APPENDIX C - Summary Table of Public responses/comments

Road	Reference No:	Comments
ANSELM ROAD		
	3094	Wants to see Mon - Fri days of operation (not Mon - Sat due to visitors arriving on Sat). Felt that the plans were not clear to understand Asks why we need to change anything when on 19.4% respond to the survey
	3331	Asia why we need to change dryaming when on 15.476 reapond to the survey
	3091	Comments that the parking in Anselm Road is due to the shops. Feels that times between restriction will be busy for parking. Comments that restriction times of twice a day will punish residents + making them pay for visitors. Feels that people will still park there.
	3090	Asks if there is a reason why no bays outside No's 16, 18 and 20?
	3089	Supports measures but suggests the bay outside his house "No 10" be made smaller.
	3088	Support the measures for parking controls in Anselm Road to eliminate long term parking
	3085	Main issue is the parking from the shoppers, thinks Mon-Sat 9am - 6pm residents parking would be better. Wants DYL on east side of Anselm 13 residents bays no sufficient for Anselm Road
	3084	Asks if there will be parking wardens to patrol any new measures.

	3083	Wants to see parking meters for the service road bays in Uxbridge Road
	3200	Experience very few problems with parking and have lived there 20 years
	3082	Says only Dove Park and Westfield Park are fully parked so no need for proposals on Anselm Road. Suggest we should only consult these residents
BRAESIDE CLOSE		
	3038	Wanted to see just 1 hour in the morning restriction and a Mon - Fri restriction
CHERRY CROFT GARDENS		
	3031	Wanted to see two more spaces (not single yellow line) in-front of No's. 15 and 17 Cherry Croft Gardens
	0001	Wanted to see two more spaces (not single yellow line) in-nont of Nos. 13 and 17 oneny oroit dardens
DEVONSHIRE ROAD		
	3154	Does not see a need for the proposals. Does not have a problem parking. Now concerned about having to pay for a permit + concerned about her guests parking. Has said this before in the first letters.
	3160	Is not aware of commuters parking in Devonshire Road. Says that high parking demand is due to density of housing in Devonshire Road Existing residents with off-street parking facilities are not using them due to convenience Considers the money to be better spent elsewhere.
	3162	Finds it unacceptable to pay for a parking in their road, they already pay council tax, road tax. Their view is that all councils consider residents as cash cows, if this is not the case then why would the council not issue permits as part of the council

	3157	Feels that the scheme should also be implemented for adjacent roads to Devonshire Road and Wellington Road otherwise it will displace cars to these other roads
DOVE PARK		
	3123	Feels that the new measures will ease congestion and access to and from dove Park at school drop off/pick up times.
	3127	Suggested free on street parking bays behind the tower blocks
	3129	Worried about not being able to park near to her flat due to having a mobility problem. Confirms that a GP will be writing to us. Does have a blue badge but feels that a personal disabled bay is required.
	3134	Feels that one side of Dove Park is a separate development with no attachment to No's 1 - 53. Wants a guarantee that the Council with monitor the situation is measures are implemented. Feels that the proposals are a waste of time
	3136	Not keen on parking restrictions
	3137	Feels that the position of the existing/proposed single yellow lines shown for the entrance on both sides to Dove Park is incorrect from the plans
	3138	Highlights support for the CPZ measures due to the commuter parking problems encountered + other safety issues caused by congestion. Feels that it will help access to and from her property
	3141	Led to believe that they would have free parking and own space to park when they recently bought their house.
	3142	Doesn't have a car but understands the problems with parking. Asks if there is any point in having the dropped kerb crossing on the bend within Dove Park, not sure if anyone uses it?

3144	Wants clarification of what is private land as there is a "Private" sign shown for part of Dove Park. Questioning why the sign is located if it is not private and why the council has not maintained the road. Asked if they will need to pay for a permit as an additional charge.
	Wants to see the proposed afternoon restriction to be changed to 4-5pm (not 3-4pm).
3145	Comparis an aming a solution in the control of the
3143	Supports morning restriction between 10-11am.
3125	Wants to see a no right turn from the Station, so that they use the Morrisons R'Bout. Suggests a speed camera on the Uxbridge Road section. Mentions that there is a number of existing Blue badge holders in Dove Park
3126	Request that we consider implementing a disabled bay outside flats 88-119 for a neighbour Ms Vera Bond.
3116	Concerned that there will not be residential permit parking (as opposed to CPZ proposals?) Officer comment: did not understand the proposed measures and implications in relation to the above comment
3115	Feels that the 3-4pm afternoon restriction is not right. It would need to be later as the school children are picked up later. Also feels that there are safety issues in Dove Park from the parking at this time and that access becomes difficult as a result
3114	Highlights that she is 97 years old and has a carer. Asked if a special permit is available for them
2956	Doesn't want the CPZ restriction times to apply on Saturday

	3146	Suggests that a 4-5pm restriction (to replace the proposed 3-4pm) will be better as this is the peak time. Wants to see the plans retain the existing space between the garages
OAKDENE CLOSE		
	3107	Not allowing enough parking for residents in Oakdene Close. Feels that the proposals allow for commuters and shoppers to park there
	3098	Does not support the proposed plan
	3109	Seeking clarification to see if they can park in the residents bays and on restricted times single yellow line as a Blue Badge Holder
	3112	Feels that the proposals are a good idea
	3110	Highlights that people are still parking on existing double yellow line on the corner of Oakdene Close
	3099	Comment was "people are using our drive to parking areas"
SYLVIA AVENUE		
	3179	Could not understand why various roads (Grimsdyke Road, Could not be included)
THE AVENUE		
	3073	See's no reason to change parking arrangements and see's no problem with residents leaving their cars there all day
	3050	Highlights the poor quality of the road surfacing in The Avenue
	3049	Asked about resurfacing the Avenue
	3059	Keen to see measures implemented ASAP

3067	Feels that the 1 hour afternoon restriction is NOT required and that the morning 1 hour restriction will suffice
3058	Keen to see measures implemented ASAP
3060	Keen to see measures implemented ASAP
3066	Happy with proposals
3068	Says that there is an urgent need to re-surface "The Avenue" prior to painting yellow lines
3069	Does not want to see or support the 1 hour afternoon restriction Does not see the need for DYL's in The Avenue
3070	Worried about displacement parking if proposals are implemented Worried about the impact on visiting friends and family Do not want to see any restrictions outside their house/road
3072	Doesn't support because he is concerned about where the residents will park now.
3075	Does not support because they feel that there will be nowhere to park. Wants to see residential parking permission allowed.
3076	Feel that a CPZ from Mon-Fri will be sufficient (Not Mon -Sat). Wants free parking permits - to charge is daylight robbery
3077	Unfair to charge residents for a permit. Should just provide Double yellow lines at junctions
3078	Can not afford to pay for a residents parking permit
3079	Does not support Mon - Sat, proposals should show Mon - Fri restrictions
3080	Has not experienced any congestion or problem with parking in The Avenue Doest want to see a parking bay outside the property Waste of money + increase in cost of living

WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
3061 Wants to see Mon - Fri controls (Not Mon - Sat) Happy with the current situation without parking controls Has not experienced any issues THORNDYKE COURT 3034 Welcomed double yellow line proposals and supported measures WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close, commuters will park there		0001	Sees the scheme as pointless and a money making exercise for the Council.
Happy with the current situation without parking controls Has not experienced any issues THORNDYKE COURT 3034 Welcomed double yellow line proposals and supported measures WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3081	Questions why Walpole Close and Cedar drive are not included.
Happy with the current situation without parking controls Has not experienced any issues THORNDYKE COURT 3034 Welcomed double yellow line proposals and supported measures WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3061	Wante to coo Man. Fri controle (Not Man. Sat)
THORNDYKE COURT 3034 Welcomed double yellow line proposals and supported measures WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3001	wants to see Mon - 1-11 Controls (Not Mon - Sat)
WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3074	
WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
WALPOLE CLOSE Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there	THORNDYKE COURT		
Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3034	Welcomed double yellow line proposals and supported measures
Sees no need for restriction as everything is working well. Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there	WALPOLE CLOSE		
Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the residents Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
Thinks the parking restrictions should end at Cedar Drive instead of going to Royston Grove. Agrees to proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3149	Suggests that the scheme will serve only to earn money for the local authority at the expense of the
proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty. Also suggests speed bumps Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			- Tobachia
3152 Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there		3150	proposals other than that. Feels that there are too many disabled parking bays in Hatch End of which 80% remain empty.
3152 Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there			
3148 Wants to see restricted parking in Walpole Close + double yellow lines on the corners.		3152	Highlights support for DYL's at the corner of Walpole Close. Comments that without controlled measures in Walpole Close, commuters will park there
		3148	Wants to see restricted parking in Walpole Close + double yellow lines on the corners.
WESTFIELD PARK	WESTFIELD PARK		

3023	If proposals go ahead: Requested that a double yellow line (not single) outside Elm Hatch be installed Requested that proposed proposed single yellow outside St Anselms Church be changed to a residents parking bays as it's the only place to park without o
	Concerned with current parking arrangements. Asked for a disabled parking space
3014	Wanted to see double yellow lines outside his block
3021	Suggested harrow update OS Basemaps
3025	Not supporting proposals due to lack visitor parking at any time by their entrance Feels that parking will do nothing for the area + it's there to raise revenue
3019	Supports proposals but wanted to see yellow lines instead of the proposed bay located just north of Oakdene Close
3018	Concerned with single yellow line across his access and wanted conformation that vehicles will not park there outside controlled hours
3017	Welcomes the changes due to the existing parking problems Concerned with access in and out of Westfield Park. Wants to see the bay just north of Oakdene Court replaced with double yellow lines because Westfield Park is too narrow
3026	Asked if we have considered a one way system around the full extents of Westfield Park
3015	Concerned with access in and out of Westfield Park. Wants to see the two bays near Elm Hatch and Oakdene Court replaced with double yellow lines to ease this
3013	Suggested Mon-Fri restriction (not Mon-Sat as proposed) Expressed concern regarding provisions for Church Parking. Doesn't want to pay for a parking permit.
3016	Highlights the increased demand in parking in recent years. + highlights the commuter parking + parking from the shoppers Welcomed parking control measures

-	
3027	Does not see any need for change as he does experience any parking problems himself. Does not want to see a single yellow line outside his house or pay for a permit
3028	Supports parking proposals but only wants 1 hour in the morning restriction (feels this will suffice) Feels the 1 hour morning and 1 hour afternoon restriction will impinge on residents and visitors unessasarily
3029	Wanted to object on the basis on the cost of a second permit being too high Doesn't support or feel that the 1 hour in the afternoon and the Saturday restrictions are necessary
3036	Requested that double yellow lines are provided (not single) outside No's 55 - 60 Elm Hatch
3037	Questioned the Mon - Sat restriction, wants to see Mon - Fri restriction as this is adequate
3043	Comments that a 1 hour morning restriction will suffice
3044	Suggested commuter facility be provided at the Morrisons car park Felt that the resident permit price was too high
3045	Requested Mon - Fri restriction (as being sufficient), Not Mon Sat
3046	Does not support any of the CPZ areas Feels that a charge for a permit is another way of accruing money from residents Suggested that the first parking permit be free.
3048	Highlighted concerns about displacement parking to near-by streets. Suggested free resident permits Commented that permits would not guarantee a parking space
3202	A single restricted time for 2-3 hours would be more convenient for residents visitors. The cost for 2nd, 3rd etc car permits + annual fee penalises residents further
3035	Wanted to see the 1 hour afternoon restriction removed. Concerned with commuter parking displacement just outside the proposed zone