AP	P	EI	N	D	IX	B

Summary of Response and Engineers Response

FORMAL STATUTORY OBJECTIONS

Ref: 2958 – a) We broadly support the CPZ and adding additional double yellow lines at key areas to improve access. But this proposal will make it worse for us to park anywhere near our home. Unless the lower half of Sussex Road up to Rutland Road can be added to the CPZ we feel that we have to object strongly to the extension.

b) Given there was a consultation on the wider extension scheme last year, we are surprised that this new consultation has happened on Devonshire Road so soon. Surely this raises the possibility of carrying out a consultation on extending the CPZ into Sussex Road.

Ref 2951 – a) This is the third time I would like to object to the scheme, there are no benefits for the car owner; the proposed measures will have a negative impact on the quality of my family's life.

- b) Why doesn't the council come up with a valid reason why this scheme should go ahead? The council is trying to increase revenue through permit fees whilst residents are struggling with finances. Please consider the local residents as we are struggling with finances.
- c) There are no problems with commuters and shoppers during the day. The only time I've experienced a problem is when there is an event at the community centre late at night. These measures will force me to sell my car which will have a negative impact on my family's life

Eng. Response

Noted and agreed – However the residents of Sussex Road when consulted did not wish to be included in a CPZ.

It was agreed by the panel to postpone works on Devonshire Road and to carry out a small localised statutory consultation again on Devonshire Road as petitions were received from residents of Devonshire Road who previously did not wish to be included in the CPZ who had changed their minds and wanted to be included in the CPZ extension.

Noted – With the introduction of a CPZ commuter parking will be removed which will free up road space making it easier for residents and visitors to find parking spaces closer to their properties during the day and on their return from work. It does not guarantee a parking space for the resident.

CPZ schemes are led by the residents and businesses in the area and not the council. The money generated from these schemes help to make them self-financing, any extra money which is generated helps to fund freedom passes for residents of Harrow.

Noted – The proposed measures help address the concerns of the majority of residents that responded to the consultation. With new large developments in the area the demand for on-street parking will increase making parking more difficult for residents returning from work in the afternoon.

COMMENTS

Ref: 2949 – a) Could you make it one way street and put in speeds humps to slow traffic down.

b) Extend the hours you cannot park to Saturday and Sunday and make it longer in the

No – There was not a majority support for this in the early consultations and as this was not part of this statutory consultation it cannot be considered as part of this process.

As this was not part of this statutory consultation it cannot be considered as

week to not park or so people cannot park hour	part of this process. The 1hr restriction was		
in the morning and hour in the afternoon.	favoured by those that responded to earlier		
in the morning and node in the alternoon.	consultations.		
Ref: 2950 – a) It is difficult to park outside my	Noted – (also see ref : 2951 (a))		
property during the day due to commuter	Noted – (also see ref. 2931(a))		
parking. This makes parking difficult for those			
1			
with small children or mobility issues.			
b) I am in favour of the CPZ extension and hope	Noted		
· ·	Noted		
that it is approved asap. Ref: 2953 – My wife is disabled and has a	A disable hav can only be provided if the		
disabled parking badge. If the CPZ is extended	A disable bay can only be provided if the council's criteria for a disabled bay is met.		
then I would like a disabled bay	A CPZ usually removes non-resident		
then I would like a disabled bay	parking and hence will free up more road		
	space making it easier to find a parking		
	place closer to ones your property. It does		
	not guarantee a parking space for the		
	resident.		
Ref: 2954 – My partner and I will be forced to	Noted and agreed – Unfortunately a CPZ		
pay for 1hr per week as that is the only time we	scheme such as this cannot be tailor made		
are at home. My day off is Wednesday and	to suit the needs of all parties.		
hence will be at home. Therefor would be	to suit the fleeds of all parties.		
paying the cost for 1hr per week.			
Ref: 2955 – Due to commuter parking problems	The introduction of the CPZ will remove		
people are prevented from going out as we are	commuter parking and free up road space		
unlikely to get parking on our return	making if easier for residents to find		
drinkery to got parking on our return	parking spaces. It does not guarantee		
	however a parking space for the resident. It		
	does not guarantee a parking space for the		
	resident.		
Ref: 2959 – a) We support the extension of the	Noted		
CPZ and look forward to its additional extension			
into Sussex Road in the next round of			
consultation.			
b) The proposed double yellow lines on the	The yellow lines are being Implemented on		
bend should not be implemented they will aid	the bend to allow vehicle to pass each		
through movement.	other on the bend safely.		
c) With the existing yellow line on the bend we	Disagree - The proposed yellow lines		
have seen a significant i <mark>ncr</mark> ease in speed.	would enable vehicles to pull in to allow on-		
Visibility on the bend is limited more by 1,	coming traffic to pass safely. The		
Sussex Road than by parked vehicles.	restrictions on the bend will also improve		
Introducing double yellow lines at the bend of	sightlines and prevent obstructive parking.		
Devonshire Road/Sussex Road will help to			
increase vehicular speeds creating a safety			
hazard. It is inappropriate to implement anything			
which will increase speeds.	N. () T. () ()		
Ref: 2960 – a) Length of existing time needs to	Noted - The 1hr restriction was favoured by		
I ha naviavvad ja kaaning viilla alban CD7 naan			
be reviewed in keeping with other CPZ near	those that responded to earlier		
towns centres.	those that responded to earlier consultations (also see ref: 2494 (b)).		
towns centres.	consultations (also see ref: 2494 (b)).		
towns centres. b) I object to double yellow lines outside 61,	consultations (also see ref: 2494 (b)). Noted – plans revised to show single		
towns centres.	consultations (also see ref: 2494 (b)).		

c) I Object to the additional double yellow lines	The double yellows at this location were
between 61 Devonshire Road and the bend if they are provided to allow access, as they are	not proposed to facilitate access to off street parking; they are intended to allow
not needed that can provide 2 parking spaces.	vehicles to pull in to allow vehicles to pass
	each other safely on the bend. Safety
	outweighs the need for parking spaces.
	Vehicles should not be parked on a bend as in accordance with the highway code
	one should not park on a bend (rule 243).
Ref: 2961 – I am the owner of 61, Devonshire	Note: Plan amended to show revised
Road, I object to having double yellow line outside my garage. I rather have a single yellow	layout.
line, because residents would loose one parking	
space.	
Ref: 2964 – a) In favour of CPZ to discourage	Noted
commuter parking as I am unable to park near my home during the day.	
Thy home during the day.	
b) The no waiting at any time restrictions on the	The limited parking restriction on the west
bend are not necessary. The existing restrictions on the west side are enough to	side is inadequate and parking on the bend
facilitate safe passing.	creates a bottle neck and sight lines are obstructed by parked vehicles right up to
Turning our parenty.	the bend. The new restrictions will improve
	sight lines as well as to facilitate a safe
	passing place.
c) Commuters, local businesses and residential	The extension of the CPZ will help to
developments which do not have access to	address this problem. However It is
parking, park their vehicles in the un-restricted sections of Devonshire Road and surrounding	important to note that a CPZ does not guarantee a parking space for the resident.
roads for long periods at a time.	guarantee a parking space for the resident.
d) Parking problems have been exacerbated by	Noted
the introduction of the existing CPZ in Dorset Road and part of Oxford Road	
e) There are no spaces in the morning at the	The extension of the CPZ will help to
northern end of Devonshire Road and Sussex Road, while there are spaces in the CPZ area.	address this problem.
f) Parking is impossible during the day. Current	Finding a parking space would become a
situation is affecting my quality of life and my daily activities are being hampered.	lot easier with the extension of the CPZ.
daily activities are being flampered.	
g) Extend the hours of no parking	As this was not part of this statutory
_	consultation it cannot be considered as
	part of this process. The agreed hours of restriction were between 11-12noon Mon-
	Fri to introduce different times would
	require another statutory consultation to be
	undertaken. The 1hr restriction removes
	commuter parking and creates the least inconvenience to residents.
Ref: 2965 – Strongly in favour of CPZ as	inconvenience to residents.
Ref. 2905 – Strongly in lavour of CF2 as	Noted

<u>APPENDIX B</u>

Two formal objections from a resident of Devonshire Road and Sussex Road. Details have been summarised in the table.

We - I would like to make a formal objection to the extension of the County Roads parking zone U to include all of Devonshire Road.

The reason for our objection is the same reason that we objected to the wider extension of the County Roads parking zone in August 2012.

Residential parking on Sussex Road is already a nightmare, and we believe highly likely to get worse with the Neptune point development and the development at the junction of Devonshire road and Pinner Road. Extending the CPZ to the end of Devonshire road will simply push all the non resident (and indeed resident) parking further into Sussex Road, and the northern ends of Oxford, Rutland and Bedford roads. This will make parking substantially worse for all residents of the county roads who do not live in the CPZ but will affect us especially as we live on the corner where Sussex Road meets Devonshire Road.

We broadly support the the CPZ and adding additional double yellow lines to key areas to improve access. But this proposal will make it much more difficult for us to park anywhere near our home. So unless Sussex Road or at least the lower half of Sussex Road up to Rutland Road can be added to the CPZ we feel we have to object most strongly to the extension.

Given that there was an consultation on a wider extension scheme last year, we are a bit surprised that this new consultation has happened on Devonshire Road so soon. Surely this raises the possibility of carrying out a consultation on extending the CPZ into Sussex Road?



I STRUNGY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL.

THIS IS THE 3PD TIME IN THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS THAT I VOULD LIKE TO STRONGLY OPPOSE TO THE SCHOME TO ETTOND THE PARKING RESTRICTED ZONES ALONG DEVENOSHIRS ROAD. COMMENTS - Please use additional sheets if you need to INSTEAD OF RESIDENTS HAVING TO OPPOSE THE SCHOME, WHY DOESN'T THE COUNCIL COME UP WITH SOME VALID REASONS WHYTHESCHEME SHOULD GO AVIONO? BE HOUEST NOW, IT IS SO YOU CAN INCREASE REVENUE FOR THE COUNCIL THROUGH PERMIT FEES ISN'T IT? THE EXCUSINY IS BAD AND TIMES ARE TOUGH AND EVERYOUE IS LOOKING TO SEE HOW WE GOUD SAVE MONEY OR EMPA A LITTLE MORE , AREN'T WE? WELL , PLEASE CONSIDER THE LOCAL RESIDENTS AS WE ARE ALSO STRUGGLING WITH FINANCES AWA THE EXTENSION IS JUST A WAY THE TO SQUEEZE A LITTLE BIT MORE MONEY FROM US. "BUT, DOBSN'T SHE THE BENEFITS FOR ALL RESIDENTS," I HEAR YOU SAY, ARE THE BENEFITS OF CHARGING ME \$62.40 A YEAR? I CAN CONFIRM THAT WHEN I HAVE BEEN ON HOLIDAY, THERE ARE STILL PLENTY OF PARKING SPACES AVAILABLE ON THE STREET SO THORE ARE NO PROBLEMS WITH COMMUTERS PARTICING THEIR CAR THEN WATHING TO THE UNDERGROUND STATION. THERE ARE NO PROBLEMS WITH SHOPPERS PARKLING DURING THE HAM- 12PM PROPOSED I USE MY CAR TO COLLECT MY WIFE FROM THE TUBE STATION LATE AT NIGHT. SHE PINISHES WORK AT 10 PM AND ARRIVES AT THE STATION ARDUND 11 PM.
SHE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE WORLDWAY WALLING HOME AT THIS TIME AS SHE HAS
SHE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE WORLDWAY WALLING HOME AT THIS TIME AS SHE HAS
BEEN A VICTUM OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR. I ALSO USE MY CAR TO VISIT ELDERLY RELATIVES IN GANTS HILL AND PERFORM OUD TORS FOR THEM. IN ALL THE YEARS I HAVE LIVED IN DENONSHIRERDTHE AR ONLY PROBLEMS I HAVE HAD PARKING IS WHEN THERE IS AN EVENT ON THE COMMUNITY CONTRO ON PINNER ROAD LATE AT NIGHT WHEN OLIETING MY WIFE FROM THE STATION. SO AGRIN, WHY IMPOSE RESTRICTIONS BETWEEN LIAM-12PM? THIS IS SOLEY TO TAX CAR OWNERS WHO NEEDTO LEAVE THEIR CAR AT HOME TO COMMUTE TO WORK. I ALBORDY PAY \$199 ZONUE 1-5 TRAVEL CARD TO TEL BACH MONTH, I HAVE A PAY FREEZE OVER THE PAST YEAR, FOOD AND PETRO PRICES HAVE INCREMENT, NOW YOU WILL ASK PUNISH TAX PAYING CAR OWNERS WITH THIS NEW SCHEME. \$62.40 MAY NOT SEEM LIKE A LOT OF MONEY, BUT IAM SURE THE THOUGHT THE \$10 INCROSE TO MY TRAVEL CARD WISN'T ALOT, NEITHER DID THE CURPORMARKET WHEN MY RODDWILLIS INCREASED BY \$15 PER WEEK. I WOULD LIKE TO STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PLAN, THERE ARE NO BOUEFITS TO CAR OWNERS WHO HAVE TO COMMUTER AND ET WILL BE SCHEMES LIKE THIS WHICH WILL EVENTUALLY FORCE ME TO GET RID OF MY CAR WHICH WILL SUBSECTION THE VERY NEGHTIVE IMPACT ON THE QUALITY OF FAMILY'S