefer not to pay by parking on adjacent roads who are not in the CPZ. Resident and visitors will be able to more easily park nearer to their properties due to reduced parking.
(1504)	183. Residing in a shared apartment with one allotted parking space. There are 3 tenants with two cars. I will have nowhere to Park.	Noted. Difficulties would only be experienced during the restricted hours of 11am-12noon.
Sussex Road		
(1555)	184. There could be an impact on Sussex Road by introducing permit parking on nearby roads.	Noted.
	185. Why should we pay to be able to park close to our house	By introducing parking permits, only residents in the area qualify for the permits and the costs of the permits are related to the no of cars owned/registered. This removed the problem of long term commuter parking and makes it easier for local residents to be able to park near their properties.

	186. I do agree with the double yellow lines in terms of safety and access.	Noted
(1547)	187. I feel that the Council has incorrectly interpreted the resident's wishes. This would not have been the case if the questionnaire had specifically asked if residents wished to be included if a NEIGHBOURING road was.	Noted. The Public Consultation carried out in July 2011 had specifically asked those that were consulted. If you answered "NO" to extending the existing CPZ in your part of the street. If parking controls were introduced in the road near to yours , would you then support residents parking in your part of the street? This was specifically done to prevent this kind of confusion at a later stage.
	188. The properties located along Sussex Rd either side of the side road junctions would be forced to park on Sussex Rd with the introduction of the CPZ. They are being unfairly discriminated against by the extension.	After considering the responses to the statutory consultation the officers in discussion with the ward councillors will not be recommending that the proposed CPZ's be extended the full length of the following County roads (Bedford Road, Rutland Road and Oxford Road. The section along Devonshire Road outside the existing CPZ will be recommended to the P.H to agree a mini statutory consultation be undertaken again due to the responses received.
	189. Objection against increase in the length of double yellow lines, and additional double yellow line to facilitate passing. Some 20+ cars will be forced to park elsewhere on congested streets.	The double yellow lines at the junctions are proposed to aid turning movement /sightlines into and out of the side roads. The high way code states that vehicles should not be parked within 10m of a junction. The double yellow lines used to facilitate passing places are intended to provide safe passing places 24/7. This is not just for the residents but for emergency vehicles also.
	190. The roads are generally clear during the day. The problems exist during the evenings and weekends	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	191. The Council cannot be clear that it is acting on residents wishes by including Rutland Road and Bedford Road in the extension due to the reinterpretation of the wording on the questionnaire	Noted. (see(187) (1547)
(1428)	192. Can you issue free stickers	This cannot be considered as part of this consultation
	193. Problem is with commuter parking	Agreed. That's why we are proposing a CPZ between 11am-12noon.

(1429)	194. CPZ would force parking onto adjacent roads	With the introduction of a CPZ there is always a possibility of some parking being pushed onto adjacent streets. That is why we consulted Sussex Roads in the public consultation and the majority had responded saying they did not wish to be included in the CPZ
	195. This will become a source of income for the council	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking.
(1430)	196. This is a money making excuse there is no reason for the CPZ extension.	The proposals were put forward by the resident & businesses to do something about the problems of long term commuter parking.
	197. Council Time better spent repairing potholes	Noted
(1522)	198. Over the last 6 months it is becoming increasingly difficult to find parking space. Parking permits in surrounding streets would exacerbate parking problems on Sussex Road	Noted.
	199. due to poor response to the initial consultation a second questionnaire or extended time frame would have been valid	Sussex road was not considered in the statutory consultation because the majority of those that had responded did not want to be included in the proposed CPZ extension. A statutory 21day consultation period is allowed for all comments/response to be submitted to the Council.
	200. It was not made clear to the residents the implications to parking, , community and well-being if the CPZ was introduced on adjacent roads what impact this would have on them.	The Public Consultation carried out in July 2011 had specifically asked those that were consulted. If you answered “ NO ” to extending the existing CPZ in your part of the street. If parking controls were introduced in the road near to yours , would you then support residents parking in your part of the street? This was specifically done to prevent this kind of confusion at a later stage.
	201. If this cannot be reviewed I would be grateful for your advice and recommendations as to how I can bring this to the attention of the decision makers.	In order for Sussex Road to be included in the CPZ extension a statutory re-consultation would need to be re-done.
(1495)	202. I object to Sussex Road not being included in the	Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the

	proposals hence forcing non-residents onto our street	public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension.
(1515)	203. As (202) (1495)	(202) (1495)
	204. The proposal will force non-residents who live within the CPZ area onto our street as they do not wish to pay for a parking permit. This problem is compounded by some properties being converted to flats and some have up to 4 cars.	Noted.
(1506)	205. Parking is a nightmare and we park on Oxford Road, Rutland Road or Bedford Road	Noted
	206. Parking is worst during the week days. When commuters park on Sussex Rd & walk to the station.	Noted
	207 As (204) (1515)	Noted
	208 As (202) (1495)	As (202) (1495)
(1453)	209. As (194) (1429)	As (194) (1429)
	210. I would like Sussex Road to be included in the CPZ	Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension.
(1479)	211. This will increase congestion on Sussex Road making parking impossible	Noted
(1518)	212. We support the proposed CPZ extension. But have reservations about the usefulness of the double yellow lines.	Noted
	213. As (211) (1479)	As (211) (1479)
	214. Disappointed that the Council did not include Sussex Road	Sussex road was not included in the proposals because the response to the public consultation did not show a majority support for the CPZ extension
	214. The analysis of the resident's survey relating to Sussex Road is flawed. We believe that the eastern and western side of Sussex Road display different characteristics. Hence requiring different treatment.	Noted
	215. We urge the Council to review their decision about	Noted

	<p>the eastern and western sides of Sussex Road. Avoiding costly errors, residents suffering, additional costs and addressing the problem in the near future.</p>	
--	---	--