

Ref	Road	Comments	Officers Response
001572 001575	BROMEFIELD	<p>Objections to the proposed double yellow lines on the roundabout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It penalises the residents and not the road users. • Prevents genuine users from parking <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single yellow line in the morning restricting parents and commuters parking. • Restrictions 8am to 8pm allowing residents to park in the evening. • Reduce the roundabout size to allow for access 	<p>Any vehicle that parks around the roundabout will obstruct larger vehicles. It does not matter whether this is a resident, visitor or commuter with the current lane width vehicles should not be parked at any time.</p> <p>Single yellow lines will only resolve the problems during the hours of operation and not outside those times.</p> <p>The suggestion to reduce the size of the island and increase the lane width would resolve the obstruction issue; however this would be a costly exercise both in funding and resources. This is not considered viable within the scope of the current project and will need to be considered in the future by the panel.</p>
001588 002020	BROMEFIELD	<p>Objections to the single yellow lines received include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will have a negative effect on the area. • It will create unwanted parking stress. • The area does not have a parking problem and there is no need for the restrictions. • It devalues the area and will make it a rat race for other residents. • The people who park are not all commuters; they are office workers working nearby and they will park further within the estate. • The proposal does not take into consideration the school mums who park between 3 to 4 for 10 to 15 minutes. • It is only a few people at the beginning of Bromefield without driveways who have a cause for complaint. I cannot see why the whole of Bromefield and the surrounding areas should be affected with your proposals. • Harrow Council eager to implement in order for the traffic wardens to generate extra revenue. • The Council should be charging less at the underground car parks to stop a handful of commuters parking. • The proposal has been thought of within the offices of Harrow Council with an opinion of a few residents. 	<p>The proposals originate from the responses received from the public consultation. The majority of residents in the area where the measures are proposed stated that they felt there is a problem with parking and would support the introduction of measures. The majority of these responses supported single yellow lines as opposed to resident permit bays.</p> <p>As the measures are amenity related they are only proposed and progress if over 50% support them. The single yellow lines do not generate any funds and the council will not look to progress them without resident support.</p> <p>The issue with parents parking is likely to be improved as commuters would not be parking in the controlled area. This will leave safer places for parents to park for short periods whilst dropping off and collecting their children.</p> <p>The station car parks are not owned by the council. We cannot control the prices they charge.</p> <p>The proposals are based on resident's responses.</p>

001604	BUCKINGHAM ROAD	Why should we pay for parking permits to park outside our own house when we pay for our road taxes?	The proposals are an amenity for the residents of a particular street. The charges for the permits pay towards the enforcement of the zone. Any additional funds help to pay for the 'Freedom Pass' for the elderly.
001638	CHEYNEYS AVENUE	There is absolutely no need for the yellow lines. I object to the pay and display in Station Parade - what will it do to the shops there?	Amenity measures are only proposed where the majority of responses received from residents in the public consultation stated they did have a parking problem. In this instance there was a majority and the preferred measures were single yellow lines. The pay and display measures are proposed to increase turnover of vehicles so that customers can find parking. The measures are supported by the businesses and residents.
001643	CHEYNEYS AVENUE	If you keep extending the parking restrictions, all that happens is the parking then becomes a problem for someone else. I agree with the changes proposed for Station Parade shops and Honeypot Lane service road as this may make it easier to use our local shops and support the small businesses to stay and serve our community.	It is possible there will be an element of displaced parking. All residents had the opportunity to consider the introduction of controls. For some people the one hour restriction Monday to Friday is preferable than not being able to park near their house due to commuters at any time. For others their current parking situation is preferred.
001659	DONNEFIELD AVENUE	The restrictions in Donnefield Avenue need to be more stringent. I suggest a Monday-Sunday 8am-7.30 to cope with parking for the park and the large amount of cars parking in the evening and weekends for events at Wembley Stadium and Arena. The disabled bay at the north end of Donnefield Avenue is a good idea, but I think the pavement there should be narrowed further to provide for two or three disabled cars.	The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home. At other entrances around the park there are safe unrestricted locations to park. Disabled badge holders can park on restrictions for up to 3 hours as long as they do not obstruct the carriageway.
001674	DU CROS DRIVE	I would not object if resident parking bays with effect between 3 pm and 4 pm Monday to Friday were introduced rather than single yellow lines. Single yellow lines are too prohibitive. Restrictions.	Single yellow lines were the preferred option supported by residents in their responses to the public consultation. This is why these measures opposed to permit bays have progressed.
001694	HONEYPOT LANE	I strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions for the Canons Park area based on a requirement for parking during the proposed restriction time. I would not be able to park outside my own residence and I object to having to pay additional costs.	Due to the responses received changes to the single yellow lines on Brick Lane at the rear of the service road now allow vehicles that require to park in the area from 14:00 to 15:00 to park.

001705	MAYCHURCH CLOSE	<p>We object to the proposal of double yellow lines at the circle end of our close as this is unnecessary as the road is wide enough for emergency vehicles and cars do not cause an obstruction.</p> <p>As it is very wide we will not be able to park outside part of our house. Also we would prefer "resident permit zone" Mon-Fri 2-3 pm as in Torbridge Close because we may want to park outside our house during the week or if we may have visitors.</p>	<p>If vehicles park in locations where double yellow lines are proposed they may obstruct emergency service access. The proposals are in line with the well established rules of the Highway Code.</p> <p>The majority of responses received from the public consultation supported single yellow lines opposed to resident permits therefore these measures progressed to statutory consultation.</p>
001732	WHITCHURCH LANE	<p>I object to the 10.5 hour CPZ in Donnefield Avenue. Whilst a one hour CPZ Mon-Fri would be reasonable, the all day restrictions would create the following problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday restrictions will inhibit access to the Park and the Children's Playground near by. • It will encourage parking on Whitchurch Lane already congested and narrowed 2 lane highway with 3 bus routes. • It will create finally (excluding the shops) a 1-2 sq. km zone where no day time parking can take place for non-residents, encouraging the hard surfacing of frontages causing flooding and ecological problems. 	<p>The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home.</p> <p>Concerns raised over displaced vehicles on Whitchurch Lane have only recently come to light and will be considered as part of a review relating to Barnet FC moving to The Hive.</p> <p>Residents wishing to transform their gardens for off street parking have to adhere to certain requirements which include appropriate drainage.</p>
001738	WYCHWOOD AVENUE	<p>We support all plans but want the "single yellow line 3-4 or 2-3 pm" controls extended to include the part of Wychwood Avenue to cover the area between the new "double yellow" lines.</p> <p>This is due to the current situation of car/van parking making the road dangerously narrow, and blocking visibility for cars trying to leave/enter residential driveways.</p> <p>In the area between these new controls, I feel that this new plan will create and compound problems. Currently, existing restrictions displace parking into the space from the corner of Wychwood Avenue to the roundabout (as designed). Overnight parking of commercial vans cause a serious continuous issue with road narrowing and nil visibility for residents leaving driveways, and also for pedestrians crossing the street.</p> <p>Further restrictions in Cheyneys Avenue/Du Cros Drive/Station Parade Shops will increase the above issue, and that the area of Wychwood Avenue should also be included in the above scheme to have a "single yellow line" between 3-4 pm or 2-3 pm.</p>	<p>The extent of the proposed single yellow lines was determined by the responses to the initial public consultation. Measures only progressed where there was a majority response, in areas where there are no single yellow lines the majority of residents did not support their introduction.</p> <p>For the proposed measures to be extended significantly a further statutory consultation would be required. This would need to be considered under a review. If the concerns raised persist after 3 months of any controls being implemented it is advisable that a review is requested.</p> <p>Furthermore all vehicles should adhere to the Highway Code and not block traffic flow, if they do it is possible the Police may issue a ticket for obstructing the highway. The proposed measures are designed to encourage compliance.</p>

001914	BUCKINGHAM ROAD	When I return at 1:30pm I am unable to find a parking space and park in neighboring roads. Therefore if the parking restrictions are introduced in Bucking Road/Gardens then commuters will be displaced to neighboring streets meaning that I will have to park even further away.	<p>The majority of responses received back from the public consultation was that there is a problem and that they would support single yellow lines.</p> <p>The hours of control for the measures cannot be changed as this would result in migration of cars from one area to another. It is important the controls are consistent throughout an area.</p>
001916 001922 001923 001924 001929 001930 001933 001934 001935 001936 001938 001939 001940 001941 001942 001943 001944 002022 002023 002024 002035 002121 002234	BUCKINGHAM GARDENS	<p>The proposed (single yellow lines) to discourage commuter parking is unnecessary, and penalises residents and their visitors as they are also denied the opportunity to park in our road space.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will detract from the enjoyment of our property, taking away our current right to all-day parking in the vicinity.</p>	<p>The objections have been considered and as there was no longer a majority support for the measures officer's recommend that the proposed single yellow lines do not progress to implementation.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are recommended to proceed to implementation.</p>
002036	MERLIN CRESCENT	<p>My objection to your proposal for parking restrictions is that inconsiderate and irresponsible parking will be transferred to the opposite side of the road which will also obstruct the view of traffic and pedestrians traveling South up Merlin Crescent towards St. Brides Avenue.</p> <p>This proposal would allow vehicles to park across driveways in Merlin Crescent, as already happens particularly at school times.</p>	<p>Should any measures be approved for introduction this location will be reviewed for the safety concerns raised. Officers feel at this time it is unlikely to cause a safety concern due to the highway layout.</p> <p>Should vehicles park across residents driveways without their permission enforcement action can be taken. Parking enforcement should be contacted in this instance.</p>

002037	TALMAN GROVE	<p>We would like to strongly object because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the proposed restrictions will cause more difficulties in this estate, both to residents and visitors; 2. Talman Grove is not a through road, so everyone takes extra care, especially areas where there is restricted vision. 3. If parking is prevented in areas, cars will drive faster through the estate. 	<p>The proposals are designed to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend.</p>
002117	WHITCHURCH LANE	<p>I have run a business for 25 years and from experience feel the road is not that busy for traffic to justify the restrictions and would also be adverse effect on businesses in the area.</p> <p>A single yellow line on one side of Buckingham Road with the time restricted for a few hours of the day would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and the proposed double yellow line restrictions have now been reduced.</p>
002149	WHITCHURCH LANE	<p>No car owner or driver should have the right to monopolize the service road for the shops in Station Parade - at any time.</p> <p>On the south side of the Canon's Park Station Parade "island". The double yellow lines must remain.</p> <p>There must be ban on overnight parking in the service road so that patrons of the restaurants can park.</p> <p>The proposed parking permit charges of £60 for the first car is derisory. It should £100.</p> <p>Object to the equality monitoring form.</p>	<p>It is not perceived the bays will be fully occupied by residents, other motorists will have the right to pay and display or park on the single yellow lines outside the hours of control.</p> <p>The double yellow lines will remain as existing on Whitchurch Lane.</p> <p>There was insufficient support form residents and businesses for controls in the evening.</p> <p>The cost of the permits is set at a level which services the ongoing cost of the controls. It is not a money making process.</p> <p>The equality monitoring form is not compulsory and residents have the option to fill it out if they wish.</p>

002151	BRICK LANE	<p>We do not believe that the proposals are necessary.</p> <p>Insufficient information about Bromefield Road's restricted parking arrangements available.</p> <p>The proposals will have an adverse affect upon local businesses and trading units, especially in Station Parade and Brick Lane.</p> <p>Business Permit Fees are prohibitive and unreasonable.</p> <p>There are insufficient offices currently and the proposals do not give us sole use of the area outside our office to enable us to trade satisfactorily.</p>	<p>Due to a large area surrounding Brick Lane supporting the introduction of controls there is likely to be a significant increase in parking pressure should measures not be introduced.</p> <p>All proposals in the surrounding area are available online or plans can be sent out. Notices on site and in the local paper also provided information on the extent of the proposals.</p> <p>The proposals have been supported by local businesses due to the problems they currently experience from external long term parking.</p> <p>The hours of control for the single yellow line on Brick Lane have been changed so they differ from the area wide control times. This allows for parking should businesses or residents need it temporarily during the operational hours.</p>
002153	GYLES PARK	<p>We have never had a problem with unwanted parking.</p> <p>We are both elderly and critically ill and require healthcare professionals.</p> <p>Friends and family visit regularly. It will seriously reduce the value of our house if double yellow lines were outside.</p>	<p>The proposals are in line with the Highway Code to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parked in this location.</p>
002154	STRATTON CLOSE	<p>Stratton Close is a quiet residential cul-de-sac and regularly receives large HGV's (eg. Rubbish collection trucks, recycling collection trucks, etc) without any access issues at all.</p> <p>We believe there is no real safety justification for the proposed yellow lines. By implementing the councils proposals the amount of available parking spaces are being reduced, which will result in additional parking pressures.</p> <p>There is sufficient room to get a large vehicle around the roundabout with a car parked on the straight approach to the roundabout. Pedestrians do not cross the road here, so loss of visibility is not an issue and in our opinion there is no valid safety case.</p> <p>In other locations there is adequate space and visibility is not impaired.</p>	<p>The proposals are in line with the Highway Code to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p> <p>Further to the comments received and officers reviewing the measures, the double yellow lines have been shortened on the approach to the roundabout at the junction of Stratton Close with Whitchurch Gardens due to the highway layout.</p>

002155	BROOMGROVE GARDENS	<p>Statutory Objection to double yellow lines around the junction between Chandos Crescent and Buckingham Road.</p> <p>Although I agree that it would be sensible to prevent parking immediately outside the newsagent /Islamic centre because of the proximity to the traffic island, I don't agree with introducing double yellow lines everywhere else.</p> <p>Visibility is not affected, the roads are quite wide and there aren't normally that many cars. This will create a lot of inconvenience for no obvious gain.</p>	<p>Officers have reviewed the proposals and amended the measures on Merlin Crescent where the double yellow line proposals have been shortened.</p> <p>It is felt the remaining are necessary to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p>
002156	GYLES PARK	<p>I have never seen anyone park in front of my house. There is an entrance to my drive, and there has always been access available to the refuse vehicles. I therefore do not consider it necessary to have double yellow lines.</p>	<p>The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p>
002157	MERLIN CRESCENT	<p>Object to the proposed yellow line. We have guests who often park outside our house. It would be inconvenient to park elsewhere away from the house.</p> <p>Our grandparents, who are elderly and have difficulty walking will be unable to park outside our house. We have moved to Edgware recently and one of the reasons we purchased the house was because it had free on-street parking.</p>	<p>The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p>
002158 002185	CHEYNEYS AVENUE	<p>I formally object to the extension of the single yellow line controls on Cheyneys Ave and the introduction of single yellow line controls across the various areas specified in the consultation.</p> <p>There has been no noticeable increase in traffic flow in the last 20 years on Cheyneys Ave.</p> <p>There is no accurate evidence of 'dangerous' parking, let alone a parking issue that would be resolved through the introduction of parking controls. Furthermore, inconsiderate parking which is unlawful under the Highway Code can be addressed under existing laws, outside of the unfounded proposed parking enforcements.</p> <p>The initial consultation results saw a poor response of 19% of the properties consulted. A poor response indicates little or no problems with parking points, as is the case here.</p> <p>In addition, if there was a parking issue in the Canons Park area, the Stanmore Place complex should not have been given planning permission.</p>	<p>The proposed single yellow lines are not related to road safety. They are proposed as an amenity for residents who suffer from external parking pressures.</p> <p>In the areas where the measures are proposed the majority of responses received indicated they did experience parking problems and would support single yellow lines.</p> <p>Harrow Council rejected the planning application for the development on the old government site however this decision was overturned by the government on appeal.</p>

002168 002209	WHITCHURCH CLOSE & WHITCHURCH GARDENS	<p>I wish to object as the parking spaces in the close is already very limited and it will further reduce if you are to extend cover to the front area of house no.74.</p> <p>This area will not obstruct any incoming or outgoing vehicles and I agree with your proposal if you limit the double lines to the end of wooden fencing opposite the entrance of no. 74.</p>	<p>The measures are proposed to prevent vehicles obstructing emergency service access to the close and to ensure there is sufficient space to turnaround preventing vehicles from having to reverse out of the close.</p>
002181	HONEYPOT LANE	<p>I am writing to submit a formal objection to the proposed restrictions on the Honeypot Lane Service Road.</p> <p>There have never been any prolonged periods of unavailable parking along this service road.</p> <p>I note that the results of your initial consultation had a very low response rate, the low level of responses does not provide a viable basis to change the current parking arrangements.</p> <p>I note that the current proposals do not include any provisions for resident permit bays or the ability of resident permit holders to park. As such, the proposals do not address the needs of local residents and business. This service road provides essential parking for those residents with no off street parking.</p>	<p>Due to a large area surrounding Brick Lane supporting the introduction of controls there is likely to be a significant increase in parking pressure should measures not be introduced.</p> <p>The proposals on the whole have been supported by local businesses due to the problems they currently experience from external long term parking.</p> <p>The hours of control for the single yellow line on Brick Lane have been changed so they differ from the area wide control times. This allows for parking should businesses or residents need it temporarily during the operational hours.</p>
002184	CHANDOS CRESCENT	<p>Parking has never been an issue around this area at all and the proposed plans for double yellow lines are not acceptable.</p> <p>I object that double yellow lines are placed outside the business and around the surrounding areas. Loading and unloading will be a problem as well as customers not being able to park and hence loss of business.</p>	<p>Officers have reviewed the proposals and amended the measures on Merlin Crescent where the double yellow line proposals have been shortened.</p> <p>It is felt the remaining proposals are necessary to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p>
002197	MAYCHURCH CLOSE	<p>We object to the introduction of single yellow line controls Mon-Fri 2-3pm since these prohibit both residents and their visitors from parking. We would support a resident permit zone.</p> <p>We object to the introduction of double yellow lines in the turning circle of Maychurch Close. This is not a junction, bend or narrow point and there are no safety reasons that would justify double yellow lines.</p> <p>The turning circle is in regular use and no resident has any knowledge of either private or commercial vehicles having any difficulties turning within it.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines would also remove one parking position outside Number 3 thus reducing the already limited parking available to residents and visitors.</p>	<p>The proposals are supported by the majority of the residents who feel they are required due to obstructive external parking.</p> <p>The double yellow lines are designed to protect the junction for access and visibility and ensure vehicles can turn in the turning without having to reverse out of the close onto the roundabout.</p> <p>They support the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10m of a junction or on a bend.</p>

002198	WHITCHURCH LANE	<p>I object to the proposals on the basis that the documentation is incomplete and ambiguous and therefore is not fit for purpose.</p> <p>With regard to Station Parade your documentation only refers to a combination of controls so one is left to assume that the drawing is the definitive document.</p> <p>On Drawing No T-DWG-00005-A-10 a yellow line is drawn on the South side of the service road adjacent to Whitchurch Lane but there is no indication of what is proposed. I have searched your documentation and the Borough web site and cannot find written down anywhere just who is eligible for a permit for any given zone. Are permits only going to be issued to residents of the flats or will residents of adjacent roads be eligible?</p> <p>The number of flats exceeds the number of permit bays shown on the drawing by 30%. Is there going to be a limit to the number of permits issued? The introduction of Pay & Display will sound the death knell for any passing trade for the shops.</p> <p>Assuming that all the parking bays were not already filled with permit holders, if you have already got in your car to drive to the shops why would you want to stop at Station Parade where you would have to get out of your car, pay, return to your car to display and only then contemplate going to the shop of your choice?</p> <p>For only a few more minutes in the car you can drive to Edgware Broadwalk where you can park for free and have a much wider selection of shops to choose from In my capacity as Chairman of the Friends of Canons Park I also object to the restrictions on Donnefield Avenue being implemented on Saturdays.</p> <p>To single out Donnefield Avenue as the only road with restrictions on a Saturday seems not only perverse but also contrary to the idea of giving as many people as possible easy access to it.</p>	<p>The documents provide all required details for the proposals. The measures on the parade are controlled within the zone which is shown with a dashed line and note stating the proposed operation hours. The key indicates where proposed double yellow lines are recommended.</p> <p>All other measures have their own note detailing the measures.</p> <p>Permits will only be available to those properties within the proposed zone (dashed boundary on plan)</p> <p>As with all controlled parking zones there will be no limit to the number of permits issued. Spaces will be available on a first come first serve basis. Either pay and display or residents.</p> <p>Parking is free on the single yellow line in the service parade outside the 2 operational hours.</p> <p>The majority of the shops support the proposed measures that were progressed in response to the suggestions from the public consultation.</p> <p>The proposals in Donnefield Avenue are a result of the responses received from the public consultation. Residents suffer from extensive parking problems due to commuters, local facilities and visitors to the park. They therefore find it very difficult to park within close proximity to their home both during the week and at weekends.</p>
--------	-----------------	--	--

002200	KYNANCE GARDENS	<p>I object is the restricted parking zones on the Bromefield/Wemborough Avenue area leading up to the roundabout.</p> <p>Parking in Canons Park station at £4- per day is absurdly expensive and I do not think it is entirely unreasonable for commuters or visitors to London have the ability to park in public roads which are not in the immediate vicinity of the station and where the houses effected have drives to park in.</p> <p>You are effectively pushing commuters to park further-up simply shifting them a few streets up. The final point relates to pay and display parking outside Station Parade at Canons Park Monday to Saturday 8:00am to 6:30pm. This is simply a tax by another name and in my opinion completely unnecessary.</p> <p>Current restrictions work perfectly well.</p>	<p>All residents in the area had the opportunity to support proposals to prevent long term parking from commuters. In areas where there was a majority support these locations progressed to the statutory consultation phase.</p> <p>In relation to the parking charges at the station car park, this is not owned by the council and we cannot dictate what price is charged.</p>
002201	WHITCHURCH LANE	<p>Formally object to no Saturday parking eastern side Donnefield Ave, as parking will be pushed onto our section of Whitchurch Lane, which currently only has Monday - Friday restrictions. Also will prevent parking for access to Canons Park and Sports lubs in Donnefield Ave.</p> <p>Would also like to suggest rather than all day CPZ in Donnefield Ave to have 2 single hour restrictions Monady to Friday.</p> <p>Station Parade - would suggest minimal Saturday restriction on single yellow line.</p>	<p>Parking on the eastern side of the carriageway has resulted in numerous complaints of obstructive parking due to the insufficient carriageway width. These measures are recommended for progression to ensure emergency service access.</p> <p>Any issues that may arise on Whitchurch Lane will be considered under a separate review relating to Barnet FC using the facilities at the Hive.</p> <p>Saturday controls were not initially supported in the responses received back during the public consultation. Therefore they were not included in the Statutory Consultation.</p>
002206	WHITCHURCH CLOSE	<p>I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines as this area provides as a parking space.</p>	<p>The proposed restrictions are to ensure sufficient access is maintained for the emergency services and for vehicles to be able to turn. They support the well established rule of the Highway Code.</p>
002207	WYCHWOOD AVENUE	<p>Objection to put double yellow lines on the bend and junction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Quiet part of Wychwood Avenue and not many vehicles come round the area. (2) Vehicles parked in this area do not cause any obstructions. (3) Residents and visitors will be forced to park further up the road where the road is narrower. (4) This part of Canons Park does not get congested when there are football matches or other major events at Wembley. Commuting from Canons Park or Stanmore stations. 	<p>The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend.</p>

002208	CORNBURY ROAD	We strongly object to the double yellow lines around the corners of Cornbury Road and Cloyster Wood. We have never had any problem causing obstruction or impaired visibility. Double yellow lines will cause severe inconvenience to us.	The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park on or within 10 m of a junction or on a bend.
002210	GYLES PARK	I am delighted to see that double yellow lines are to be put around the island but very unhappy that they appear not to extend all the way around. I would still have cars parked opposite. Unless they extend all the way around, emergency vehicles & council refuse vehicles will still be blocked. Reversing out is currently dangerous and hugely frustrating.	The extent of the double yellow lines supports the highway code and are proposed on grounds of safety. For amenity related measures to be considered the majority of responses received need to be in support of introducing measures. Officers understand that this is in relation to access however with the existing carriageway width it is felt there is appropriate space for parking on one side.
002213	WHITCHURCH LANE	Strongly object to the double yellow lines extending, they seem to be much longer than any of the other double yellow lines which are mainly around bends and junctions why is this? I can understand it being around the bend and especially near St. Lawrence Close since it is a small road but to have it extend so far up seems excessive at best.	The extent of the double yellow lines have been reviewed by officers and have been shortened, however they cannot be removed completely as they are proposed to protect the island and prevent obstructive parking.
002215	WHITCHURCH LANE	We would like to formally object to the proposal of no Saturday parking in Donnefield Avenue between 8am and 6.30pm. There should be NO Saturday restrictions as it will a) transfer parking onto Whitchurch Lane which currently has Mon. to Fri. limits only, so potentially causing major traffic congestions and b) it will prevent visitors to the area using park and sports clubs. If Saturday restrictions are required then they should be limited to 1 or 2 separate hours.	The hours of controls for Donnefield Avenue are to protect the residents from external parking pressures allowing residents to park within a reasonable distance from their home. Concerns raised over displaced vehicles on Whitchurch Lane have only recently come to light and will be considered as part of a review relating to Barnet FC moving to The Hive. There are other locations around the various park entrances where visitors can still park should they wish to drive to the park.

002216	DU CROS DRIVE	<p>I object to the introduction of a single yellow line parking restrictions on Du Cros Drive.</p> <p>Recently there was a theft from one of my vehicles while it was parked in my driveway and therefore I feel it is essential that our vehicles are parked in our sight. This incident was very expensive to repair and so it is even more essential for us to have parking access outside our house without restrictions and having to pay for permits.</p> <p>As a current full rate payer, I feel the Council is already getting enough funding without having to charge us extra for parking permits.</p> <p>Please inform me of any changes in writing before they are made and any meetings which are being held for this area, so that I am able to express my concerns where possible. I am sure that as a responsible council, we will get a response to this and consultation will be taking place with residents rather than officials taking decisions without a democratic view.</p>	<p>Amenity related controls are only progressed where there is a majority support. In this instance the majority of responses received did feel there was a parking problem on Du Cros Drive with vehicles significantly obstructing traffic flow. The option preferred was for the introduction of single yellow lines.</p> <p>Permits will not be available for residents as what is proposed is a single yellow line not resident permit bays. Therefore there will be no financial burden to residents.</p> <p>Note: The objector will be informed of the TARSAP meeting date and location.</p>
002235	WYCHWOOD AVENUE	<p>Objection - Happy with the proposal with the exception that whilst Double Yellow Lines are being put in place we would request they be extended to the order of an additional thirty feet or so to the curb stone located on the other side of the road to prevent cars parking and obstructing entry and exit from private accesses.</p>	<p>It is not possible to extend the proposed measures significantly without a further statutory consultation. Additionally, should vehicles park blocking a private access a penalty charge notice can be issued, residents are advised to call the parking enforcement team should they experience obstructive parking in the future.</p>

002236	BROMEFIELD	<p>I object to the proposed Parking controls. Having examined the plan of the proposed measures in the vicinity I notice that the proposed Single Yellow Line control (2-3 pm) does not include the part of my Road (Bromefield) in which my house is situated.</p> <p>I feel that the result of the proposed parking controls will cause the displacement of commuter traffic and other residential traffic into the non-controlled areas.</p> <p>This will result in an increase in parked vehicles and an increase in the incidences of illegal, inconsiderate and irresponsible parking such as the partial or complete blocking of driveways, which I already experience from time to time.</p> <p>I feel that the parking controls should be extended and/or residents' parking bays introduced to Bromefield to prevent the above mentioned parking infringements of the Single Yellow Line control (2-3pm) restriction be removed completely in Bromefield.</p>	<p>Displaced parking is possible. Restrictions were only proposed in locations where there was majority support from residents directly fronting the measures; all residents in the area had the option to support such controls.</p> <p>Having considered the comments received from the statutory consultation and lack of support for the proposed single yellow line measure between Bush Grove and Maychurch Close they are not recommended for progression to implementation. In all other areas there was a majority support.</p> <p>Should the parking displace to other, adjacent areas and cause future problems residents are advised to request a review after a period of 3-6 months to allow parking patterns to settle.</p>
002240	WHITCHURCH GARDENS	<p>There is no historic precedent and circumstances have not changed. I have medical condition and need transport close to my front door. If introduced I will have to walk a long distance. By introducing the DYL's parking capacity will be removed by 20%.</p> <p>The council is wasting money as there have been no accidents. The road is wide enough for vehicles to park and although I have a garage it is dilapidated and too far to walk.</p>	<p>The proposals are to maintain access and good visibility for all road users. They are in accordance with the well established rule of the Highway Code, Rule 243.</p> <p>It should however be noted that in reviewing the area officers did feel that due to the unusual bend alignment at the northern end of Whitchurch Gardens the double yellow lines on the bend are not recommended for progression to implementation due to the limited vehicles usage and reasonable visibility maintained.</p>