

APPENDIX E

Comments	Officer Response
<u>AMBERLEY CLOSE</u>	
Thank you for the documents outlining the Pinner Parking Review which I totally support.	Positive response
<u>ASHRIDGE GARDENS</u>	
We very very strongly object to the new parking restrictions intended to be ??? In near future in Holwell Place and Ashridge Gardens because the width of these two roads is too narrow for the permit holders to ???? To ???? Where they are parked with permit and yet (the very wide vehicle which empties waste bins) the ambulances to be able to come in to park in front of an elderly persons home and disabled persons home who are quite few in these two roads, unless the council insist on generating their revenue from the parking permits, in which case, this objections would not reach the greedy deaf ears of the council officials. Previous object was received about the removal of the disabled bays in Ashridge Gardens but this was removed when it was explained that they were not being removed and staying as they are.	Resident originally objected to something that wasn't happening so officer asked for clarification and withdrawal of objection which was done however this subsequent objection was received. Ashridge Gardens and Howell Place were considered as one for consultation analysis. Majority from public consultation wanted all day restrictions.
I should like to raise some objections to the above proposal to vary the current Controlled Parking Zones, specifically in Zone A. The particular changes to which I object are those proposed in Area 11. May I point out that the map of Area 11 is confusing as Residents' Permit Bays are not shown in blue as indicated by the key, but green suggesting that there are none and that existing bays will be replaced by extended double yellow lines? I support double yellow lines at the intersection of Ashridge Gardens and Holwell place. I have spoken to your office about this error but the online maps do not appear to have been corrected. These must remain available as parking bays. Objection: The pre-amble to the proposals states in note 2 that "The general effect of the orders would be to make MINOR extensions to the existing Pinner CPZ A". Extending the hours in Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place from 5 hours per week to 63 hours is far from minor. Requiring residents of a residential street to purchase permits to park outside their own homes, particularly at weekends, is exploitative and unacceptable. Alternative proposal: Parking restrictions within the proposed Zone A5 should be 11-12am and 3-4pm Monday – Friday only. This is consistent with the original "Parking in Pinner" scheme, the aim of which was to restrict commuters from parking here all day. Further, this suggestion may be cheaper to enforce. No reason for the changes is given in the proposal – it details the changes but does not say why. I am left with the impression that the only reason is to increase revenue from the sale of permits, particularly from those residents who have no choice.	Plan comments noted Ashridge Gardens and Howell Place were considered as one for consultation analysis. Majority from public consultation wanted all day restrictions. Most properties in road have a garage and some off street parking.
I would like to make an objection to the proposals to introduce a controlled parking zone in Ashridge Gardens which will be operational Monday-Saturday 8.00am-6.30pm. The current parking restrictions work very well, and the proposed change will greatly inconvenience	Ashridge Gardens and Howell Place were considered as one for consultation analysis. Majority from public consultation wanted all day restrictions Most properties in road have a garage and some off street parking.

APPENDIX E

<p>residents without providing any benefits. Visitors and tradespeople will not be able to park on the road at all during the day, causing problems for them and for residents. In addition, this will prevent residents from parking in the road at times outside the current 11.00am-12.00pm restrictions, which will be highly problematic. The current system prevents commuters from parking all day, which is quite sufficient to manage the parking in the road, and this should be maintained.</p>	
<p>I strongly disagree with the consultation proposal c) (controlled zone Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm) in respect of Ashridge Gardens. It would be very inconvenient for residents in Ashridge Gardens if the parking control hours were extended beyond the current Mon-Fri 11am-12pm, as we would not be able to park anywhere in the road ourselves in the daytime except on a Sunday and neither our visitors nor any tradespeople would be able to park. The current daytime arrangements in Ashridge Gardens are fine, and any further restrictions would be detrimental to residents. Please do not make the proposed change (c) to the controlled parking zone in Ashridge Gardens.</p> <p>Also, it is not clear what is proposed in respect of Ashridge Gardens under proposal i) (double yellow lines), but please do not introduce these on either the gentle bend on the road or on any other part of the carriageway. This is not necessary and would reduce the parking available to residents, visitors and tradespeople. The road is quiet, as it is a small cul-de-sac, and can deal with the relatively small number of vehicle movements to and fro without needing any additional restrictions on the carriageway.</p>	<p>Ashridge Gardens and Howell Place were considered as one for consultation analysis. Majority from public consultation wanted all day restrictions. Most properties in road have a garage and some off street parking. Double yellow lines being introduced oat junction Howell Place and Ashridge Gardens only</p>
<p><u>AVENUE ROAD</u></p>	
<p>I am now confirming my concerns in an e-mail.</p> <p>On page 6 of the Pinner Area Parking Review - Public Consultation gave an example of CPZ bays and yellow line markings approximately 1.5m excess gap on both sides of driveways cross over for visibility and manoeuvring purposes. It appears that this will be the case on the north side of our drive only (Drawing no T/DWG/000731/007) and on the other side it will be left unmarked.</p> <p>We already have residents' parking bays directly opposite our drive and a bend close by that many drivers cut. This means that when vehicles park close to our driveway cross over not only do we have very limited visibility especially with large vans and cars but we have very little room to manoeuvre with vehicles coming either way in the middle of the road. We have had to live with this hazard but had hoped that the new parking restrictions would take account of this danger and at least leave a gap on both sides of our drive.</p> <p>Could I also mention that the present layout of the road between the junction of Love Lane and Bridge Street and the end of the shops in Love Lane often causes traffic to come to a standstill due to parking.</p> <p>I believe unless the proposed loading bays, pay and display bays and disabled bays are all positioned one side of the road, congestion will continue. Remember this area of road is the main access to and from the car park.</p>	<p>Actual position of parking bays will be investigated during the detailed design stage before installation and the length and position may change to accommodate specific site conditions and resident comments.</p> <p>Positioning bays on one side or both sides as proposed would make no difference and at least with the proposals the parking is more formalised.</p> <p>The loading bay would be used intermittently so it is anticipated that this would cause minimal disruption but would be an important amenity for the local shops and businesses.</p>
<p>I have received the Statutory Consultation document and studied the proposals.</p> <p>The proposals for the short stretch of road at the bottom of Love Lane between the M&S Car</p>	<p>A combination of Pay and Display (P&D) bays with a repositioning of the disabled parking together with an At any time loading restriction should provide a</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Park and the junction with Bridge Street (your Map Area 7) will serve only to legitimise what people do now illegally and in no way will that make this difficult road any better. At present there is parking for those with Blue Badges on one side of the street (outside Bradley and Jones Funeral Director) and for permit holders further up on the other side near the Catholic Church. But others park illegally (usually people who want to "pop" to the cash machine) or Blue Badge holders park outside the designated bays (because the bays are full or they can't / wont cross the street) frequently making this road into a single lane. This doesn't happen occasionally but is the norm most of the day. As the road curves at this point it is possible for people to enter from both ends at once (not being able to see the other is approaching) and thus meet head to head. As more cars come in behind it is difficult to back up and I have frequently seen difficult situations arise here - including some road rage. If loading bays are added and pay and display bays on both side plus Blue Badge bays on both side the end of Love Lane will be single lane traffic for much of the day and things will remain difficult or get worse.</p> <p>I was hoping that parking (of any sort) would be made clearly one side only thus leaving the Love Lane as a two way lane. I was also hoping for more vigorous enforcement to keep the way clearer of illegal parkers. At the moment people know the Traffic Wardens only appear between 1100 and 1200 so they are happy to risk it outside this hour.</p> <p>One other thing: why are some of the new areas to be included into the CPZ being made Monday to Saturday inclusive? I thought the point of the CPZ was to stop the commuters leaving their cars all day during the week but surely this isn't a problem on a Saturday? It will be harder for people to get a grip of which bit of street they can park on and which bit they can't - not very helpful.</p> <p>Thank you for doing your best to sort out the very tricky problem of parking on our streets</p>	<p>much more organised parking situation which should provide better flow of traffic through the area at busy times. It will also allow easier enforcement of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Some areas within the consultation area asked the council to consider longer or different restrictive periods during the day as residents thought this would help with particular parking issues they had including increasing problems on Saturdays with non resident parking. It was not imposed by the council directly.</p>
<p>Further to our telephone call today I am contacting you on behalf of Pinner Methodist Church in respect of the Pinner Area Parking Review.</p> <p>It would appear from your information both online and at Pinner Library that there may have been an error in respect of the parking surrounding the church. Pinner Methodist Church is located at the junction of Love Lane and Avenue Road and has off street parking located at the front of the church, with drop kerbs into both Avenue Road and Love Lane.</p> <p>The plans appear to show an extension to the resident parking bays in Avenue Road, which will extend in front of our drop kerb. It would be much appreciated if you could check your records and have the details amended accordingly.</p> <p>We would, however, appreciate it if the council could extend the double yellow lines in both Love Lane and Avenue Road to cover the church's drop kerbs. We are continually experiencing problems with cars parking across the drives. This area is used for parking both wedding and funeral cars, along with cars for our church members who are disabled or less able to walk. As I am sure you can appreciate it becomes very difficult if we are unable to gain access to the drive due to the ignorance of other drivers, who appear not to realise that the drop kerb indicates a drive!</p> <p>We hope that you will be in a position to support our request as it would make a big</p>	<p>Reduction of the size of proposed extension to the existing permit bay and an extension of the proposed double yellow line can be accommodated during detailed design as church itself is the immediately affected property and it will not affect the number of existing permit parking bays.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>difference to the church members.</p>	
<p>BARROW POINT AVENUE</p>	
<p>Please note there is now regular parking of vehicles by station users on Paines Lane – just beyond the width restrictor near the junction with Barrow Point Avenue. This is extremely dangerous. It has always been a difficult spot since the introduction of the width restrictor so close to the Barrow Point exit – cars emerging from BP Avenue have no line of vision to the left into Paines Lane. This spot is now even worse as any vehicle travelling along Paines Lane towards Pinner High Street have to travel on the wrong side of the road in order to go around the parked vehicles. Please consider a CPZ at the area so close to the width restrictor or remove the width restrictor in order to make this area safe.</p>	<p>There are double yellow lines proposed at the junction of Barrow Point Avenue and Paines Lane through the width restriction to improve visibility and remove obstructive parking adjacent to the width restriction.</p>
<p>BARROWDENE CLOSE</p>	
<p>Would you please make the following changes. 1) period of no parking 5 days a week Monday to Friday. Please do not include Saturday. 2) add double yellow line (no parking at any time) on the left hand side of the road entering the close from Paines Lane to the bottom T junction. Also return entrance to car park and the lamp post on the right side.</p>	<p>Initial proposal was in direct response to previous consultation results. Reduced hours proposed following objection Double yellow lines are not proposed at these locations as it is hoped the residents will park sensibly once the non-resident vehicles are removed during the control periods. It will also remove the available on-street parking for residents themselves. Drivers are reminded that they have a responsibility under the rules of the Highway Code not to park in such a way as to cause an obstruction</p>
<p>I have read in detail, the information on the inclusion of Barrowdene Close in the Parking controlled plan, not just the leaflet but also the notice on the lamppost in the Close. I am a Disabled Driver in possession of a Blue Badge but I have a close friend who also acts as my carer who spends time helping me during the day. It was not very clear from your notice exactly what visitor permits I would be able to acquire not only for my carer friend but for my children who visit me, sometimes for a day or two at a time. Please would you be able to clarify the cost, if any, of these permits this for me as I am an OAP on a limited income.</p>	<p>Link to information on Harrow Website was sent to resident. http://www.harrow.gov.uk/info/200190/parking_permits/271/visitors_parking_permits Also informed resident that as blue badge holder they do not need to purchase a resident parking permit if they need one themselves and can park in any resident permit bay/area in Harrow free of charge providing the blue badge is displayed.</p>
<p>I wish to object the Monday- Saturday 11.00-12.00 No parking at Barrowdene Close. I will however agree to the mon-Friday 11.00-12.00 Restrictions. The reason being that I will not be parking our close on a Saturday and we have visitors and workers coming on Saturday.</p>	<p>Initial proposal was in direct response to previous consultation results. Reduced hours proposed following objection</p>
<p>BEECHEN GROVE</p>	
<p>With regard to introduction of extended CPZ to include Amberley Close and double yellow lines along stretch of Moss Lane from Amberley Close to Beechengrove. I am objecting to the omission of Beechengrove from the CPZ. The reason I am objecting is that by omitting Beechengrove from the CPZ you are pushing all the cars at present parking during the day along the stretch of Moss Lane between Amberley Close and Beechen Grove into our very narrow cul-de-sac.</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening. Amberley Close residents requested some controls during the public consultation, hence why a CPZ is proposed for their road.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>This will affect access into all the houses in the close. In the case of our house (No 3) which is opposite No 8, where a disabled person resides, any cars parked between No 2 and 3 severely restrict reversing access into No 8. Similarly, delivery vans, workmen, refuse collectors and visitors to Beechengrove would be affected on a daily basis as turning spaces will be restricted as it will be difficult for any large vehicles to negotiate small spaces when cars are parked along the road-side. In addition, cars currently parking outside our house, (no 1), make it extremely difficult for us to exit our small driveway because of the narrow road. In addition, I am objecting to the introduction of a CPZ as this will prevent us from parking in Moss Lane. Our house(no 1) is on the corner of Moss Lane and Beechengrove and has only sufficient frontage to park two cars. We require parking for four cars for our family. In order to support the CPZ in Moss Lane, we would require that the council allocate two free permit parking spaces reserved for only our house on the corner of Beechengrove and Moss Lane. Without this, we will be negatively affected by the introduction of the CPZ as we will not be able to park in close proximity to our house. We hope that you will consider the affect of the CPZ on all residents in Beechengrove.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines in Moss Lane are to restrict dangerous and inconsiderate parking on the narrow route through the borough. There would be no permits issued for parking on double yellow lines regardless if it was in a CPZ or not. The well established rules of the Highway Code state that no-one should park within 10 metres of a junction. The proposed double yellow lines into Beechen Grove extend slightly further than this due to the narrowness of the road. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own per household or park on the public highway. This resident supported the introduction of parking controls during the public consultation.</p>
<p>With regard to introduction of extended CPZ to include Amberley Close and double yellow lines along stretch of Moss Lane from Amberley Close to Beechengrove. I am objecting to the omission of Beechengrove from the CPZ. The reason I am objecting is that by omitting Beechengrove from the CPZ you are pushing all the cars at present parking all day along this stretch of Moss Lane into our tiny cul-de-sac. This will affect delivery vans, workmen, refuse collectors and visitors to Beechengrove on a daily basis (M-F). While the double yellow lines will make this stretch of Moss Lane safer for those of us exiting Beechengrove, the omission from the CPZ will greatly increase the dangers within the cul-de-sac. Eye view will be hampered on exiting driveways, turning space will be non-existent, and large vehicles eg refuse collectors will not be able to negotiate the space between cars which will be parked on both sides of this narrow road.</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening. Amberley Close residents requested some controls during the public consultation, hence why a CPZ is proposed for their road. Helpful to hear a supportive response in relation to restrictions on Moss Lane.</p>
<p>Ref: Pinner Parking Review Statutory Consultation / Area 8 / DP 2014-02 With regard to introduction of extended CPZ to include Amberley Close and yellow lines along stretch of Moss Lane from Amberley Close to Beechengrove: I am objecting to the omission of Beechengrove from the CPZ. The reason I am objecting is that by omitting Beechengrove from the CPZ you will push all the cars at present parking all day along the stretch of Moss Lane between Amberly Close and Beechen Grove into our tiny cul-de-sac. (ie Beechen Grove) This will affect access into all our own houses, and in the case of our house (No 3) which is opposite No 8, where a disabled person resides, any cars parked between No 2 and 3 severely restrict reversing access into No 8. Similarly, delivery vans, workmen, refuse collectors and visitors to Beechengrove would be affected on a daily basis – turning space will be restricted and it will be difficult for any large vehicles to negotiate small spaces when</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening. This resident did not support the introduction of parking controls during the public consultation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>cars are parked along the road-side. The overall peaceful and happy living environment within the Close will be negatively affected by your new CPZ parking proposals.</p>	
<p>Re the introduction of extended CPZ to include Amberley Close and double yellow lines along stretch of Moss Lane from Amberley Close to Beechengrove. Parking along this stretch of Moss Lane has become extremely busy in order to facilitate access via the foot path for local workers in Pinner. This has become dangerous as visibility when turning out of Beechengrove is restricted by vehicles regularly parking close to the corner. Whilst to my knowledge there have not been any accidents so far there have been several close incidents. It is undoubtedly an accident waiting to happen. We have no objection to the extended CPZ provided that parking in Beechengrove is not compromised. Potentially there are only 3 small parking places in what is a very small close, one of which is impractical as it is directly opposite the drive to a house which requires access to larger vehicles for the transportation of their disabled daughter. If the extension of CPZ was to proceed and this 'encouraged' cars to park in Beechengrove this would cause chaos and be a hazard for delivery lorries, collection of waste, emergency vehicles etc. We suggest therefore resident's parking be installed in Beechengrove in tandem with the proposals. Otherwise we strongly object. We have no objection to this with the proviso</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening. The well established rules of the Highway Code state that no-one should park within 10 metres of a junction. The proposed double yellow lines into Beechen Grove extend slightly further than this due to the narrowness of the road.</p>
<p>I refer to the proposed parking restrictions, and support the Moss Lane restrictions as the present parking creates a very dangerous turn from Beechen Grove. I am not aware of any fatalities or accidents, but there have been many near misses. Beechen Grove has limited parking, allowing for the parking of only three cars on the road. The parking opposite no 8 does inhibit their access, which is not helped by the high curb. This family has a disabled daughter and when cars do park opposite access for the larger disabled vehicles and charity/council mini vans is compromised. Car parking also restricts access to Beechen Grove, particularly for the refuse collection. I would ask the Council to consider extending the permit parking to Beechen Grove to deter the commuting parking and it would be sensible to have a disabled bay opposite no 8</p>	<p>Helpful to hear a supportive response in relation to restrictions on Moss Lane. If any resident requires a disabled parking bay there are procedures detailed on the Harrow Council website about the criteria for installing such a bay on the public highway. It is for the resident to contact the council and make an application if they feel they meet the criteria. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed. It is not possible at this stage to add anything that has not been advertised as part of the statutory consultation. This resident supported the introduction of parking controls during the public consultation.</p>
<p>With regard to introduction of extended CPZ to include Amberley Close and double yellow lines along stretch of Moss Lane from Amberley Close to Beechen Grove. I am objecting to omitting Beechen Grove from the CPZ. The reason is that this will result in the many cars that park in the morning on Moss Lane, likely belonging to workers in Pinner or commuters using Pinner Tube Station, parking their cars on Beechen Grove which is only a small cul-de-sac. I am a senior doctor, working as a Consultant at Northwick Park Hospital and get called out to emergencies at all hours of the day and night, so need to have free and easy access to my drive and the small road of Beechen Grove where I can rapidly drive to an emergency from casualty. Also, we have children who use their bicycles on the cul-de-sac and the extra cars and reduced space will be a danger to them. In addition this small cul-de-sac was built many years ago for access to a few houses, and</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening. This resident did not support the introduction of parking controls during the public consultation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>should not now be used like a car park. This will have a worsening effect on the environment and make it very difficult to have access for large refuse trucks to come up the small cul-de-sac to empty our bins for which we have paid Harrow Council Tax.</p>	
<p>We refer to the proposed parking restrictions, and support the Moss Lane restrictions as the present parking creates a very dangerous turn from Beechen Grove. Our previous neighbour Marjorie Raffaelli, from no 10 Beechen Grove had an accident there in 2011 trying to turn right out of Beechen Grove. This has become a “blind” corner as cars obscure any view when coming around this corner.</p> <p>Beechen Grove has limited parking, allowing for the parking of only three cars on the road. The parking opposite our house, no 8 does affect our access. We have a disabled daughter and when cars do park opposite access for the larger disabled vehicles (especially carrying a wheelchair in the boot) has been compromised. Our daughter gets transport to & from school daily & Harrow transport do struggle when people park there. Indeed we have had three accidents where visitors have bumped into cars parked opposite our drive as the drive is sloped and therefore rear vision on reversing is very restricted.</p> <p>We have young children and chose Beechen Grove as it is a quiet safe environment for our daughter to ride her disabled bike. This will become impossible if we have an influx of commuters choosing to park at Beechen Grove as the parking restrictions have changed. I would ask the Council to consider extending the permit parking to Beechen Grove to deter the commuting parking.</p>	<p>Helpful to hear supportive response re the restrictions in Moss Lane.</p> <p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed.</p> <p>If there are only three spaces on the road to park, as described by a number of residents, then there will not be an influx of commuters looking for parking.</p> <p>If residents have difficulty reversing out of their driveway then the Highway Code suggests it may be more practical to reverse into the property and drive out in a forward gear.</p>
<p>As a resident Beechen Grove, Pinner HA5 3AH I wish to lodge my strongest object to Beechen Grove having been omitted from the CPZ.</p> <p>It is obvious that with yellow lines being introduced into Moss Lane, commuters who currently park their cars in Moss Lane in the immediate vicinity of Beechen Grove will move their cars into Beechen Grove to avoid having to pay for car parking in the designated public car parks. This in turn will cause obstructions for those living in Beechen Grove. Additionally, visitors, refuse collectors, delivery vans etc will face a problem in gaining access, turning etc.</p> <p>May I respectfully suggest that one of your representatives visits the proximity I refer to so that he/she can see the problems and dangers first hand caused by commuter vehicles that almost completely obscure vision to those wishing to exit Beechen Grove and the obvious alternative they will seek of parking their cars in our small cul de sac.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that in the interests of all concerned Beechen Grove will now be included in the CPZ</p>	<p>Beechen Grove has not been omitted from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed – it is not possible to object to something that is not happening.</p>
<p><u>BELL CLOSE</u></p>	
<p>OBJECTION to Controlled Parking Zone (CPz) introduction at Bell Close, Pinner We wish to add our strong voices and whole heartedly object to this infringement to our peace of mind by the imposition of this unwanted CPZ scheme.</p> <p>Having lived at this address since April 1998 we have seen the parking availability at Bell Close wax and wane however there is always the ability of residents to park their cars and so we don't need this scheme. Our objections are numerous and include but are not limited</p>	<p>By national legislation CPZ must be self financing. Other residents of Harrow who do not have the benefit of using the road during the control times do not pay for the scheme in the same way this resident does not pay for other CPZ in the borough that they cannot use. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents chose to own or park on the public highway. The public highway space outside a property should not be assumed to be the sole use of the property</p>

APPENDIX E

to those below:

1. Financial Penalty:

a) This appears to be a scheme to raise revenue for the council. A number of residents have two or more cars and with the charge/tax on parking on our own streets this will be a financial penalty to us which many may ill afford.

b) We will also have to park whenever friends come to visit or tradesmen come to perform repairs. We already pay a hefty amount in council tax per year on this road

c) It may also mean that less well-off residents will have to ask the doctor and other important callers to visit in the evening, after the restrictions have ended. This will be highly inconvenient and may be detrimental to their health.

d) The charge once set for this year will only rise and rise and rise leaving us with no choice but to pay it or sacrifice some of the essentials of living. For example in 2007 residents of the London borough of Waltham Forest were hit with a 50% increase in the price of their annual parking

permits and a trebling in the cost of visitor permits.

e) CPZ is a stealth tax by name. We pay enough in tax already.

f) For those trying to sell their property the absence of parking restrictions has always been a bonus and the CPZ may depreciate the value of our houses.

2. Lack of Necessity:

a) It is not necessary. Yes we do have passing trade as cars coming to shop or collect goods from the shops at the end of our street on Uxbridge Road park temporarily but this is only for a short while and this CPZ charge for every car owning person on this street just to prevent a few cars a day from parking is taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut.

b) We so are far away from Pinner Metropolitan Station that no-one comes here to park and walk the 15 minutes it takes to get to the station which your Mon-Sat 8.3G18.30 parking exclusion suggests may be happening. To punish all residents because you wish to prevent this perceived event is atrocious and punitive to the residents.

3. No Demand: You have not had letters filling up your Inbox from residents clamouring for this. Having lived here for so long and spoken to residents and neighbours over the years there are other priorities we would wish from the council; having to pay for controlled parking has never been one of them. Weekly bin collection of all bins especially during the summer would be more welcome.

4. Restrictive: The peace and quiet of this lovely neighbourhood will suddenly be policed by scooter driven traffic wardens chasing targets of issuing their daily quota of parking tickets to cars who do not display a valid parking permit. We did not move to Bell Close to have this way of life enforced upon us by the council. It was free parking when we arrive, it has been free parking for the sixteen years we have lived here and we wish that to remain. We do have a right to a private and family life under article eight of the Human Rights Act 1988 and this will be disturbed by your parking enforcers. Leave us and our free parking alone

5. Apathy:

a) The short consultation process may not be long enough for all residents to reply. I hope the absence of objections will not be considered as giving assent to this unwanted policy.

owner. Most properties in the road have some off street parking. There are systems already in place for care workers and other health professionals that need to make regular or emergency visits within CPZ area in Harrow. Cost of permits is set to reflect the cost of operating such schemes. Officers cannot make comments on how other borough choose to set their tariffs. The claim that CPZ depreciate property values is subjective as it can also be claimed that if there is better parking available for residents then this can be seen as a bonus particularly in areas near shops when parking can be problematic. According to the public consultation that this resident did not respond to, of those that did respond all wanted a CPZ in their road to control non-resident parking

The Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) do patrol on scooters. They do not have a daily quota of tickets to issue, however residents in a CPZ expect it to be patrolled reasonably regularly to ensure non compliant vehicles are ticketed.

The statutory consultation process and timescales are set by legislation and the consultation in the Pinner area fulfilled these requirements. Further more, the hand delivery of the consultation documents to every property in the area would have been concluded some days before the official start date of the consultation to ensure all properties had the documents prior to the start of the consultation.

Anyone is eligible to return a response during the statutory consultation phase including those not living in the road regardless of who is currently living at an address. It may also mean that any resident who has more vehicles that may fit in the own current off street parking areas are more concerned about where they will park their extra vehicles than those that have sufficient off street parking for the number of vehicles at the property.

APPENDIX E

<p>Please do not set aside our objection if others do not respond by your deadline.</p> <p>bl Many of the houses in Bell Close are rented so the registered owner may not respond to the consultation if the Pinner Area parking Review document is not forwarded to them. We may therefore be at the mercy of current tenants who may be here today and gone tomorrow leaving a legacy of CPZ for we the homeowners who have rejected the scheme because the objections of the landlords have not been received.</p> <p>6. Fairness: There are four registered voters at this address but I presume you will give us the same weighting as the household with only one registered voter though we will be four times more affected than them if this objectionable policy is introduced. In case you have not got the message; we do not want CPZ in Bell Close. I could go on and on but will end here. We object vehemently to this proposal to introduce a CPZ in Bell Close. It has not been requested, it is not wanted and it should not be introduced.</p>	
<p>Further to the Pinner Area Parking Review (Reference: DP 2014-02), I have the following observations and hence objections on taking the proposal further:</p> <p>1) I am not sure if the road parking situation, for a small road like ours, will be any better with the control parking zone restriction, based on the number of properties with vehicle. If everyone took up a parking permit, there is not enough parking spaces to accommodate the resident's vehicles. Most properties will have multiple cars, so the status quo with the vehicle parking works; on average, we have 10-12 cars parked on the road.</p> <p>2) For a cul-de-sac road, I am not clear why the road will be restricted from Monday to Saturday, between 8am - 6.30pm, I can understand for a main road and the reasons for 6 days restrictions. In addition, the longer restrictions is not in line with the neighbouring roads and closer ones to the Pinner Tube station & High Street, for example which have the weekdays 11am to 12pm (1 hour) restrictions.</p> <p>3) The additional out-of-pocket incurred for a family in a residential road does not meet the reason for additional costs for Control Parking Zone. If this proposal was worthwhile, I would consider some offset amount against my annual Council Tax. For a Bell Close resident being in area for over 18 years, should we not get some rebate on having already contributed to the Harrow Council Tax.</p> <p>If I was given some strong reassurance on the control parking restrictions working from the current status quo, I would consider the proposal, but feel strongly that this is the wrong action to proceed this time round, in the current financial climate with costs rising, and hence our objection.</p>	<p>As with any CPZ, a permit does not guarantee a parking space but gives permit holders a better chance of finding a space during the control hours as non resident parking is removed. The hours of restriction are in direct response from the residents of the road who responded during the public consultation.</p> <p>By national legislation CPZ must be self financing. Other residents of Harrow who do not have the benefit of using the road during the control times do not pay for the scheme in the same way this resident does not pay for other CPZ in the borough that they cannot use. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents chose to own or park on the public highway. The public highway space outside a property should not be assumed to be the sole use of the property owner. Most properties in the road have some off street parking.</p>
<p><u>CANNON LANE</u></p> <p>I am writing to you with regards to the proposed free parking place outside Nos 42 to 60 Cannon Lane in Pinner which appears as No 8 in the London Borough of Harrow proposed Pinner controlled parking zone A review. The proposal in my view is vague and unclear as it does not specify what the complimentary waiting restrictions will be. I have looked at areas 14 and the plan is for free parking Bays. At present there are no parking restrictions outside Nos 42 to 60 which does cause a problem.</p>	<p>The shops do benefit from having a rear service road, however, the business wants the service road restricted to vehicles delivering to the shops and for customers of the shops. Unfortunately this does not cater for the residents who live above the shops who will expect somewhere to park close to their property. There were no responses from these properties during this consultation. P&D is not part of this consultation so it is recommended that TARSAP allocates</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>As you will be aware this area is a service road for the five shops in coronation parade.A service in my view should be restricted to service road for the five shops coronation parade. A service road in my view should be restricted to delivery vehicles supplying the shops and for members of the public to park whilst using the shops.I did express my views in a letter i sent to your department on 24 august 2013 {copy enclosed] accompanying the questionnaire you invited me to complete. At the i pointed to a number of concerns regarding parking which were a having a detrimental effect on the shops in cannon lane Over the past year these problems have got worse as i feared would happen. I was at the time and still am in favour of parking bays in the service road which could offer short term parking. The system now in use in Rayners Lane is an ideal example and has a positive effect on the local businesses. A similar system in Cannon Lane should it be introduced, would give a much needed boost to the parade Free parking with no restrictions would kill the parade as customers will be unable to access the shops if bays are being used all day free of charge by motorist not using the shops. I hope you will give some consideration to the points i have raised as small shops are important part of the community and need all the they can get to survive'</p>	<p>funding next financial year to investigate the installation of P&D</p>
<p>I am writing to you with regards to the proposed free parking places outside Nos. 42 to 60 Cannon Lane in Pinner which appears as No. 8 in the "London Borough of Harrow Proposed Pinner Controlled Parking Zone A Review".</p> <p>The proposal in my view is vague and unclear as it does not specifo what the complimentary waiting restrictions will be. I have looked at area 14 and the plan is for Free Parking Bays. At present there are no parking restrictions outside Nos. 42 to 60 which does cause a problem. As you will be aware this area is a service road for the five shops in Coronation Parade. A service road in my view should be restricted to delivery vehicles supplying the shops and for members of the public to park whilst using the shops.</p> <p>I did express my views in a letter I sent to your department on the 24th August 2013 (copy enclosed) accompanying the questionnaire you invited me to complete. At the time I pointed to a number of concerns regarding parking which were a having a detrimental effect on the shops in Cannon Lane. Over the past year these problems have got worse as I feared would happen. I was at the time, and still am in favour of parking bays in the service road which could offer free short term parking. The system now in use in Rayners Lane is an ideal example and has had a positive effect on the local businesses. A similar system in Cannon Lane should it be introduced, would give a much needed boost to the parade. Free parking with no restrictions would kill the parade as customers will be unable to access the shops if bays are being used all day free of charge by motorists not using the shops. I hope you will give some consideration to the points I have raised as small shops are an important part of the community and need all the help they can get to survive.</p>	<p>The shops do benefit from having a rear service road, however, the business wants the service road restricted to vehicles delivering to the shops and for customers of the shops. Unfortunately this does not cater for the residents who live above the shops who will expect somewhere to park close to their property. There were no responses from these properties during this consultation P&D is not part of this consultation so it is recommended that TARSAP allocates funding next financial year to investigate the installation of P&D</p>
<p><u>CECIL PARK</u></p>	
<p>Just a quick thank you for considering to change the parking restrictions on Cecil Park to include 3 - 4pm. I am so in support of these measures.</p>	<p>Helpful to hear positive response</p>
<p>I wish to object to the proposal to change parking permits for residents of Cecil Park (Pinner,</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Ha5) from Zone A to Zone A1. As the safeguarding adult for a child, and an elderly relative, it would be impossible for them (and me) to access central Pinner without the Zone A permit. Cecil Park also remains within "Pinner Village" and the parking permit for Zone A should be reflective of this.</p>	<p>two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We am writing to object to the proposal to extend parking restrictions in Cecil Park to 3-4pm and to reclassify Cecil Park as CPZ A1 from CPZ A. We originally supported the proposal, as there was no mention made of the reclassification. We don't actually think that extending the parking restriction to 3-4pm will have the desired impact on inconsiderate waiting by parents of Reddiford School since they do not leave their vehicles, and it is congestion, not access to parking, which is the problem. Nevertheless it feels worth a try and is why we originally supported the proposal. However, we now understand that the proposal has been extended to include the reclassification to Zone A1 from Zone A. This will have a material impact on us, as we have often made use of the facility to park in other streets in Pinner within Zone A, which will be lost to us if this proposal goes through unchanged. For this reason we would oppose the proposal as currently constituted.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>I would like to express my support for the proposed changes in parking in Pinner. In particular I support (n): to extend the operational hours of the CPZ in Cecil Park to operate Mon-Fri 11am – 12 noon and 3 – 4pm and to install School Keep Clear restrictions on bend near No. 9 Cecil Park.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings</p>
<p>I write with regard to proposal n) and I am in complete agreement with the proposals.</p>	<p>Helpful to hear positive response</p>
<p>We are writing to support the current proposal to extend the CPZ in Cecil Park and install School Keep Clear restrictions on the bend near No.9 Cecil Park. The current traffic issues caused by parents delivering and collecting their children from Reddiford School has become intolerable to residents and the proposals IF ENFORCED will help to solve these issues. We will expect that if these proposals are agreed that Harrow council will ensure that a regular parking enforcement team will patrol during these controlled periods and ticket any cars in violation. If the council is not willing to enforce this then the proposed scheme will not be worth the investment. we hope that you will take these comments into consideration.</p>	<p>Helpful to hear positive response regarding the school keep clear markings Enforcement of any waiting contraventions outside schools can be problematic due to the number of schools in the borough and the need to keep major through routes flowing as freely as possible. The school does work with the borough and is active in promoting good parking practice with the parents and has an active School Travel Plan to try to mitigate the potential disruption that occurs for limited periods during the school drop off and pickup times. However the behaviour of some individuals is something that cannot be enforced. Obstruction of the public highway is a traffic offense and is dealt with by the Police.</p>
<p>Proposed No parking restriction between 3pm - 4pm. Please take this email as our strong OBJECTION to the proposed new parking at Cecil Park. Myself and my wife will be both be materially affected by these new changes if they are implemented. Please confirm by return email, that you have received our response and have taken our objection into your consideration.</p>	<p>No specific reason given but objection considered with all other correspondence received. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We wish to object to the proposal that CPZ A1 does not allow parking in CPZ A. We understand the extra restricted hours that are added to proposed CPZ A1 to restrict parking during school collection times.</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Firstly, we are not sure the additional hours are that sensible. If there are primary schools in the road, where should parents park to collect? Not every parent is within walking distance. If there are houses in Cecil Park with no off street parking, then I am happy to agree with the proposal. But if virtually all houses have off street parking, then I see little merit in the additional restricted time from 3-4pm. We don't see how this proposal will reduce collection: the cars will still mill around, trying to avoid traffic wardens.</p> <p>Secondly, we suggest that if CPZ A1 is accepted, then a permit for CPZ A1 should also allow parking elsewhere in CPZ A, particularly adjacent streets such as Marsh Road, Love Lane, Leighton Road, the High Street etc. This is for various reasons: CPZ A1 is a very small area and sometimes it is not possible to park in this area on say Sunday night due to functions at the school or synagogue. If we park in Marsh Rd, then under these proposals, we would be forced to repark before 11am on Monday. This is not always possible due to our patterns of work (e.g. away from Sunday night to Friday night). Secondly, the we feel that, as local residents, we should be able to use our permit to park nearer to amenities in CPZ A such as the shops or restaurants. Whilst we accept this is a privilege, and not essential, we feel that the high cost of these permits should allow us to do this.</p> <p>Therefore, we are opposed to CPZ A1. We are happy with the status quo. At the very least, if additional restricted hours are needed in Cecil Park, then we think this should be implemented without resorting to an extra zone. Failing this, any resident with a CPZ A1 permit, should be allowed to park anywhere in CPZ A. Equally, we would have no objection to other CPZ A residents being able to park in CPZ A1. It is not currently a problem.</p>	<p>second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We have considered your Statutory Consultation document on the Pinner Parking Review and wish to inform you that we strongly support the extension of the CPZ in Cecill Park to 3-4 pm (Monday – Friday). We have lived at this address for 32 years and throughout have been plagued by inconsiderate parking by parents and Reddiford School's ("the School") indifference to the problems cause by uncooperative (and sometimes rude) parents of children attending the School.</p> <p>We would urge the Council to have regard to a fundamental fact that has come up on each occasion the Council considered either planning applications by the School or other related aspect (eg School traffic): the School is too large for its present residential location. This fact was recognized by the Council on each occasion (eg documentation under ref WEST/563/97/FUL). The Council acknowledged that if 34-38 Cecil Park were a green field site planning permission for a school of the School's size would not have been granted. However, the cumulative expansion of the School over the years, including the acquisition of the former Cecil Park Clinic and premises on Marsh Road is clear evidence that the School has no regard to its position on a residential road. The consequence of the expansion has been a loss of residential amenity and a host of other problems. In order to secure tacit agreement of residents or gain development approval the School gave a number of assurances most of which have not been kept (eg that the School roll would not exceed 170 – it is now probable double the number, and that the front of the school would be laid out as a garden – it is a car park).</p>	<p>Enforcement of any waiting contraventions outside schools can be problematic due to the number of schools in the borough and the need to keep major through routes flowing as freely as possible. The school does work with the borough and is active in promoting good parking practice with the parents and has an active School Travel Plan to try to mitigate the potential disruption that occurs for limited periods during the school drop off and pickup times. However the behaviour of some individuals is something that cannot be enforced</p> <p>Obstruction of the public highway is a traffic offense and is dealt with by the Police.</p> <p>If parking across driveways occur residents can contact the Parking Operations team who may be able to send a Civil Enforcement Officer to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) to any offending vehicle. It is not possible to automatically issue a PCN to any vehicle across a driveway as it may be a person with connections to the property.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>In summary, the problems are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The School's inability or unwillingness to control the behaviour of parents during the afternoon collection of their children; 2.Gridlock of Cecil Park (and Marsh Road) during the afternoon collection time; 3.Private drives blocked by parent's cars (some parents abandon their cars across drives and congregate near the School gate with complete disregard to the possibility that the drive may be in use); 4.Cars left with engines running adding to pollution, and 5.Increase in noise and litter. <p>The traffic problem could be resolved if parents used one of the many car parks in Pinner, and walked to and from the School – improving the health of both parent and child! Crucial to the success of the extension of the CPZ is the attendance of a traffic warden – at the very least parents will stop parents abandoning their cars across private drives if there is a risk of a parking ticket. Without School traffic Cecil Park is a peaceful residential road befitting a conservation area as can be evidenced during school holidays. Any action taken by the Council and the School to enable this would restore harmony between residents and the school and be greatly appreciated by all residents.</p>	
<p>The traffic scheme consultation document does not make clear to the residents of Cecil Park that the extension of the CPZ in their road [paragraph n) of the document] means they will no longer be part of Zone A In consequence, they will be unable to park in Zone A bays throughout Pinner. Neither will family or friends coming from Zone A to Cecil Park be able to park during the morning and afternoon restriction periods. This is a significant loss of amenity and, for elderly people and the less mobile, could lead to a greater sense of isolation. For this reason I am against removing Cecil Park from Zone A. Furthermore, I do not believe that implementation of the proposal would alleviate the situation in Cecil Park at Reddiford School pick-up time. A major problem is parents leaving cars parked, entirely or partially, across driveways. As they indulge in this obvious obstruction of residents facilities, it seems unlikely that they will take notice of a parking bay restriction. This proposal which removes Cecil Park from Zone A should be rejected: the current position is preferable</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation. If parking across driveways occur residents can contact the Parking Operations team who may be able to send a Civil Enforcement Officer to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) to any offending vehicle. It is not possible to automatically issue a PCN to any vehicle across a driveway as it may be a person with connections to the property. If this has not had the desired affect then residents need to contact their local ward councillor to see if they can provide any resources to patrol the area more robustly. The school is active in promoting good parking practice with the parents and has an active School Travel Plan</p>
<p>I object to the proposed parking restrictions in Cecil Park, Pinner, between 3-4pm, but not to the School Keep Clear restrictions on the bend near no 9 Cecil Park. The latter are necessary for general safety. Living in this residential road I am affected more socially than materially by these proposals. All my social contacts have long been scheduled for the afternoons to fit in with the existing parking restrictions. For example, a regular meeting of friends, all elderly and depending on their cars for transport, could not longer take place if there were additional restrictions in the afternoon. Family visits and other services are all arranged for the afternoons. Under the</p>	<p>Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>new proposals I will be doubly inconvenienced or even penalized for 260 days a year when the school is only operational for around 30 weeks (150 school days) a year. Along with other Cecil Park residents I welcome the relative freedom of school holidays when visitors can at least come and go freely in the afternoons. This is worth far more to me than reducing the school traffic in the road in the afternoons. After all, we have adapted to the situation and you would only be moving the problem elsewhere.</p>	
<p>We wish to record our objection to the proposed zone parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The original parking zone A was designed for the residents and business of Pinner to stop commuters choking the streets surrounding Pinner tube station and thus allow local life and events to flourish. •We are residents of Pinner not just residents of Cecil Park and would therefore suffer should these many proposed individual zones come into force. •We would therefore like no change for zone A. <p>May we make this suggestion to aid Cecil Park Residents and Reddiford school users. Cecil Park has Reddiford School in the middle of its length and a Junior school at the bottom bend, opposite the Synagogue. Parents need to drop off their children at the kerb side on the school side of the road. Thus, this will require all school traffic to enter the road from the top of the road and with a small amount of signage and width restrictions (sighted to allow coaches and buses to function easily) induce a priority flow down the road similar to that used in Paines Lane.By advising signage at the roads entrances and at restriction point or points, all would be aware that priority inducing flow at peak times would be from the top of the road, down towards the synagogue end. The advantage of having a pedestrian crossing on the Synagogue corner would afford easier breaks in the traffic, allow one direction traffic to exit Cecil Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Thus increased safety of the children at drop off and pick up times. •Reduce the frustration caused by cars doing U-turns to avoid blockages caused by inconsiderate drivers and parents / children crossing and re-crossing Cecil Park. •Local residents would have the advantage of a two way street out of rush hour or school times. •Buses and school coaches would not have to contend with inconsiderate parking and the “after you” and “back and forth” that happens when cars encounter other cars in a width restricted road. <p>May we also suggest the cobbled edge mounds as used in Cheney Street, Hillingdon would be more acceptable than the house disturbing sleeping policemen as used in Paines Lane. Thank you for noting our objection to the proposed multiple Zone A’s with numbers. Also trust our suggestion is of interest.</p>	<p>Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation. Any one-way or priority system, formal or informal, relies on compliance by motorists. Any such system could also be disadvantageous to local residents as they would have to comply with any system every time they use the road. Those at the ‘far end’ of a one-way system are greatly affected. A priority system would still allow vehicle to travel both ways along the road thus some would still conduct U turns to go back the way they came so would not be of benefit.</p>
<p>Pinner Area Parking Restrictions: My objections herewith to the additional restrictions proposed for the Cecil Park residents: In reply to your earlier Re-consultation Questionnaire (Your letter of Dec 4, 2013) I had raised the following objections/queries/suggestions which I repeat hereunder once again for ready reference:</p>	<p>Changing from one time to another has not been considered in this area. The residents have always stated they wanted an additional hour control. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. The school does work with the borough and is active in promoting good parking</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>“Q1. I believe 3-4pm parking restriction is more than adequate provided present 11am-12noon restriction is withdrawn for the convenience of our guests and service providers. Two restrictions are one too many. Q2. Yes. At the same time - possible restriction - on Cecil Park residents with ‘Zone A’ permits not being allowed to park in the peripheral ‘Zone A’ is a totally unwarranted imposition with which I completely disagree. On the face of it, it looks as if the residents are proposed to be collectively punished for raising this continuous harassment in the residential area through complete lack of action by the Reddiford School Authorities. I believe all proposed changes may not even be necessary if the Council puts appropriate pressure on the School who are primarily responsible for causing this nuisance. The School’s proud claim of service for a hundred years is appreciated; but circumstances over time have changed enormously if their Authorities haven’t noticed! There were not as many cars 100, 50 or even 10 years ago. Following suggestions come to mind which the School can and should take note of, on the Council’s advice - and if necessary a directive: 1. The School may introduce the school-run bus or two for the pupils travelling from more than a walking distance away of which parents can take advantage, if they choose to. 2. If not that - the School should engage 2 lollypop ladies either end of the Park to whom the parents can hand over their charges to be safely shepherded to and from the premises (in the morning and afternoon). 3. If parents still want their independence, they should find a neighbouring car-park and walk their children to school. 4. The School itself can volunteer to move some distance away in the local countryside with the help and guidance of the Council where they can find even more space to expand and exercise the children in their playtime. Even so, with the proposed changes there is no guarantee that 1 / 2 penalty ticket issuers will be able to cope with the unruly motorists up and down the Park bent on getting their way or will they? The traffic and pollution in the C/Park on school working days (morning and afternoon) is worse than on the High Street. At the same time if the residents happen to arrive from their journey between 3-4pm, they have no chance to park their cars within their areas - and they have paid for the privilege!” Finally may I say that many of the residents in Cecil Park are in their 70s and 80s and restricting their movements by cars for their local errands is no help at all but a huge inconvenience.</p>	<p>practice with the parents and has an active School Travel Plan to try to mitigate the potential disruption that occurs for limited periods during the school drop off and pickup times. However the behaviour of some individuals is something that cannot be enforced Obstruction of the public highway is a traffic offense and is dealt with by the Police.</p>
<p>Parking in Cecil Park Objection to zone change We wish to object to the change to designate Cecil Park a different zone from the rest of Pinner. As we live in Cecil Park we shall be materially affected by the proposed change to the controlled parking zone from A to A1. At present we are able to park elsewhere in Pinner during 11.00 – 12.00 with our A zone permit and we understand that this would not be</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>possible if our road is designated a different zone from the rest of Pinner, we would therefore be “punished” by only being allowed to park in our own road. Also, unless you deploy a warden in Cecil Park between 3.00 and 4.00 (i.e. for the whole hour) in the afternoon, it is unlikely that the parking restriction in that time would be enforceable. The point has been made that our problem in the afternoon is congestion rather than parking, parents usually wait in their cars or nearby and if they see a traffic warden will probably just drive round and come back a couple of minutes later.</p>	
<p>I wish to make a formal Objection to that part of the Pinner Area Parking Review proposals affecting Cecil Park, namely the introduction of Residents Only parking between 3 and 4 p.m.</p> <p>My main concern is that the change will (a) further, and severely, restrict the amount of already limited space for parents / carers picking up Reddiford School children (almost the sole cause of problems), and therefore (b) make drivers even more likely to park across driveways (2 have been across mine as I write this !)</p> <p>This is not helped by the incorrect information in Harrow’s publication “Parking - Can we help you” “Single yellow lines” (paraphrased : the time of the single yellow line, which is placed across all driveways, is the same as the ‘zone-time’) and associated signage; this apparently contradicts the Law. Moreover and curiously this is contradicted by Harrow’s own web-site “ Parking in front of crossovers (lowered footways / driveways)</p> <p>It is a contravention of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (as amended) to park a vehicle in front of a lowered footway. This applies to all lowered footways, for example: access drives [etc]”</p> <p>My understanding of the law is that the web-site correctly reflects the law. To reflect the law, all of any yellow lines across driveways should be double yellow. The police were recently happy to take this interpretation for me recently (essentially, obstruction), ironically on a Saturday (i.e.outside of ‘zone-time’) and not caused by a Reddiford parent / carer.</p>	<p>By legislation all the kerb space within a CPZ must be controlled. That can be either with a parking bay or a single (syl) or double (dyl) yellow line. Dyl are usually installed at junctions and bends. Syl are installed between all permit parking bays and are usually across driveways to protect these during the control times and are part of a Traffic Order covering the operational times of a CPZ.</p> <p>Outside of the control times any vehicle can park in a permit bay without a permit or on a CPZ timed syl. If for some specific reason a syl is timed differently, 8am – 630pm for example, then this overrides the CPZ timed syl and will have an appropriate Traffic Order covering this time.</p> <p>If a vehicle is parked across a driveway during the control line on a syl then they will be ticketed for not parking in a marked bay in control time.</p> <p>If a vehicle is parked across a driveway outside of these times, regardless of syl or CPZ then this is contravention under the Traffic Management Act as the resident has said. In this instance the council can issue the vehicle with a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) but it is reliant on the resident contacting the Parking Operations team as they will need to sign paperwork to say that the vehicle is not connected with the property. The council will not automatically issue a PCN to any vehicle across a driveway as they have no way of knowing if the vehicle is connected with the property.</p>
<p>I am a house owner at cecil park, pinner. I think it's outrageous that you are trying to prevent parking on cecil park, pinner there is practically no alternative parking for parents to use. Theres always been school in cecil park and residents have to accept that when they buy a house in this road there will busy periods.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed 3-4pm parking restriction which will also affect friends and family parking outside my house as there will be no place for them to park for free.</p> <p>I also object to losing my Zone A parking permit which allows me to park in pinner during the 11-12 parking restriction.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>I writing to you to object to the parking restrictions down Cecil park in pinner, I am a resident at Cecil park , and I feel that this is unfair not only on the resident of Cecil park and also parents picking up their son's / daughters from Redford school between the proposed times between 3pm-4pm. There is no where else to park around the area, and I have friends and family who will not be able to Visit because of these times also. I feel that the council should have realised the parking was going to cause a problem when the school extended the</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>nursery....at the end of Cecil park... I hope that the council can think of a better solution...</p>	
<p>I think it's outrageous that you are trying to prevent parents from parking for a short period of time to pick up their children from school, there is practically no alternative parking for them to use. There has always been a school down Cecil park and it's completely ludicrous preventing or making it highly difficult for parents to collect their children. I strongly object to the proposed 3-4pm parking restriction which will also affect when family and friends visit as there will be no space to park for free. Again, completely ridiculous.</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>Excellent news. I shall tell my concerned neighbours they need not worry. Thank you for your help.</p> <p>I refer to my previous email and confirm that there are no changes to the existing permit parking bays in Cecil Park. We are however proposing to introduce some additional bays, so the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) outside your property is not changing. Harrow use a descriptive order and this is based on a road description and the number of parking spaces between two points within that road. As part of the implementation process the traffic order maker and the engineer walk the scheme and place a witness mark on the carriageway in accordance with the TRO to indicate where the contractors are to install the road markings, they do not work from the consultation plan. I trust this is sufficient information for you to respond to the consultation and apologise for any prior confusion on our part.</p>	<p>Existing bays not moving, error on plan noticed by resident</p>
<p>Re: Change to parking restrictions in Cecil Park</p> <p>We realise that we are one day late for raising our objections but we were on holiday for the last few weeks and we missed the Notice.</p> <p>We object to the parking restrictions in the afternoons between 3-4 pm on following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although the parking is difficult during term time during those hours Reddiford school has really short school terms and the change would apply all year round. This makes it very inconvenient for receiving visitors, tradesmen, and generally organising one's social and family commitments. We have lived in this house since 1981, long before any restrictions were imposed, and we managed. The chaos in the street during school leaving times is manageable. 2. We value that we can park in Pinner using our Residents Parking permits and do not wish to have to be taken out of Zone A. <p>We hope that you take our comments into account</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>I am resident at Cecil Park, Pinner. I object to the planned proposal of extended CPZ hours of 3-4. I don't agree with the planned proposal of the additional restriction on Cecil Park. As a resident we are penalised if the proposed changes go ahead with the street changing from zone A to Zone A1 because of Reddiford Parents inconsiderate parking and congestion of Reddiford Parents. Also this will not deter Reddiford Parents as they do tend to congest the road and congregate on the street and block driveways. As a mother of 3 children, Zone A is extremely valuable for myself as I have 3 small children and parking around Pinner at restricted times is invaluable. As I mentioned before, a parking attendant should be appointed at that time of 3-4 so parents will move on. Have the school more accountable to</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>the situation it is causing to local residents.</p> <p>We wish to OBJECT to the proposed new Zone A1 for Cecil Park as outlined on public notices dated 4th September 2014. Whilst we welcome some control of the parking of parents from Reddiford School and the congestion that this causes, especially in the afternoon, we cannot see how a new restriction of permit only parking between 3 – 4 pm will help in any way.</p> <p>Currently many of the Reddiford parents remain in their cars (usually across residents driveways) awaiting their children to walk to the car or double parking in the street. Whilst we appreciate the 3 -4 pm restriction would in principle prevent cars from parking in the bays in practice we fail to see how this can be actively enforced – unless Harrow Council have a team of dedicated traffic wardens in the street each day between 3- 4pm and constantly move the cars on – which will just leave the streets around Cecil Park very busy and move the congestion to other areas.</p> <p>Meanwhile, us, the residents, will lose the ability to park in the other zone A bays in and around Pinner. We, therefore, ask for this proposed scheme to be withdrawn.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We are writing about the upcoming proposed zonal change on Cecil park from zone A to Zone A1:</p> <p>Attached is a photo of this notice as I am unsure who to address my letter to.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned that this zonal change will lose me and my wife (and hence family of 7) the right to park in other roads in Pinner</p> <p>It is completely unjust and unacceptable for us to lose this right that other residents around Pinner take for granted. It is extremely important for us to be able to park on Love lane and nearby roads so as to access shops and other facilities like the Doctors</p> <p>Without having to pay for parking which is already so restricted. This is surely our neighbourhood!</p> <p>I understand that the reason for this proposal is in order to solve another problem of parents of the Reddiford School who are causing congestion. However solving this problem should not come at the expense of losing our rights to park in the rest of Zone A . I must tell you that some of the parents are really rude and obnoxious about the parking. Often I come home and my driveway is blocked. We need traffic wardens to come at this time and issue on the spot fines or tickets for parents who are blocking the road. They are simply stubborn and don't wish to park elsewhere and walk</p> <p>On this basis I am writing to oppose this new proposal and request a new proposal is drafted that addresses the residents' concerns without causing us the new problem of being unable to park in zone Am</p> <p>I look forward to hearing a response shortly</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>I am writing with regard to the additional proposal of a 3-4pm daily restriction in parking in our road of Cecil Park' Pinner'</p> <p>I am very happy to keep the restriction as it is currently and cannot see how it will create anything but problems to restrict the school mothers from parking in the afternoon.</p> <p>I am hoping that many other residents will be in agreement with me and we can leave this</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>situation as we currently have it</p> <p>I am writing to object to the creation of a separate parking zone for Cecil Park (proposal n) since I understand that this will mean that the residents of Cecil Park will no longer be entitled to park in Zone A in Pinner.</p> <p>Pinner has now become so busy that it is very difficult to find parking in town. The only time we can be sure of being able to park there is during restricted parking hours. The loss of such a benefit would materially affect those of us who are getting on in years and need to drive into town to shop.</p> <p>Moreover, unless you are planning to have a traffic warden patrol the road from 3 - 4pm every day of the week, it is unlikely that the proposed measure will work.</p> <p>I would therefore ask you not to proceed with the plan.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation./</p>
<p>When, at the end of last year, it was suggested that we could have an additional hour of parking restriction in Cecil Park to alleviate the daily traffic congestion occasioned by the collection of pupils from Reddiford school. I expressed my support and wrote to you to that effect.</p> <p>It was not made clear to us then that such a measure would necessitate the creation of a separate zone, and that the residents of Cecil Park would necessitate the creation of a separate zone A in Pinner nor was this mentioned in the brochure recently distributed to residents.</p> <p>I and many of my neighbours are now strongly opposed to implementing the proposal, as it means that we will lose access to zone A, which is of enormous benefit to us. Not being able to park in the centre of Pinner would be a serious disadvantage, especially for those residents who are now elderly and less able to carry shopping for longer distances. They would thereby be materially affected.</p> <p>I am therefore requesting you to disregard my earlier statement of support and urging you not to proceed with the proposal.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>This response is from Cecil Park, Pinner, Middx HA5 5HH.</p> <p>We are writing in relation to proposal 'n' - which relates to operational hours of CPZ in Cecil Park.</p> <p>We object to this proposal as we do not think it is necessary and will cause further congestion and potential danger at school picking up time as cars will be unable to park to pick up children.</p> <p>As residents of Cecil Park we don't feel there is a problem with commuters parking all day with the current arrangement in place.</p> <p>Our proposal would be to consider making Cecil Park a one way street during school picking up and dropping off times.</p> <p>However, the School Keep Clear restriction on the bend near no. 9 Cecil Park seems reasonable.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings</p>
<p>I live at Cecil Park, Pinner, HA5 5HH.</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposal that parking permits in Cecil Park, Pinner, be changed from A to A1. I want to retain an A parking permit as a resident of this road.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>We object to the proposals to introduce an extra parking restriction between 3pm and 4pm in Cecil Park. We recall that the original restriction between 11am and midday was to prevent all day parking in streets close to the Pinner Station as the streets had become clogged up with commuters' cars parked all day. We understand that the current proposals, which we had previously supported, are designed to reduce the congestion problems caused by parents picking children up from Reddiford School. On reflection we believe that the proposed restrictions will have limited impact - for example, the school could simply change its hours. However, the proposals will be an unnecessary inconvenience to residents of Cecil Park. For ourselves, we have occasional need to park a car on the road, whilst, for example, doing a job in the drive and the extra restriction would limit the time available to do such jobs.</p> <p>We support the plans to introduce School Keep Clear restrictions around Reddiford's Annex in the old Cecil Park Clinic. This seems a simple safety measure and we are surprised that you need to consult on such obvious measures.</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p> <p>Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings</p>
<p>We are writing to object to the proposal listed in the Pinner Area Parking Review, item n ("extend the operational hours of the CPZ in Cecil Park to operate Mon – Fri 11 am – 12 noon and 3-4 pm...").</p> <p>We accept that Reddiford School creates significant congestion from inconsiderate parking during drop off and pick up times. However, in our view, extending the operational hours of this CPZ would not solve the problem, this is for three reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Firstly the proposal does not address the congestion at around 9 am (school drop off);• Secondly we feel that inconsiderate parents would still be tempted to risk parking in the CPZ during the operational hours for a short duration dash to the school;• Thirdly, it is likely that the school will revise their hours to ensure pick up after 16:00 to avoid the CPZ operational hours. <p>On top of being ineffective, we also object to the proposal on the grounds that Cecil Park residents will suffer additional inconvenience. The current CPZ operating time imposes restrictions that affect visitors, tradesmen and deliveries to our properties. The proposed extension to the operational hours will increase the impact on the residents of Cecil Park. We note that there is no differentiation between term time and school holidays, so presume that these restrictions would still be in place during school holidays, even though there is no school parking problem outside of Reddiford School term time.</p> <p>Lastly your proposal takes away one benefit that Cecil Park resident permit holders have. Currently the disadvantage of CPZ restrictions is partially offset by Cecil Park residents being able to use their Zone A parking permits at other Zone A locations in the area. However, under your proposal, Cecil Park residents would have a separate and unique CPZ zone, and would no longer benefit from being able to use Zone A.</p> <p>To summarise, we think that extending the operational hours of the CPZ will disadvantage the residents without providing any benefit, since the measures will not be effective in solving the problem of Reddiford School parking. For this reason we offer our objection to the proposals and request that the council reconsiders.</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>We are of Cecil Park, Pinner, Middlesex, HA5 5HH. We object to the current proposals to alter the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Pinner because it withdraws our right as residents of Pinner to obtain a permit for CPZ A and replaces it with a right to obtain a permit for CPZ A1. CPZ A1 is too constrained to be useful and seems unlikely to achieve its intended purpose of reducing congestion in Cecil Park at school discharge time by limiting parking. We welcome the proposal to install School Keep Clear restrictions and waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends etcetera.</p>	<p>In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation. Helpful positive comment about school keep clear markings</p>
<p>I strongly object to the ludicrous proposal to extend the CPZ to include 3-4pm for the following reasons. 1) Reddiford only needs to change their dismissal time to 4pm. 2) Parents will sit in their vehicles with engines running ready to move if a warden appears. This would be extremely dangerous for children and other drivers and pedestrians. 3) Parents will park in Marsh Rd/Pinner Rd—a busy main road and bus route—which already has heavy parking from St John Fisher School. I, personally, will have to pay for all afternoon callers as well as those who have to come in the morning. I will also have to pay for local tradesmen who already possess a Zone A permit as you are proposing that Cecil Park becomes Zone 1A. That sounds like a money spinning scam to me. It is bad enough persuading tradesmen to call after 12pm without harrying them to complete before 3pm. It is also unclear whether separate permits will have to be purchased for the 3-4 slot. For more than a quarter of the year there is no school traffic, so householders will be penalised and inconvenienced for a problem which only lasts about 1 1/2 hours during term time</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem. In Harrow it is not currently possible to have the same CPZ permit operating at two different times. Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We have read the new proposals and whilst we won't be materially affected whichever scheme goes ahead wanted to make the point that if the CPZ is not approved that it should be separated from the introduction of zig zag lines and parking restrictions on the bend near the nursery It is essential for all children's safety both those at Reddiford and local children that drivers do not stop here and do not reverse onto pavements in this area. I have had a near miss with a driver nearly knocking over our son by driving on the pavement in this location. The zig zags for a school entry in my opinion are non negotiable and must be introduced. On the parking issue I understand and witness daily the inconsiderate, selfish parking of the parents at this school. Any attempts to ask drivers to move are met with rudeness and on occasion aggression. However I would be concerned that this parking scheme will not address this and in all probability the school will move their finish time to 4pm or do something else to make the situation worse. I do not think the residents will 'win' by the approach. What would work is if the school could actually effectively manage the parents and ensure they are courteous and drive responsibly. The voluntary one way system with a drop off /pick up zone in my view would be much more effective as it is congestion that causes</p>	<p>Different aspects of the proposals can be taken forward. If the extension of the control hours for Cecil Park do not go ahead the council would still progress the installation of the school keep clear markings and additional permit parking bays. A voluntary one way system is not practical as it only takes one driver who may not be connected with the school or the residents to drive the 'wrong way' and would likely meet another vehicle on the other side of the road as motorists would likely consider the whole road as usable as it is 'one way'. There are no signs or other methods of controlling this under the current Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions as laid out by the Department for Transport. There is also no way in which school staff or parents can direct traffic on the public highway.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>issues and danger in the street as much as parking. The current name and shame clearly does not work but the threat of expelling children where there are multiple complaints about a driver certainly would.</p> <p>The school does not instil a sense of respect and neighbourliness and maybe I am naive that a public school would even think of such things. Our own children at local schools are expected to be good citizens. Can the council lean on the school in this direction?</p> <p>Please introduce the zig zags and if you do introduce a new CPZ ensure that it is monitored as effectively as the 11-12 one. If it is not, the police will be involved,as it will lead to increased aggravation if the Reddiford parents openly flaunt a restriction that is not monitored (which they will). This would be the worst of all worlds.</p> <p>We do not want this letter made public and write in confidence</p>	
<p>I am emailing you as the Chairman of Pinner United Synagogue of 1 Cecil Park Pinner Middx.</p> <p>I have read the statutory consultation document regarding the Pinner area Parking Review. I understand that it is the intention to create proposed permit bays, operational Monday to Friday from 11am – 12pm. in Cecil Park on the side of the Synagogue and the Henry Jackson Centre which is also a Synagogue building.</p> <p>I wish on behalf of the Synagogue to object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The Synagogue and the Henry Jackson Centre are public communal buildings not residential properties where a house owner would wish to be able to park their car outside their house. 2.At present there is a single yellow line where the proposed permit bays will be. No parking is allowed between 11am and 12 pm at present and therefore no one can legally park there effectively for the whole day. 3.The creation of the permit bays would therefore allow permit holders to outside both buildings for the whole day. 4.This would cause problems for people attending or delivering items to the synagogue. 5.The Henry Jackson houses a playgroup /nursery and if cars are parked outside for the whole day it would hinder parents bringing and collecting their children during the day. 6.I am also concerned that the parking of cars all day outside the Synagogue could be a risk as to security for the Synagogue. <p>I hope that you will consider these objections favourably.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.</p>	<p>At present there is only one hour that vehicle could not park outside the synagogue. The additional permit parking bays would have little effect on this but would allow residents the ability to find parking close to local amenities if other parking is fully utilised. It is unlikely that vehicles will be parked there 24 hours a day.</p> <p>Outside of the control times any vehicle can still park there regardless if they have a permit or not.</p> <p>This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned but the additional permit bays be progressed.</p> <p>It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>Reddiford School Staff letter (x58)</p>	
<p>Reddiford School Staff Standard Response Letter</p> <p>We are writing to formally object to the proposal of an extension to the parking restrictions, to 3pm-4pm (Monday to Friday) on Cecil Park, Pinner.</p> <p>Between 3pm and 4 pm Monday to Friday, over 250 children require safe and efficient collection from Reddiford School in Cecil Park. If the parking restrictions are extended then our grave fear is that pupil safety will be severely compromised, to a dangerous level.</p> <p>The simple fact is that parents need to collect their children from school and Reddiford</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem due to their inconsiderateness and rudeness towards the local residents</p> <p>The council is aware of the work the school does however some parents have aggravated the local residents into requesting the council do something about the parking and traffic problems the parents themselves are causing.</p> <p>The busy nature of the road is only at school times and therefore can be directly</p>

APPENDIX E

School has been a resident of Cecil Park for over 100 years. There is very little parking in the area and most children do not live within walking distance of the school. Many parents are also picking up other children from local schools and only have a limited amount of time to collect their child.

We believe that the proposed additional restriction will result in current parking concerns being exacerbated and could make the situation worse rather than better. It would potentially result in people/parents parking illegally or 'hovering' over residents' driveways whilst very young children navigate the road unassisted.

As our pupils are at the younger end of the youth scale (aged 3-11 years) - road safety is of paramount importance as their spatial and social awareness is developing over these formative years. This can only increase the chance of a child being injured or killed on this busy road. There, is of course, the concern that the additional restriction will make things worse for our neighbours, not better, which worries us as we always strive to forge good relationships with our neighbours.

We are also mindful that, in keeping with other roads we must ensure that at all times, emergency vehicles can travel up and down Cecil Park. If parents cannot park legally then the temptation will be for them the 'hover' in the middle of the road and collect their child from this dangerous position. Our fear is that this proposed parking restriction could potentially hinder/stop a fire engine/ambulance/police van travelling up or down Cecil Park in a timely fashion, in response to an emergency. This could be further hindered as coaches delivering children back from offsite games on a Tuesday and Thursday arrive back to school during the proposed parking extension time in the afternoon. We believe, that Harrow Council, will also want to ensure emergency vehicle access, during parking restriction proposed times- for the benefit of everyone.

Reddiford School continues to work closely with the Borough. We have put into action all of their recommendations such as staggering the school finishing times asking the coach companies not to turn up early and run their engines and having staff with high visibility jackets outside each site moving cars on. After speaking with John Nikolai and subsequent meetings with Paul Newman and Willy Hauptmanni we have appointed Junior Road Safety officers as part of our objective to encourage stakeholders to keep road safety at the forefront of all minds.

We as a school also endeavour to do all we can to encourage parents to park considerately, we name and shame in our newsletters and make it part of the Parent Contract. Staff feel passionate about parents driving and parking responsibly for child safety (and the benefit of our neighbours) and regularly challenge behaviour which they consider not to be in keeping with our clear expectations. However, all residents will have moved into the road knowing that there is a school and undoubtedly parents will need to collect their children from it. We do not condone the actions of a few of our parents but the simple fact is that we do not have the authority to enforce the law. We have requested many times to have regular traffic enforcement people here, but this only happens temporarily after our contact with you. We think to solve this problem there should be a regular presence.

It is important in these matters to take all affected parties into consideration and I fear that

contributed to the school and its parents for which the school and parents must accept some responsibility for.

The school may well have been in the area longer than the current residents however the location of the school in a residential area may not be a suitable as it was 100 years ago when there weren't vehicles on the road and I would suggest most of the pupils lived locally.

The council has to balance the needs and requests of all road users which means the traffic issues around schools are difficult to address due to the short duration of the problems and that any remedial measures would affect the residents all of the time, not just a term drop off and pick up times.

APPENDIX E

<p>the extension of the parking restrictions will not be in the best interest of anyone. It is a matter that would have a huge impact on the working day and education of all Reddiford pupils and a matter that we would feel the need to discuss as a matter of urgency with our local MP Mr Nick Hurd (who wrote to us recently and congratulated us on our Centenary Celebrations) There would be a huge detrimental effect to the daily business operation of our school which would also affect the children's education and staff jobs.</p> <p>However, the main concern is that these changes will endanger the lives of Reddiford children a concern that cannot be overstated.</p> <p>However, we would like to strongly support the "school keep clear" restrictions at the bottom of Cecil park as this is much needed to ensure the safety of our youngest pupils (3-5years) as long as the restriction are enforced. We would also like to request that the timing of these and the zigzag lines outside 38 Cecil Park be extended until 5.30 as many of our after school activities do not finish until 5.00 pm.</p> <p>We of course continue to work with Harrow Council, residents and Reddiford School stakeholders on this matter in both the short and longer term future for the benefit of everyone.</p>	
<p>Reddiford School Parent letter (x218)</p>	
<p>Reddiford School Parent Standard Response Letter</p> <p>We are writing to formally object to the proposal of an extension to the parking restrictions, to 3.00pm -4.00 pm (Monday to Friday)on Cecil Park, Pinner.</p> <p>Between 3 pm and 4 pm Monday to Friday, over 250 children require safe and efficient collection from Reddiford School in Cecil Park.</p> <p>If the parking restrictions are extended then our grave fear is that our child's safety will be severely compromised, to a dangerous level.</p> <p>The simple fact is that we need to collect our child from the school and Reddiford School has been a resident of Cecil Park for over 100 years. There is very little parking in the area and we do not live within walking distance of the school.</p> <p>We believe that the proposed additional restriction will result in current parking concerns being exacerbated and could make the situation worse rather than better. We do not want to become so concerned about the additional parking restrictions that this distracts from our primary concern namely, the safety of our child. This is clearly unacceptable and can only increase the chance of a child being injured or killed on this busy road.</p> <p>Reddiford school continues to work closely with the Borough and have put into action all of their recommendations. Quite simply our main concern is that these changes could endanger the life of our child, a concern that cannot be overstated.</p>	<p>Residents have told us that the parents picking up their children in the afternoon is a problem due to their inconsiderateness and rudeness towards the local residents</p> <p>The council is aware of the work the school does however some parents have aggravated the local residents into requesting the council do something about the parking and traffic problems the parents themselves are causing.</p> <p>The busy nature of the road is only at school times and therefore can be directly contributed to the school and its parents for which the school and parents must accept some responsibility for.</p> <p>The school may well have been in the area longer than the current residents however the location of the school in a residential area may not be a suitable as it was 100 years ago when there weren't vehicles on the road and I would suggest most of the pupils lived locally.</p> <p>The council has to balance the needs and requests of all road users which means the traffic issues around schools are difficult to address due to the short duration of the problems and that any remedial measures would affect the residents all of the time, not just a term drop off and pick up times.</p>
<p><u>CHIGWELL HURST COURT</u></p>	
<p>I refer to the proposed additional permit parking places in Chigwell Hurst Court, Pinner and object on the following grounds –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There appears to be no need for the additional spaces as the existing parking spaces are often empty. -The proposed places will completely block the turning head when occupied making it 	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. If additional bays are provided in front of property then proposed bays within the turning area could be removed. However there is anecdotal evidence that vehicles park in this location outside of the control times.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>extremely difficult, and probably impossible in the case of commercial vehicles, to turn around in the roadway. This may well lead large vehicles to be forced to reverse into the main road which is clearly dangerous and therefore highly undesirable. If the turning head was not necessary then it would not have been incorporated in the roadway in the first place. Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email in due course</p>	
<p><u>COMPTON RISE</u></p>	
<p>Please confirm that Compton Rise is unaffected by the proposed changes to on-street parking in Pinner.</p>	<p>Confirmed to resident that the only changes in Compton Rise will be the installation of double yellow lines at its junctions with Rayners Lane and Whittington Way.</p>
<p>With referance to your work on parking and saftey, we need yellow line at a sharp bend in Compton Rise adjacent to house numbers 43 and 41. This road is used as a run through by many vehicles at all times of the day.</p>	<p>No yellow lines are proposed at this location at this time as the parking at this location did not manifest a danger to other road users. If motorists using this road cut the corner then yellow lines would have no effect on this driver behaviour.</p>
<p><u>COPPERFIELD WAY</u></p>	
<p>As representatives of Pinner and the Chair of the Committee responsible for Parking I am forwarding to you my formal objection to the proposals contained within the above Review. I believe that these proposals were instigated by the previous administration? In my view they create more issues than they solve. There are simpler and far more economic solutions to the parking issues in Pinner. I have set out some suggestions in my objection. I would have hoped that a professional, impartial and objective Council Officer would have come up with something more constructive and positive. These appear to be just an attempt to satisfy either a political requirement or an antagonistic resident(s). As such I trust that the residents of Pinner can rely upon your support to reject the proposals as presented and opt for a simpler and more cost effective solution to the few issues that affect the area around the High Street. The remainder of the proposals appear to be a gratuitous attempt to placate some rather vociferous residents who are looking at their own specific interests, rather than the well being of the village as a whole. Or maybe, when instigated prior to the local elections, were an attempt to seek electoral support and not for any genuine reason? I am obliged for your support and look forward to receiving your confirmation that you will be objecting to these proposals too?</p> <p>Subject: REF: DP2013-02 Pinner Controlled Parking Zone A Review - OBJECTION Sirs, I wish to formally object to the proposals contained with Pinner Controlled Parking Zone A Review. In particular I am concerned at the impact the current proposals will have upon the residents of Copperfield Way Pinner. I also believe that the proposals for Pinner High Street will not alleviate the current traffic issues and are merely an income generating scheme that will adversely impact upon the foot fall of the local businesses Currently Copperfield Way and the adjacent section of Nower Hill are excluded from the Pinner Zone A CPZ. The proposals, as they currently stand, now intend to include the</p>	<p>Copperfiled Way has not been excluded from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed whereas Nower Hill and Mayfield Drive wanted some parking controls which is why they have been included. Alterations to the waiting and loading restrictions in the High Street are proposed to reduce the congestion that occurs there mainly due to parking on both sides of the road. By national dispensation Blue Badge holders can park on single or double yellow lines for upto three hours providing there are no other loading restrictions are in place and they do not cause an obstruction. Unfortunately some blue badge users do not adhere to this last guideline. It has been necessary to install more stringent waiting and loading restrictions in this report to deal with this issue.</p>

APPENDIX E

currently excluded section of Nower Hill within the CPZ area. However, Copperfield Way, a cul-de-sac that runs off of Nower Hill, is excluded. This lower section of Nower Hill contains a number of large properties that have been converted in to flats. There are presently neither yellow line nor CPZ restrictions affecting the parking in Copperfield Way or this section of Nower Hill. Many of the residents in this area of Nower Hill park in Copperfield Way, as do a small number of commuters using Pinner underground station.

Firstly I am not sure why there is any need to extend the current CPZ in to the length of Nower Hill that is currently excluded. At the moment there are no parking issues that would justify this proposal. I would like to see any evidence to the contrary, as I am sure it would be flawed. If the proposals exclude the extension of the Zone A CPZ into Copperfield Way, especially the length from Nower Hill to say outside number 7 Copperfield Way, then parking in Copperfield Way, especially for residents, will become exacerbated and almost impossible, as the vehicles displaced by the new extended CPZ and the new double yellow lines will seek to use the road as their nearest alternative. There are probably three clear sensible and practical options that will address this problem:

1. Do nothing and maintain the current position;
2. Include Copperfield Way in the proposed extended Pinner Zone A CPZ; or,
3. Leave Copperfield way out of the proposed extended Pinner Zone A CPZ but allow the residents to apply for Zone A permits.

Mayfield Drive is another cul-de-sac off Nower Hill a few yards north of Copperfield Way. It is not currently affected by parking issues. So, why is it proposed to introduce a CPZ solely for this road covering the hours 8.00 am 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday? This road contains 8 large detached residencies that all have significant off street parking provision. There can therefore be no reasonable justification for introducing a CPZ to cover just this small residential street that currently has no parking problems. How can scarce funding be used to implement these proposals (yellow lines, signage, etc.) when the money could be better used on more important schemes? I can only assume that some undue influence has been exerted by a resident or residents in order to make this road, to all intents and purposes, an exclusive private enclave? Even if there is a parking issue in Mayfield Drive why is it considered necessary for the controls to be more extensive and punitive than the adjacent roads? And, if there is perceived to be a parking issue in Mayfield Drive will the introduction of these proposals not just displace these vehicles to the nearest suitable alternative? Copperfield Way!

So far as the High Street (and the equivalent area of Love Lane) is concerned the main and only real problem is the obstruction caused by parking on both sides of the road at the lower end from its junction with Bridge Street up to (approximately) the entrance of the Queens Head car park. There are no real parking or other traffic issues to address in the remainder of the High Street. This specific problem can be addressed by the introduction, as well as the proper and regular enforcement, of double yellow lines on both sides of the High Street from its junction with Bridge Street. Additionally, as Blue Badge holders are, especially during the business day, a major contributor to this parking problem then consideration should be afforded to including loading/unloading restrictions which would then not permit

APPENDIX E

Blue Badge parking. Blue Badge holders are still well catered for by way of the existing spaces in the High Street as well as those in the off street car parks adjacent thereto. I am therefore somewhat confused as to why there is any need to introduce any other controls and the like in the remainder of the High Street apart from the double yellow lines and loading controls at its lower end. Unless, of course, it is just an excuse to introduce a paid for parking regime? Why else could the cost of implementing a scheme that will deliver no real benefits be justified? And, I am sure, we are all aware of the adverse impact that introducing paid parking has on the local footfall and the economic consequences for the local traders?

As a final point, the introduction of a multitude of different sub-zones and parking restrictions within Zone A can only create confusion for local residents and visitors alike. The existing controls generally address the local issues and with a few minor adaptations can deliver a solution to the current localised problems. In the present environment of looking for cost savings in the public sector how can such a needless extensive and expensive scheme be justified? Why not just address the specific issues and not the selfish desires of the specific individuals?

Finally, I wish to reiterate that I am formally objecting to the proposals contained within the Pinner Controlled Parking Zone A Review in general and those specifically that impact upon Copperfield Way and the High Street in particular. The proposals as currently presented, do not address the real issues, are expensive and do not provide either a sensible or cost effective solution to any problems that may exist. Additionally, I believe that in some instance (i.e. Mayfield Drive) there is no evidence or justification to support the proposals and that there must be some other motive or influence driving the decision!

I am copying this objection to the local Pinner Councillors as well as the Portfolio Holder. I shall also be grateful if you can bring this objection to the attention of any other Member who may be involved in the final decision making process or maybe otherwise interested.

I wish to lodge my formal objection to an aspect of the extension of the controlled parking zone in Nower Hill (between No's 2 and 20).

I live in Copperfield Way which adjoins this lower end of Nower Hill and believe imposing parking restrictions here will lead to parking congestion in Copperfield Way.

The end of Nower Hill that you propose to include in the parking zone has not, to my knowledge, been subject to problems and I would be surprised if the residents along that stretch have requested parking restrictions. Many of them have their own driveways and in any event this section of Nower Hill is far away enough from the shops in Pinner Village not to attract too many people looking for parking availability.

The council charges very high council tax and has a responsibility to provide parking for people, without expecting them to pay more for parking outside their front doors in residential areas.

I appreciate that this sometimes becomes necessary where houses are situated in busy shopping areas but what you propose along Nower Hill would appear to be purely a revenue raising exercise.

Copperfield Way has not been excluded from the CPZ. During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed whereas Nower Hill and Mayfield Drive wanted some parking controls which is why they have been included.

Unfortunately the resident is not correct in the statement that the council has a responsibility to provide parking for people. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own or park on the public highway and does not have a responsibility to provide any on-street parking but does so as a concession where it feels it is safe and practical to do so.

APPENDIX E

<p>You will indeed cause a parking problem where there is none currently! Please reconsider in the light of this objection.</p>	
<p>Having reviewed the Pinner Area Parking Review recently received I would like to object to the proposal to extend Zone A Controlled Parking Zone between No2 and No20 Nower Hill As a resident of Copperfields Way, which is a road off Nower Hill, I object to the proposal as it will cause cars to park in Copperfield Way in order to avoid the parking restriction in Nower Hill. Copperfield Way is a narrow road with houses closely packed and parking is often quite difficult, particularly when people have visitors. The proposal will make this problem much worse and I therefore request that the CPZ is not extended from its current position in Nower Hill.</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of Copperfield Way for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed whereas Nower Hill and Mayfield Drive wanted some parking controls which is why they have been included.</p>
<p><u>CRANBOURNE DRIVE</u></p>	
<p>I am writing to confirm that I approve of the details of the Review. In particular, I am keen to see the implementation of the scheme for Cranbourne Drive. The extension of the CPZ is long overdue to deal with the substantial problems caused by all-day parking in our road.</p>	<p>Helpful to hear positive response</p>
<p><u>CREST VIEW</u></p>	
<p>Some comments made as a resident I note that in point I you mention introducing waiting restrictions double yellow lines in all Junctions I mention this in connection with our road Crest View and its junction with Northfield Avenue and the chaos which ensues when West Lodge school breaks up and the parents collect their children from the school gate. Cars are parked up and around the junction and indeed on both sides of Crest View and they are often parked on the pavements. There is effectively no access for emergency vehicles at that time and given that a disabled person with a history of falling lives at No 2 this needs to be addressed. The lines are a good idea but the key has to be proper enforcement and a heavy traffic control presence in the early days followed by regular follow up visits would be most helpful Point K pay and display outside St Luke's Church I am mindful of the law of unintended consequences and mention the case of St Anselms Church in Westfield park Hatch End as an example I know the cases are completely unrelated but the law of unintended consequences as meant that the parking restrictions in the area of West Field park have had a serious effect on the Church. I hope that in the case of St Luke's this has been taken into account My final point concerns the lower part of Cannon Lane south of the junction with St Michaels' Crescent and before the junction with Darley Road where there is a bend I believe this is outside the consultation scheme The H12 busses are double deckers and when one stops at the bus stop the bus in the other direction sometimes has difficulties passing. There should be no waiting areas for a long distance on the opposite side of the road to where the bus stop is located This happens in the part of Cannon Lane North of St Michaels' crescent but does not appear to happen in the area i am speaking of God luck with e review and i hope that any review in HE will not take the 20 years that the</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are being recommended for the reasons the resident gives. Enforcement is carried out by the council Parking Operations team and they will be aware of all new restrictions installed. The P&D outside St Lukes Church is not progressing. The area of Cannon Lane mentioned is outside the scope of this consultation however it has not been brought to our attention by the bus operator. Any waiting restriction for a long distance has to be balanced against the needs of the whole community and how it would affect residents everyday</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Pinner one has taken</p>	
<p><u>CUCKOO HILL</u></p>	
<p>Will the proposals for Cecil Park for 3 - 4 pm not cause problems for parents dropping off and collecting their children at Reddiford School? My other comments are on the presentation, grammar, etc, in the Statutory Consultation document and on the website, including: 1.What is TARSAP? It's mentioned on page 6 of the document, but I can't see anywhere what this acronym stands for. 2.page 6 - It's not the "affected properties" which would comment on or agree to the alterations, but their owners or occupiers. Sloppy English! 3.Why couldn't the plan in the document give the names of all the affected roads? I'm sure there's room. High View (not a long road) is named three times! 4 In some places you state "12 noon" (correct) but elsewhere, particularly on the detailed maps on the website, the time appears as "12 pm". There's no such time! 5.paragraphs 2 (b), (c), (d) and (e) of the Traffic Order - "it's" should be "its". A schoolboy error! 6.paragraph 3 - presumably the cost of the permits is per annum. You don't say so! I hope you find these comments helpful for future consultations.</p>	<p>The proposed additional hour in Cecil Park is recommended not to proceed following objections from local residents Consultation documents are under continuous review and comments are noted</p>
<p>As an ex Pinner shopkeeper , I want to register my objection at the proposed parking restrictions there. More shops are closing & part of this is due to shoppers already put off by present charges & v. little free time at metered bays. This discourages people from spending time & money in Pinner, 1 of the loveliest ' villages ' in N.W. London. I urge you strongly to veto further moves which will force even MORE businesses to close down & move from the area. Pinner needs incentives NOT restrictions</p>	<p>Parking controls are unfortunately required due the sometime dangerous and inconsiderate parking of those using the area. Regulating the on street parking,, including introducing P&D with the 20 minute free parking period, will encourage a turnover of customers and prevent long term all day parking in front if the shops which prevents customers getting close to where they want to be. Pinner also has large off street parking in the area for longer shopping stays.</p>
<p><u>CUCKOO HILL ROAD</u></p>	
<p>I object to the proposed change from Zone A in Cecil Park to a single road zone. Having an hour's restriction, as currently, between 11-12 is sufficient. Increasing the restriction to include the time between 3-4 will be a huge problem for mothers collecting school children, as well as for users of the library (car park often full) and the synagogue. This unnecessary additional hour of restriction should not be adopted. It would also have an impact on surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Residents of Cecil Park were consulted a second time to ensure this consultation reflected what they thought they wanted. This report recommends the additional control hour be abandoned.</p>
<p><u>EAST END WAY</u></p>	
<p>I have just read the pinner area parking review as I understand it you intend to remove the disable parking in the high st.and love lane . As a disabled permit holder this will cause me (and I'm sure all other local disabled residents) great difficulties in doing our local shopping. In openig up these positions to all car drivers , you will be making it even more difficult for us to find a parking space close enough to the shops and with the minimum of painful walking . Drivers who are perfectly fit have the option of parking within a walking distance of the centre of Pinner, disabled drivers have not! You will be forcing us to use other shopping areas such as Hatch end where they have a generous number of disable parking bays,</p>	<p>The disabled bays are not being removed they are being formalised to bring them in line with other areas of the borough. One or two may be repositioned but over all there will be more dedicated disabled parking spaces in the main shopping area. Limiting the period of stay will allow other blue badge holders to park in the area rather than the spaces being monopolised by a few drivers</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>thereby local pinner shops will be loosing our customer.</p>	
<p><u>EASTCOTE ROAD</u></p>	
<p>It is understandable that parking restrictions should be extended to the western edge of the Pinner zone to free the congestion in Cranborne Drive and Malpas Drive. I believe it would be wise to have a parking restriction on the Western end of Eastcote Road from Lyncroft Ave to the Hillingdon border otherwise displaced parking will half the width of Eastcote Road and obliterate the cycling lanes. This road is a busy bus route and maim link between Eastcote and Pinner taking overflow traffic from the A40 when it is blocked westwards from the Polish War Memorial</p>	<p>Additional double yellow lines at the junctions along this stretch of road are proposed as part of the scheme. There are currently no plans for any other restrictions along this road as there was no support from the local residents for any further restrictions at this time.</p>
<p>Further to the receipt of the Parking Review and my fathers subsequent conversation with the council I write to bring to your attention the problems that I currently have with parking and to explain how the proposed changes can only worsen my situation. I already have parking issues even though there are parking areas both sides of the road and constantly have to park a long way from my cottage. With the probable introduction of parking permits to roads in my area this will mean that commuters will seek out other areas to park (for free) and walk to the station. This already happens and the situation will be far worse if the plans go ahead. My property and adjoining ones are only c. 12 feet wide and it does not take many cars to completely fill the parking areas both sides of the road. I could be left with absolutely nowhere to park! Whilst appreciating that the road are public highways, I am certain that most of the commuter parking is from outside the borough and they only drive to Pinner to reduce costs and really do not care if anybody else is inconvenienced. There is a simply solution which will be relatively cheap to implement. The existing parking bays both sides of the Eastcote Road could have permit only parking during the day to control the parking and keep it for local tax paying residents. If this can happen in adjacent less busy side roads further from the station then why not in Eastcote Road which is a very busy main road. I appreciate that there was probably extensive representation from the residents of these roads but just because only a few properties are effected in Eastcote Road why should our voice not be heard. I would request you to reconsider your proposed plans and include the parking bays both outside my cottage and the opposite side of the road to be resident parking (permit holders) for say 1 hour each day. I look forward to your response.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of this statutory consultation. If residents feel they want a controlled parking zone then they need to make representation to the council to show that the majority of residents in the area are supportive of the idea. To date this has not happened and was not brought out in the previous consultations.</p>
<p><u>ELM PARK ROAD</u></p>	
<p>Please refer to the attachment pictures and below for reference. We live at Elm Park Road and it has become an increasingly dangerous stretch of road, not only because of speeding but especially because of the parking and restricted traffic movement due to the parking allowances and permit spaces. You will see in the pictures that there is a bottle neck around my location due to parking on both sides of the street (yellow line outside my house and permit opposite) then, with buses stopping further along, and worse when a bus comes the other way, a huge and dangerous</p>	<p>There has been one reported personal injury collision in this area in the last three years from information the council have Police data for. This collision was as the result of the stationary car opening its door in the path of a passing car. As part of the Pinner CPZ the yellow line is only operational for one hour a day which does mean any vehicle can park on this reasonably wide public highway outside of these times.. If additional waiting restrictions were installed and the parking bays removed it is</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>snarl up builds.</p> <p>There have been two crashes outside my entrance (within the last two months) because of this and if you see the parking arrangements, cars (and high trucks and vans) park right up to the edge of my driveway and totally restrict not only any viewing possibility for traffic but extremely difficult for residents to get out with opposite parked cars causing a very narrow access around cars and avoiding oncoming traffic and as mentioned, at speed. Cars are not 90 degree jointed This needs immediate addressing to alleviate this mess, preferably by: Eradicating the permit space (everyone has sufficient off street parking here), Making parking yellow lines further from driveways so as not to block exits and allow cars leaving their properties to exit. This needs to be taken into account also in your other assessments. I fear there will be more accidents if this is not addressed.</p>	<p>likely that speeding, or constantly moving, traffic would increase and the resident is already saying there is speeding traffic along the road. The Police are the only authority that can enforce speed of traffic.</p> <p>There have been no complaints to the council from the bus operators regarding any delays in their service.</p> <p>The council does look to maximise the parking where possible and as part of this review several new permit parking bays are being proposed throughout the area. It is not only residents that need to use these permit bays but their visitors as not all properties in the area would have sufficient parking for all their visitors as well as any vehicles they own.</p>
<p>I saw a note on a lamp post concerning the above review outside our church at 2 Elm Park Road.</p> <p>As you know our church owned the land that the bay consists of 70 years ago, but handed it over to the council for ease of maintenance at that time. So we feel that we have the right to comment on the layout of the parking spots in the bay. We understand that it is your proposal to mark out 2 or 3 longitudinal spaces, whereas the more efficient use of the bay would be to turn it into 5 diagonal spaces. Please consider and respond</p>	<p>Parallel parking in the proposed parking bays would be the safest option. If currently vehicles angle par then they either have to reverse into the bay or reverse back into the main carriageway. The current regulations under the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions as laid out by the Department for Transport also do not allow for what would be such a shallow angle and provide a minimum width of bay suitable for use.</p>
<p><u>GILBERT ROAD</u></p>	
<p>I have received the above consultation document. I live at Gilbert Road which is within the area of the CPZ, but there are no restrictions in Gilbert Road itself. As a result cars from outside the area use the road for all day parking. The junction of Gilbert Road with Northfield Avenue has poor sight lines and cars are now sometimes parked on both sides of the road very close to the junction. This restricts the width of the carriageway to one car wide for vehicles entering and leaving the road. In view of the poor visibility it is only a matter of time before accidents occur.</p> <p>In the interests of road safety it would be sensible to extend the existing yellow lines some ten metres into Gilbert Road to prevent parking so close to the junction.</p>	<p>The existing single yellow lines at the junction are being upgraded to double yellow lines. There are no properties directly affected and there is a large hedge on the side of the property fronting North Way. It may be possible to extend the proposed double yellow lines on this northern side for approximately 15 metres if approval is obtained from the Portfolio Holder.</p>
<p><u>GRANGE GARDENS</u></p>	
<p>My material objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are already too many parking bays in Grange Gardens (GG), 2. There is no proper regulation of GG parking bays as often vans which are too wide do park in the bay but no action is taken by the Council, so more bays will mean more such problems, 3. GG is narrow in width and it is a horse-shoe shape road which makes fire engines difficult to go in and out if necessary. If more parking is allowed, the above situation will get worse, 4. There is probably no demand from residents of GG for the Council to put in more parking bays. This point can be verified by the fact that many bays are often empty. Most residents of GG park their cars in their own drive, thus rendering the need to park in the designated bays obsolete! There is little doubt that the majority of the cars that park along the single yellow lines in GG are NON residents of Pinner. The problem is parking in Central Pinner, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. 2. Any vehicle issued with a residents permit must abide by the regulations at the time. If other vehicles park in the road outside of the control times the council has no powers to deal with this, such as builders vans etc. 3. There has been no representation from the London Fire Service that they experience difficulty in this road. Emergency vehicle access width is maintained during the control times by the location of the bays. 4. As 1 above and also putting in bays means the council keeps them clear of driveways by at least 1-1.5 meters. Additional bays also allow for visitors and workman to park close to a property during the control time if there is not enough off-street parking space. Marked bays can also encourage motorists to park in a

APPENDIX E

<p>and it is even more dangerous for such cars to be in effect relocated in the quiet residential road that is GG!</p> <p>5. Strong objection from 20GG -- because of the shape of GG on either side of 20GG, limited visibility and limited space means it is already difficult to exit safely from our drive, thus allowing new parking bays will exacerbate this problem!</p> <p>Thank you for your attention and I do hope the above points will be taken on board.</p>	<p>more controlled manner even outside the control times.</p> <p>5. Property is on a virtually straight section of road between two curves. Property shares a double width driveway with neighbouring property. The Highway Code does recommend reversing into a property and driving out in a forward gear. This may offer a better view of the road when exiting property.</p>
<p>I object to the creation of any additional permit bays in Grange Gardens. At certain times it is impossible to drive down the road and the creation of more permit bays will just encourage all day parking by permit holders when there are sufficient car parks in Pinner</p>	<p>The additional bays will formalise where parking can occur during the control times and marked bays can also encourage motorists to park in a more controlled manner outside the control times.</p>
<p><u>HAZELDENE DRIVE</u></p> <p>We were extremely disappointed to receive the news that Hazeldene Drive will not be covered by the Pinner Area Parking Review despite the unanimous feedback from the Hazeldene residents. We wish to object on the grounds that access to and from our property is severely limited each day by the number of cars using the road as the last free parking space for the London Underground tube. This creates difficulty each day when we leave and return. As a nurse I am often called out to work and have to perform several attempts to back out from my drive, due top the parked cars.</p> <p>In addition we wish to object on safety grounds in terms of access through the parked cars, which has been a feat of advanced driving on the part of the refuse lorry and would be impassable to a fire engine. (see attached photos).</p> <p>We would respectfully request that you consider the strong feelings of Hazeldene Drive in modifying the Pinner Parking Plans. Your latest plans will exacerbate the problem by pushing even more cars into Hazeldene Drive to join the stream of commuters who block the road each working day.</p> <p>as a minimum we would request that you extend the zone most of the way down Hazeldene Drive as a deterrent. I enclose photos of a typical day.</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of Hazeldene Drive for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed.</p>
<p>We object to the Pinner Area Parking Review consultation, the documentation of which we recently received for the following reasons.</p> <p>We object to the fact that parking problems in Hazeldene Drive have unfairly been completely ignored by the Review. Hazeldene Drive is a road fairly close to the centre of Pinner and is being used by non residents continuously for parking particularly on weekdays during working hours. Our road has become a "free car park" to all day parkers. It is difficult to exit our driveway with cars parked opposit€ and either side of our exit. We are unable to enjoy the normal facility of allowing friends, relatives or trades persons to park outside our property when visiting us. In addition, the present parking arrangements are in our view dangerous as illustrated by the enclosed photo that shows cars parked either side ofthe road at the entrance to West End Lane.</p> <p>Can you please explain why the residents ofHazeldene Drive are not being offered the same restrictions as residents in adjacent roads as per your Review and why you consider that this road should be used as an overflow car park. Could you also please confirm that ifyou decide to allow Hazeldene Drive to continue as a free car park, then you will be</p>	<p>Hazeldend Drive has not been ignored, during the public consultation there was no support from the residents of Hazeldene Drive for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>recommending to your colleagues on the Council that our council tax will be reduced. We do not understand why we should subsidise third party parkers, who should be contributing towards Harrow Council's finances by parking at fee paying car parks within Pinner. We look forward to your early reply in writing and you can be assured that if we are not satisfied, we will be taking this matter up with our local councillors and our MP.</p>	
<p>I am in support of the proposed parking restriction taking place in the road i.e . Summary item (i) This will indeed make the road accessible at all times to emergency vehicles. Please see photographic evidence 1 of a typical day in the road. However this does lead to an objection. By shunting daily parkers further into the road it is debatable as to whether emergency vehicles would be able to pass through extra double parking. Also the street has become far more congested since the original consultation. Now residents are experiencing difficulties in accessing or leaving their driveways due to inconsiderate parking. Please see photographic evidence 2 of a typical day in the road. I would be grateful if you would consider these comments when making the final decision.</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of Hazeldene Drive for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed.</p>
<p><u>HIGH STREET</u></p>	
<p>I am writing a letter of formal objection to one aspect of the recently published traffic and parking plans for Pinner Village. I realise that it is difficult to make changes to published proposals at this stage, but my predecessor, Mrs Jill Tyndall was too ill to make representations for the benefit of the pub, prior to selling it to me in August 2013. I was not therefore part of the consultation process. The Queen's Head is a very successful pub employing 12 staff. It is one of only two left in Pinner Village. We have a number of deliveries during the week, which are extremely heavy. Our Monday morning dray weights 6.00 tonnes. We have over 100 barrels of beer a week delivered, with minerals on top of that. In addition we have 250 bottles of wine delivered every week. The present proposal provides for a loading bay on the far side of the road, but more importantly, some way down the hill. This will make task of delivery staff enormously difficult, having to push beer barrels up a hill. The most appropriate place for a loading bay would be immediately outside the pub, and it would then be shared by Pizza Express, and Prezzo who also have very heavy deliveries. I realise however, that a loading bay is for all commercial users. I would be grateful if the Council could enter into further consultation on this request.</p>	<p>The council is aware of concerns about loading facilities. Alterations to the proposed parking and disabled bays nearby are part of the recommendations of this report with a view to future local amendments next financial year if approved by the Panel and Portfolio Holder.</p>
<p><u>LAWN VALE</u></p>	
<p>We are residents of Lawn Vale, HA5 3DA. Our neighbors at 22A and 29 Woodhall Avenue have informed us that they will be requesting single yellow lines outside of their respective properties on Woodhall Avenue. We would prefer that residents parking bays are put in place instead of the yellow line so that residents are still able to park. If their request for single yellow lines is accepted then we would like to request that 2 residents parking bays are also put on the south side of Lawn Vale along the borders of our house 1 Lawn Vale and that single yellow lines are put on the north side to prevent the road from being blocked (as</p>	<p>There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>the road is very narrow) by cars parked on both sides of the road. We are aware of a similar request made by our neighbors at 24 Woodhall Avenue. We reside at Lawn Vale Pinner HA5 3EA. We have had sight of the views expressed by our neighbours at 24 Woodhall Avenue in their submissions to you. For our part we are in total agreement with their suggestions . To do otherwise would merely move the problem elsewhere in Lawn Vale or in time.</p>	<p>from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road. There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road.</p>
<p>I refer to the planned amendments to parking restrictions in Pinner. I would like to suggest that additional restrictions be applied in Lawn Vale, Pinner for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lawn Vale is very narrow and so easily blocked by vehicles. •With the existing driveways, there is very limited space available for parking at the best of times. •because of the above, any diversion of cars from nearby roads risks making Lawn Vale impassable. •Residents have ample parking in their garages and driveways, making the need for residents' bays unnecessary. <p>I would like to propose the following restrictions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •a single yellow line on the south side of Lawn Vale, extending from the junction with Woodhall Ave to, and including 5 Lawn Vale. •a double yellow line on the north side of Lawn Vale (as cars parked on this side would make the road impassable), extending from the junction with Woodhall Avenue to the drive of 6 Lawn Vale. <p>As an additional consideration, may I ask the Council to review the parking on the High Street, on which the traffic flow is severely impeded whenever there are vehicles parked on both sides of the road. I would ask that parking be prohibited on one side, to ensure traffic can flow.</p>	<p>There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road. The resident would also see from the proposals that there are a variety of proposed++ waiting and loading restrictions being proposed for the High Street to try to combat exactly what they mention.</p>
<p><u>LEIGHTON AVENUE</u></p>	
<p>We note from the "Pinner Area Parking Review" leaflet that this email needs to include the word objection. So please read the below as an objection to the plan as it is. The request below is to have the plan extended to cover outside number 8 to 10 for consistency. I was heartened to see the above notice. You have obviously realised the need for some action concerning the horrendous traffic problem in Pinner and in particular on Leighton Avenue. The problem is so frustrating that on weekdays I am unable to park outside my house at any time before 6pm. The</p> <p>1) Why is there not a plan to place a permit bay outside numbers 8 and 10 Leighton Avenue? Creating additional permit holder bays on the road will then mean that there will be</p>	<p>1.When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. As these properties have off-street parking and there are three driveways opposite it was felt by the engineer that it would not be a suitable location for an additional permit bay. 2.If residents feel that the existing operational times of the CPZ are not suitable this has not been indicated during the consultation process.</p>

APPENDIX E

an even worse problem outside my house (number 8) as people will prioritise this as a place to park. I expect to see a change of plan with the addition of a permit bay outside numbers 8 and 10. This should allow me to at least park outside my house with my three children. I query the logic behind the choice of location of the additional bays.

2) Creating additional permit parking places will not solve the problem as the restriction only applies between 11 - 12 all that happens is that staff and patients at Pinn medical centre and other businesses move their cars into the Marks and Spencers car park for that hour and then simply move them back to Leighton Avenue and adjacent roads after 12 o'clock. The solution would be to create dedicated parking spaces for Pinn medical centre staff in the car park or extend the time restriction in the resident permit spaces.

I have spoken to many of my neighbours who all agree the situation is unbearable. This problem did not exist before the opening of Pinn Medical centre which although has been very beneficial to the community has aggravated this problem.

I await your response.

Additional photos and comments received

I have taken the attached photo's to show the extent of the issue on Leighton Avenue.

-The first picture named "corner of Road" , shoes how motorists park on the corners of road creating a danger to public and other motorists . The corner areas need to double yellowed to stop this.

-The other three pictures show the situation at 11.00 a.m. , then at 11.01 a.m. and then back at 12.01 a.m.

The pictures how that the restriction between the 11.00 a.m. to 12.00 a.m. needs to extended or a secondary period of no parking introduced. Note how the amount of cars all move at 11.01 a.m. as workers take early lunch sit in their cars elsewhere and then bring them back at 12.00 a.m.

The motorists parking during the week have "worked around" the no parking period as evident in the pictures.

Even when we get home after work we cannot park on out road , even with parking permits as the spaces are taken.

I appreciate you taking the aforementioned into consideration as it is becoming ridiculous on the road. We now have people waiting in cars on the road, outside our drives, waiting for someone to leave so they can take the space.

There are two fantastic car parks in Pinner and both have ample space to accommodate shoppers et al. Drivers need to using these spaces as that is what they are designed to do. They need to be discouraged of working around the restrictions whilst ensuring they have a place to park and this the council has done very well in the form of the car parks.

LLOYD COURT

Individual copy received of mass letter sent from residents road as form of petition
OBJECTION
Objection to the proposed plans to introduce a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in Cranbourne Drive. Ref (DP2014-02) Pinner, Harrow.

The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road, Rochester Road and Lloyd Court were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining

APPENDIX E

<p>A CPZ will have a direct impact to Lloyd Court residents on the adjacent road.</p> <p>1)As a result of lack of available parking space, Lloyd Court residents currently experience serious parking problems, which have been highlighted to the council in the past. In our view, the proposed plans would make these issues even worse.</p> <p>2) As one of the last free parking roads in the area, we believe Lloyd Court would receive a significant influx of displaced parking if a CPZ is introduced in Cranbourne Drive. During the consultation period, we objected to a CPZ on Lloyd court as we believe it wouldn't make a difference to the lack of parking space on such a densely populated street with no off-street parking.</p> <p>3)Lloyd Court residents would lose the option to park in Cranbourne Drive in the, unfortunately common, occasions when there is no available space in our road. To make things worse, we have been informed that Lloyd Court residents will not have the option to buy resident permits for Cranbourne Drive.</p> <p>4)Most, if not all, of Cranbourne Drive residents already have off street parking and have already paid the council for their dropped kerbs so the benefits to them are limited compared to the large inconvenience the implementation of the CPZ would cause to Lloyd Court residents.</p> <p>Possible solutions</p> <p>1)Residents may consider their own CPZ on Lloyd Court if more parking space was available. This could be achieved by extending the road side to create more parking space into the council owned grass area that is currently unused, which effectively would allow for parking on both sides of the road. It is worth noting that the kerb on Ellement Close (on the other side of Eastcote Road) has already been modified in this way to create more parking space.</p> <p>2)There is also potential for parking space adjacent to the garages as you enter Lloyd Court. The degraded footpath on the left hand side could be removed as this is currently unusable for pedestrians given it is in such poor state. Funding for this project could be obtained from the CPZ charges.</p> <p>3)Clearly marked out parking bays would also help the residents use the current limited on-street parking space more efficiently (e.g. a lot of space is sometimes wasted with unnecessarily large gaps in between vehicles).</p> <p>We sincerely hope you take our views into account before making a final decision on this matter.</p>	<p>road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road.</p> <p>It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p> <p>The roads listed above did not support any additional parking controls in their road during the public consultation stage. This is why they were not included in the proposals for and extension of Pinner Zone A CPZ into their road, although it is proposed to install double yellow lines at all junctions in the area.</p> <p>The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own and park on the public highway. The council does not have a responsibility to provide any on street parking and would not convert existing grassed areas to parking.</p> <p>The council also does not mark out specific parking bays in residential areas as some residents may claim ownership of a particular bay especially if it directly outside their property.</p>
<p>I can confirm that we have received the petition (in paper form) with objections from residents in Lloyd Court. These will be noted and considered along with all other responses received.</p> <p>You should have received 49 original letters by post objecting to the CPZ proposal on Cranbourne Drive (Front cover image on the Pinner Area Parking Review Statutory consultation leaflet)</p>	<p>See above for response</p>
<p><u>LOVE LANE</u></p>	
<p>Reference: DP2103-02</p>	<p>Helpful to hear a supportive response in relation to restrictions in the area.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>I reside at Love Lane, Pinner which is area 7 in the Zone A review document. Currently, the relatively unrestricted parking causes significant problems with congestion, bad driving and inconsiderate parking around the junction of Avenue Road and Love Lane. Adding double yellow lines as per the proposal will significantly improve the situation. It will also help us personally, as non-residents often partly block or completely block access to our own driveway, despite there being a drop-down in place, making access a lot more difficult. Therefore we wholly approve of the changes proposed to the Love Lane parking controls. Could you advise on the timescales for the restrictions to be approved and then implemented?</p>	<p>Assuming the recommendations are approved by the Panel and Portfolio Holder it is anticipated that the measures on the ground will be installed in the new year but unfortunately the road markings are weather dependant.</p>
<p>Regarding your new proposals, I agree with more residents parking bays, but please curtail your ideas of double yellow lines. They are a nuisance and are not required. Single yellows operated properly are sufficient.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are required to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained at all times in line with the well established rules in the Highway Code.</p>
<p>Re Pinner Area Parking Review You ask for comments regarding the above review. I have already sent letters and emails (believe it or not, I began my campaign over 22 years ago!!) regarding the parking bay outside nos. 83/85 Love Lane. (Area 7 map). This space is far too big for two cars, but just not big enough for 3 cars. All that is required is to extend the existing space by a small amount to allow for 3 vehicles to park there. It is not near a bend or the end of the road, and therefore would not cause any safety problems. There is plenty of room between the driveways of nos. 83 and 85 for this extension. My husband also sent a letter to this effect in June of this year, and received a reply from your department to say that this request was being seriously considered. It was therefore very disappointing when we looked at the plan to find that it still does not show up as having been implemented. Please rethink this while there is still time, it will make such a lot of difference and would be so easy to achieve. I appreciate that you are adding spaces to Love Lane, but in view of the vast increase in car ownership (some houses own 4 cars!) - it will still not be enough.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible and the actual length of any bay will be considered at the detailed design stage. The length of the existing bay could be increased if site conditions allow during the final design stage. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own or park on the public highway.</p>
<p>Thank you for sending me the Pinner Area Parking Review 1.)The parking bay in the kerb space outside Nos. 83/85 Love Lane (area 7) allows for two cars to park. However, when two cars occupy that space - there is still space left over for three quarters of a car. Please could you extend that space by just one quarter of a car to allow of one more vehicle to be parked? 2.)Waxwell Lane & Bridge Street section (area 7). This section requires urgent attention. When vehicles are allowed to park on opposite sides of the road to each other, this causes serious constrictions in the width of the road. Traffic has to weave erratically through these constrictions from one side of the road to the other. It is a wonder that the Fire and Ambulance services have not put their case to you more forcefully. (your note i.) Just for this section a double yellow is required for one side of street parking only to stop this dangerous chaos. Please give serious attention to these points, which I hope will allow your Project Engineer to take positive action.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible and the actual length of any bay will be considered at the detailed design stage. The length of the existing bay could be increased if site conditions allow during the final design stage. The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own or park on the public highway. The resident would note from the plans that additional waiting and loading restrictions are proposed for the area they mention for the reasons they mention.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Many thanks for requesting my comments,</p> <p>I am writing in respect of the above review to reiterate two points I made to you over the telephone a couple of weeks ago:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •I live at XX Love Lane. Between 85 and 83 Love Lane is a residents' permit bay large enough only for 2.5 cars. We, and our neighbours at 83, would really appreciate it if the space could be lengthened to accommodate 3 cars. There is no risk that this lengthening would overlap either of our drives. •The lower end of Waxwell Lane, between Love Lane and Bridge Street, is like a slalom, with cars parked randomly on both sides. One side should have double yellow lines for most of its length. I believe that you may already be planning to do this, but let me reinforce you in your resolve. 	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible and the actual length of any bay will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The length of the existing bay could be increased if site conditions allow during the final design stage.</p> <p>The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own or park on the public highway.</p> <p>The resident would note from the plans that additional waiting and loading restrictions are proposed for the area they mention for the reasons they mention.</p>
<p>I would like to object to the placement of the 4 residential permit bays O/S no. 87 Love Lane, Pinner, HA5 3EY as proposed in the Pinner Proposed Controlled Parking Area Review reference DP 2013-02 because the bay nearest to no. 85 Love Lane will obstruct the drive at 87 Love Lane according to the map of Area 7. The drive at 87 Love Lane is on a very steep downward slope and at an angle to the road such that any car parked close to the drive on the North-West side will severely obstruct access to the drive and the view of any traffic on Love Lane coming from the North West direction.</p> <p>I would have no objection to the proposal if the bays would be no closer than 2 metres to the drive measured at the kerb.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible and the actual length of any bay will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><u>LYNCROFT AVENUE</u></p>	
<p>As long term residents of Lyncroft Avenue we would like to make the following objections:- Lyncroft Avenue has now become a very busy, fast dangerous narrow main road (short cut from North Harrow to Eastcote, Ruislip, Northwood etc) which at times can be very difficult to cross, as you are unable to see oncoming traffic owing to parked vehicles on 'both sides' of the road, you have to step out into middle of the road to see what's coming thus taking your life in your hands.</p> <p>Also owing to the very large heavy lorries that are used by business these days one or the other has to give way to let the others get through, owing to the parking on both sides, no doubt the emergency services and council refuse collectors will confirm this.</p> <p>There is also the problem of long-term parking during the day and every night of commercial vehicles and non-resident cars, which are also left unused from Friday evening until Monday morning most weekends.</p> <p>We think that the Council should consider putting in yellow lines on one side or the other of Lyncroft Avenue from the junction of Cannon Lane to Hill Road to improve safety and vision when crossing Lyncroft Avenue which is used by every- body coming down Hill Road, from mothers with prams to the elderly with wheel chairs.</p> <p>Oddly some roads that appear to have very little traffic seem to have yellow lines and restrictions already?</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of Lyncroft Avenue for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed. However to improve visibility at junctions, double yellow lines have been proposed as part of this scheme in line with other areas throughout the borough.</p>
<p><u>MALPAS DRIVE</u></p>	

APPENDIX E

<p>I fully support the proposal to introduce parking restrictions. However, from a personal perspective my wife is disabled and wheelchair bound and therefore, we would prefer that a permit bay is not placed outside of our house, as this would potentially lead to someone parking in that bay and could hinder my ability to transfer my wife in to the car.</p>	<p>This property does have off street parking but from their response assume this is not able to be utilised by the resident. There are no permit parking bays located directly outside the property but one is proposed opposite the property. However as with any CPZ any vehicle can park in the road anywhere outside of the control times as they do now.</p>
<p>Please can you ensure parking bays in Malpas drive are all on the one side of the road. (Odd number side only) This will ensure cars can drive down the road without the need to interweave between sides. Residents should get two free permits Also controls should be mon to fri only</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible and this may mean the need to install permit bays on both sides of the road. By national legislation CPZ must be self financing. Other residents of Harrow who do not have the benefit of using the road during the control times do not pay for the scheme in the same way this resident does not pay for other CPZ in the borough that they cannot use. Presently Harrow do not offer free permits for residents. The proposal is for the CPZ to operate the same hours as the existing Pinner CPZ ie Monday to Friday.</p>
<p>OBJECTION to the Extension of the CPZ to Cranbourne Drive & Malpas Drive. If the extension of the CPZ to Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive is introduced, then Commuter Parking in Cranbourne Drive will be transferred to Winchester Drive (and possibly Colchester Drive) and will be equally intolerable to all residents. As you are no doubt aware up to 18 cars are regularly parked on weekdays on both sides of Cranbourne Drive between West End Lane and Malpas Drive. The resultant transfer of parking to Winchester Drive and Colchester Drive (which have a carriageway width of only 4.6m) is likely to cause</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a total blockage if vehicles are parked opposite each other on both sides of the road, • impeded access for Emergency Services (jeopardising safety), the Borough's Refuse Collection vehicles and other HGVs if there is inconsiderate 'staggered' parking creating a tight chicane, due to the narrowness of the road. • damage to pavements when commercial vehicles face restricted access (this is already a problem on the corner of Malpas and Winchester Drives) <p>I understand that although the residents of Winchester, Colchester and Rochester Drives were originally consulted they were not in favour of extending the CPZ to their roads. However knowing that the CPZ is likely to go ahead in Cranbourne and Malpas Drives only, they could well change their views. This OBJECTION is therefore made on the basis that the CPZ extension is insufficient and should be extended to include Winchester Drive and Colchester Drive.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.</p>
<p>Pinner Area Parking Review – Response to Statutory Consultation We object to the proposed extension of CPZ Zone A into Malpas Drive and in particular into Malpas Drive beyond the junction with Winchester Drive towards Eastcote Road. The evidence does not suggest a strong demand for the extension and nor does it suggest a significant risk of commuter parking in the road as a consequence of the very limited extension of parking restrictions in other surrounding roads.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.</p>

APPENDIX E

We also feel that as far as we can tell from Plan, the proposed double yellow line on the corner of Colchester Drive and Malpas Drive that is outside 8 Malpas Drive is longer than it needs to be for safety reasons and appears to remove all the street parking outside number 8.

The CPZ Zone A applies between 11am – 12 noon. We assume that the rationale for extending the Zone to restrict parking in Cranbourne Drive is because it is believed that any problems experienced are due to commuters who park there for Pinner Station rather than:-

- residents' own vehicles
- residents' visitors
- parents dropping off and picking up their kids for West Lodge School
- visitors to the Cuckoo Hill allotments, including dog walkers
- visitors to Pinner Memorial Park/Daisy's.

We assume that the proposal to also extend the CPZ into Malpas Drive is because there may be a level of concern that commuters dislodged from Cranbourne Drive, should that proposal go ahead, would simply park round the corner given that residents say there is no current problem. Again, do correct us if the Council has something else in mind.

Whilst we cannot ignore the possibility that some commuters using Pinner Station now parking in Cranbourne Drive would park in Malpas Drive if the Zone were extended to include it, in fact that's just one possibility for the, on a rough count, <20-25 drivers the Council wants to deter. There are several other alternative actions commuters may take, including but not limited to:-

- using public transport to get to Pinner Station
- cycling to Pinner Station
- using public transport to get to another station
- cycling to another station
- paying for parking at Pinner Station as, beyond Cranbourne Drive, the trade-off between the cost of parking and the longer walk to the station no longer "costs in"
- paying for parking at another station, such as Rayners Lane
- driving to street parking close to another station, eg Eastcote, Ruislip Manor, Rayners Lane, Northwood Hills etc to reduce the length of the walk
- parking on other local roads in Pinner without restrictions but closer to or a similar distance from the station. Those near us include but are not restricted to:-
 - o Eastcote Road
 - o Lyncroft Avenue
 - o Hill Road
 - o Moorcroft Way
 - o Ellement Close
 - o Rosecroft Walk
 - o Colchester Drive
 - o Winchester Drive
 - o parking on other local roads elsewhere in Pinner within walking distance of the station but not close to us

The council has to respond to the responses provided by the residents of these roads during the previous consultation and although the responses were low there was support for parking controls.

The alternative actions commuters may take supplied by the resident are indeed correct unfortunately it is our experience that they do not do these otherwise residents would not be complaining to the council about commuters parking in their roads throughout the borough.

The proposed double yellow line is to reinforce the well established rules of the Highway Code and in this instance has been extended due to the slight bend in the road at this junction and would ensure that the resident at No8 would have a better view of any traffic coming from that direction when exiting their driveway.

APPENDIX E

We object to the proposals as they are unnecessary. The only adjacent road that might have a new CPZ is Cranbourne Drive. Other adjacent or nearby roads will not – see list above. The most likely outcome from including Cranbourne Drive within the proposals, if that proposal goes ahead (given the slim case, there must be a good chance that that decision will be reversed in its entirety or in part in which case the Malpas Drive proposal, we would submit, falls away), is that they will use one or more of the options outlined above rather than simply flock to park in Malpas Drive.

On balance whilst we do not want commuters permanently parked outside our houses the cost and inconvenience to us and our visitors, social or tradespeople, is one that is not currently justified by the level of the potential risk.

We object to the proposal to extend the Zone into Malpas Drive. It is not needed and will impose greater costs and inconvenience upon Malpas Drive residents. The case for including Cranbourne Drive is thin, but that is primarily a matter for residents there. The case for extending it to Malpas Drive is even thinner and in our view unsustainable.

If the Zone is to be extended to include Malpas Drive, given that Winchester Drive is going to be outside the CPZ, this should be mirrored by omitting Malpas Drive south of Winchester Drive from the Zone. Plan 13 clearly shows the rest of the road surrounded by areas with no restrictions, including roads with plenty of street parking that are closer to the station than we are.

Furthermore, the double yellow lines on the corner outside 8 Malpas Drive, if required, should not extend beyond the drain cover outside number 8 on Malpas Drive and in the other direction beyond midway between the drain cover and the lamp post outside number 8 on Colchester Drive.

We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of this response with you if it would be helpful.

Thank you for your time when we spoke on 3 September 2014 about the Pinner parking proposals as they relate to Malpas Drive. Thank you also for sending me the link that led me to the overview document of responses road by road. We have since given matters further thought.

We object to the proposed extension of CPZ Zone A into Malpas Drive and in particular into Malpas Drive beyond the junction with Winchester Drive towards Eastcote Road. The evidence does not suggest a strong demand for the extension and nor does it suggest a significant risk of commuter parking in the road as a consequence of the very limited extension of parking restrictions in other surrounding roads.

We also feel that as far as we can tell from Plan, the proposed double yellow line on the corner of Colchester Drive and Malpas Drive that is outside 8 Malpas Drive is longer than it needs to be for safety reasons and appears to remove all the street parking outside number 8.

Why propose to extend CPZ Zone A into Cranbourne Drive

The CPZ Zone A applies between 11am – 12 noon. We assume that the rationale for extending the Zone to restrict parking in Cranbourne Drive is because it is believed that any problems experienced are due to commuters who park there for Pinner Station rather than:-

The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.

The council has to respond to the responses provided by the residents of these roads during the previous consultation and although the responses were low there was support for parking controls.

The alternative actions commuters may take supplied by the resident are indeed correct unfortunately it is our experience that they do not do these otherwise residents would not be complaining to the council about commuters parking in their roads throughout the borough.

The proposed double yellow line is to reinforce the well established rules of the Highway Code and in this instance has been extended due to the slight bend in the road at this junction and would ensure that the resident at No8 would have a better view of any traffic coming from that direction when exiting their driveway

APPENDIX E

- residents' own vehicles
- residents' visitors
- parents dropping off and picking up their kids for West Lodge School
- visitors to the Cuckoo Hill allotments, including dog walkers
- visitors to Pinner Memorial Park/Daisy's.

If the Council's objectives were around road safety or traffic flow, the hours that restrictions would apply would presumably be all day to address the former or at rush hour, morning and afternoon, to address the latter.

It is worth reviewing the survey results for Cranbourne Drive. Only 41% of households responded (as opposed to over 60% for Malpas Drive) which suggests that parking is not a burning issue. Of the 14 that did, only 4 experienced problems and only 5 said their visitors did. Also, only 7 out of 14 respondents said they wanted to be in a CPZ (noting that as far as we can see, no adjacent road is going to be added to the zone that would have a consequential negative impact). This does not seem like a strong mandate for extending Zone A into Cranbourne Drive.

Do correct us if the Council has something else in mind or we have misread the survey data.

Why propose to extend CPZ Zone A into Malpas Drive

We assume that the proposal to also extend the CPZ into Malpas Drive is because there may be a level of concern that commuters dislodged from Cranbourne Drive, should that proposal go ahead, would simply park round the corner given that residents say there is no current problem (see survey results below). Again, do correct us if the Council has something else in mind.

From what you said, and in the absence of any other rationale (other than for the Council to raise more revenue from Malpas Drive residents from parking which from the proposals overall we don't think is the motivation), the Council relies on the following facts as its justification for the extension of the CPZ into Malpas Drive and the one we've put in italics in particular.

- 20 out of 21 (the other one had no opinion) Malpas Drive respondents said that they did not have problems parking on Malpas Drive
- 19 out of 20 respondents said that their visitors did not experience problems parking on Malpas Drive
- 18 out of 20 respondents said they did not want a CPZ introduced in Malpas Drive (whereas 2 would like one)
- 7 Malpas Drive respondents thought that they would not change their minds if a CPZ were introduced in an adjoining road, 11 thought they would and 2 voiced no opinion.

What commuters who park in Cranbourne Drive would do if they could not park there

Whilst we cannot ignore the possibility that some commuters using Pinner Station now parking in Cranbourne Drive would park in Malpas Drive if the Zone were extended to include it, in fact that's just one possibility for the, on a rough count, <20-25 drivers the Council wants to deter. There are several other alternative actions commuters may take, including but not limited to:-

APPENDIX E

- using public transport to get to Pinner Station
- cycling to Pinner Station
- using public transport to get to another station
- cycling to another station
- paying for parking at Pinner Station as, beyond Cranbourne Drive, the trade-off between the cost of parking and the longer walk to the station no longer “costs in”
- paying for parking at another station, such as Rayners Lane
- driving to street parking close to another station, eg Eastcote, Ruislip Manor, Rayners Lane, Northwood Hills etc to reduce the length of the walk
- parking on other local roads in Pinner without restrictions but closer to or a similar distance from the station. Those near us include but are not restricted to:-
 - o Eastcote Road
 - o Lyncroft Avenue
 - o Hill Road
 - o Moorcroft Way
 - o Ellement Close
 - o Rosecroft Walk
 - o Colchester Drive
 - o Winchester Drive
 - o parking on other local roads elsewhere in Pinner within walking distance of the station but not close to us

I drove round some of these roads at about 11.30am on 8 September (a working and school day) – when the current CPZ applies - there was plenty of space closer to the station than Malpas Drive. Since then, I have specifically noticed that parking space is available during the day on school / working days at the West End Lane end of Cranbourne Drive and in other local roads. The situation I saw on 8 September therefore seems to be fairly representative.

Conclusion

We object to the proposals as they are unnecessary. The only adjacent road that might have a new CPZ is Cranbourne Drive. Other adjacent or nearby roads will not – see list above. The most likely outcome from including Cranbourne Drive within the proposals, if that proposal goes ahead (given the slim case, there must be a good chance that that decision will be reversed in its entirety or in part in which case the Malpas Drive proposal, we would submit, falls away), is that they will use one or more of the options outlined above rather than simply flock to park in Malpas Drive.

We do not think that a survey, the results of which were 11 out of 21 households responding that they would change their mind if an adjacent road were to be included in a hypothetical situation, constitutes a strong mandate for change in Malpas Drive.

Looking more closely at the question, it does not address (not unreasonably, we accept) which adjacent road or roads or how many would have to be brought within a Zone for the 11 respondents' views to apply. And we know that 7 households said that they wouldn't change their mind regardless of which or however many adjacent roads were to be included.

APPENDIX E

<p>We also now know how many nearby roads are included within the proposals – only Cranbourne Drive(at most).</p> <p>Don't get us wrong. We don't want commuters permanently parked outside our houses. But the cost and inconvenience to us and our visitors, social or tradespeople, is one that is not currently justified by the level of the potential risk. Beyond the cost of annual and daily permits, which would be unwelcome enough, it's the near certainty that through forgetfulness or late changes of plan, or when annual passes are due to be renewed and an out of date pass is displayed that residents or their visitors will be fined. This happened to my wife when she lived in the Borough of Camden when her pass ran out whilst she was on holiday. She received daily tickets and then was clamped before she returned; very expensive and inconvenient!</p> <p>Alternative Proposals</p> <p>We object to the proposal to extend the Zone into Malpas Drive. It is not needed and will impose greater costs and inconvenience upon Malpas Drive residents. The case for including Cranbourne Drive is thin, but that is primarily a matter for residents there. The case for extending it to Malpas Drive is even thinner and in our view unsustainable.</p> <p>If the Zone is to be extended to include Malpas Drive, given that Winchester Drive is going to be outside the CPZ, this should be mirrored by omitting Malpas Drive south of Winchester Drive from the Zone. Plan 13 clearly shows the rest of the road surrounded by areas with no restrictions, including roads with plenty of street parking that are closer to the station than we are.</p> <p>Furthermore, the double yellow lines on the corner outside 8 Malpas Drive, if required, should not extend beyond the drain cover outside number 8 on Malpas Drive and in the other direction beyond midway between the drain cover and the lamp post outside number 8 on Colchester Drive.</p> <p>We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of this response with you if it would be helpful.</p>	
<p><u>MARSH ROAD</u></p>	
<p>Re the above document which I have received recently, on page 3 paragraph m): if the disabled parking is removed and a 3 hour maximum is introduced how are the disabled going to be catered for?</p> <p>I am not disabled but this should interest everybody.</p>	<p>The disabled bays are not being removed they are being formalised to bring them in line with other areas of the borough. One or two may be repositioned but over all there will be more dedicated disabled parking spaces in the main shopping area. Limiting the period of stay will allow other blue badge holders to park in the area rather than the spaces being monopolised by a few drivers</p>
<p>I live at Marsh Road Pinner HA5 5NH.</p> <p>2, Marsh Road is situated in Nower Hill thus we will be affected by the proposed new parking restrictions.</p> <p>At present there are twentyone parking spaces and all who need to park in Nower Hill manage to do so successfully. Your plans would reduce those twentyone spaces to fifteen. I would like to point out some facts that you may not be aware of. 692 Pinner Road is a dental surgery just off Nower Hill with seven staff who each has a car and park in The Chase. Spaces outside the surgery are kept for patients with mobility difficulties. 694 Pinner Road is a care home. I don't know how many staff work there but do know that some staff park in</p>	<p>When a CPZ is proposed engineers will look to provide as much on street parking as possible. It may well mean that during the control time some of the historical parking locations are removed. Outside of the control times any vehicle is able to use the area whether they have a permit or not. Double yellow lines throughout the area are proposed to reinforce the well established rules of the Highway Code about where motorists should not be parking which may be in a dangerous or inconsiderate location.</p> <p>The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose to own or park on the public highway.</p>

APPENDIX E

Nower Hill. 696 Pinner Road. on the corner of Nower Hill, is four privately owned flats with one parking space for each flat but at least one flat has two cars. 2/4 Nower Hill is eight housing association flats none of which has off street parking. 6/8 Nower Hill is also eight housing association flats none of which has off street parking. Across the road 9 Nower Hill is at present six flats but a planning application Ref: P/1223/14 is in for a single story rear extension and a self contained flat in the loft area. There is no off street parking for number 9 and no parking is planned for the new self contained flat. Number 11 Nower Hill is six flats none of which has off street parking. There were eight garages at the rear of 9/11 Nower Hill but consent was given for these to be demolished and two, very pretty, houses have been built in their place.

We do have a carport but being a family have three cars. X Marsh Road has one off street parking but two cars and two boys who will be of driving age in a couple of years. X Nower Hill has no off street parking but two cars and Xower Hill has two cars parked on the road. I hope you can see that there is nowhere else for local residents to park. Marsh Road is a bus route so not suitable for parking even if there are no yellow line. Where are we to go when you take away those six parking spaces?

Please reconsider this plan and leave us as we are.

I would like to express some concerns that I have about the proposals being made in the Pinner Parking Review. I was born in Pinner, and have lived here all my life, and so have probably seen more changes to the 'village' than most. Although I understand the need for some measures to cope with the increase in road use and parking, it is the extent of some of the proposals that I would like to object to.

I am the owner of the Lamb Chiropractic Clinic at XX Marsh Road. This is a family run business that has been at this location for 55 years, but in Pinner itself for nearly 70 years. My father was treating patients in the Harrow area from 1939. This clinic currently employs 13 people and provides parking for approx 8 cars for my patients. Currently there is a parking restriction from 11-12, but I understand that there is a proposal being considered for double yellow lines, and a restriction that will affect all day Monday to Saturday.

I am writing as a business owner in Pinner to let you know the impact that these parking restrictions will have on my patients, many of whom have difficulty walking, which is why they are attending this clinic. These are practical concerns that I have for patients who need to be able to park nearby as they physically cannot walk far. For many of my patients, coming to Pinner by public transport is not an option due to their injuries/conditions. For patients with back, shoulder, leg injuries, etc, getting in and out of a car is sometimes as much as they can manage, and even that can be difficult; the agility required for coping with bus journeys, or all the walking and steps involved to come by tube is beyond them. The majority of my patients do use the parking that I have provided but there are times when this is full, and they need to park in as close proximity to the practice as possible, .i.e. on the road. Due to the speed and volume of traffic in Marsh Road itself some of my patients, elderly ones in particular, would find it impossible to cross the road safely from Grove Avenue opposite, and that's assuming that there would be any spaces available there after

The council should also not be expected to provide any on street parking for staff of local businesses where it may not necessarily be appropriate to do so.

Engineers have reviewed the proposed change of restriction and in light of this objection have made recommendation to this meeting that the change be abandoned. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation although it should be appreciated by the businesses that the council should also not be expected to provide any on street parking for staff of local businesses where it may not necessarily be appropriate to do so.

APPENDIX E

<p>restrictions are proposed there too. Obviously I pay business rates, but I would like to think that I contribute more to the local economy than that. Most of my staff live locally, but all of us support shops and businesses in Pinner throughout our working week, but beyond that I am sure that this is the case with patients that come to attend appointments here too. I would ask that you consider the points raised in this objection, and hope that some kind of compromise can be found. Should you require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
<p><u>MAYFIELD DRIVE</u></p>	
<p>Please find comments in attached letter I support the introduction of parking restrictions in Mayfield Drive given the extension of the Pinner CPZ into adjacent roads. My only comment on the proposal is that I wonder whether a Monday-Saturday 8:00 to 6:30 resident permit holders only is unnecessarily restrictive? I would have thought an 11-12:00 restriction as in the wider CPZ would be sufficient to deter commuter parking which I have always assumed to be the main driver behind problematic parking. However, I don't feel strongly about this, and if my neighbours do I'm happy to go along with the street's wider view.</p>	<p>The proposed control times were suggested by the residents of the road although in light of the objections engineers are recommending that Mayfield Drive becomes part of CPZ A operating Monday to Friday 11am to 12 noon. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>I am a resident on Mayfield Drive and wish to object to the restrictions proposed in the Pinner parking review. While I agree to the need for Permit holders only parking on our street with our own zone, I think that the timings need to be the same as zone A, (Mon-Fri 11am-12pm). I feel that the proposed restriction of Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm is too lengthy and would mean I have to frequently buy visitors permits for anyone coming to my house. We do not have too many problems with parking on our street, and the zone A restriction would be enough of a deterrent to anyone parking and not visiting one of the houses on our street. Also with regard to the yellow lines, I believe the turning circle is large enough to accommodate parking on one side (next to Coniston) and still leave ample room for cars to turn. As parking is very limited on the street, this is frequently used spot and has no detrimental effects on the ability of cars to turn round at the end of the road. I have discussed this with other houses on my street and they are of the same opinion as me, so we would appreciate if you could amend the restrictions as described above.</p>	<p>The proposed control times were suggested by the residents of the road although in light of the objections engineers are recommending that Mayfield Drive becomes part of CPZ A operating Monday to Friday 11am to 12 noon. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation. As this road is quite narrow compared to other residential roads the necessity to keep the turning area is more critical in this instance particularly for larger vehicles.</p>
<p><u>MOSS CLOSE</u></p>	
<p>There is no mention in the review of Moss Lane. I am referring to the west side of Moss Lane by "The Fives Court" down as far as Eastglade where commuters park all day from Monday to Friday. This is very dangerous as it is on a bend and a hill, and it is not possible to see oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>Moss Lane has a variety of locations identified for the installation of double yellow lines including between Church Lane and Beechen Grove and the S bends between Eastglade and Bloomsbury Court</p>
<p><u>MOSS LANE</u></p>	
<p>I am in receipt of the paper produced on the above. I am one of the Neighbourhood Champions for Moss Lane and was present at the meetings. I have 3 issues to be highlighted as I feel strongly that these should be addressed in whichever way it is possible.</p>	<p>1. Moss Lane has a variety of locations identified for the installation of double yellow lines including between Church Lane and Beechen Grove and the S bends between Eastglade and Bloomsbury Court</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Your attention on these would be very valuable.</p> <p>1 Moss Lane (Plan 8) The stretch between Wakehams Hill and East Glade on Moss lane has become a free car park from Monday to Friday between from about 8.00 a.m until approximately around 5.00 p.m. This is causing problems as the drivers are unable to see any oncoming vehicles coming to-wards the direction of Pinner Road. I have seen on many occasions, two car halfway along this stretch and with arguments. The driver proceeding to-wards the direction of Pinner Road has the right of way as he/ she will be on the correct carriageway. I am pretty sure that the people who park on this stretch are the people who takes the Underground from Pinner. I hope you will be able to address this issue. There is no problem in the evenings and during week ends</p> <p>2. Paines Lane (Plan 7) Between Oakhill Avenue and Barrow Point Avenue along the Paines Lane, there is a traffic calming system in operation with the give way sign for the oncoming vehicles towards Uxbridge Road. The drivers coming from the direction of Uxbridge Road to-wards the Pinner High Street will have to stop at this point but sometimes the drivers are unable to stop as there are always at least two or more cars parked. The drivers sometimes thinks that these are moving vehicle and waiting to give way to the oncoming vehicles. This is causing confusion for the drivers driving towards both directions. I feel that these vehicles belongs to the few houses around this spot assuming that these are their extra vehicles. This is only an assumption.</p> <p>3. Paines Lane/ Uxbridge Road Junction (Plan 3) I am sure that you are aware of the problem at this junction. The drivers waiting to turn right to go to-wards Hatch End are finding it extremely difficult and dangerous as you cannot see the vehicles coming from the direction of Hatch End due to the fact that there is a bend. The drivers will have to take dangerous risks when turning right. I feel, the solution to this, is a set of traffic lights to be installed at this junction. If the cost is the problem, at least a round about or even a mini round about at this junction is a consolation until a permanent solution is found.</p> <p>I hope you can address these issues and help the local residents to be safe as best you can.</p>	<p>2.Double yellow lines are being proposed at this location.</p> <p>3.Double yellow lines are being proposed at this location to improve sightlines.</p>
<p>I am sorry to be writing at the last minute.</p> <p>I have only regrets that the CPZ was not extended to include part of Moss Lane and some of the roads off it. eg Beechengrove and Terrilands.I can foresee that people who usually park in Nower Hill and Amberley Close will now park in Moss Lane and roads leading off it. But the residents can blame themselves for not responding to the consultation in 2013. Some of us did respond, but clearly not many residents felt moved to do so.</p> <p>It is a good idea to have double yellow lines on all junctions, turning places and narrow sections of the carriageway. I look forward to such lines being painted as soon as possible.</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of road for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed. The council can only proceed with amenity based parking controls where it is shown there is support from the local residents. The council cannot and does not second guess responses from residents who do not choose to respond to the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>Having now studied the Pinner Area Parking Review I'm concerned that the proposed double yellow lines proposed for Moss Lane do not go far enough. I'm referring to the area eight drawing T/DWG/000731/008.</p> <p>We currently have great difficulty in safely entering and exiting our driveway at XXX Moss Lane due to commuter cars and Pinner business people parking between the Fives Court and East Glade. When cars are parked opposite to the entrance of XXX Moss Lane and we</p>	<p>Moss Lane has a variety of locations identified for the installation of double yellow lines unfortunately at this time this is not such a location.</p> <p>The behaviour of motorists is something the council cannot control</p> <p>If residents have difficulty reversing out of their driveway then the Highway Code suggests it may be more practical to reverse into the property and drive out in a forward gear. It may be possible that a property with a large front area that a</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>approach from Pinner to turn right into our driveway cars behind us assume we are indicating to move to the right hand carriageway rather than actually turning into our drive. When trying to reverse out from our driveway we face cars coming from both directions on the same carriageway. It is almost impossible to reverse out without making at least two manoeuvres which increases the chance of an accident happening.</p> <p>The very sensible addition of double yellow lines between Amberley Close and Beechen Grove will cause more commuter and Pinner business users cars to park between Beechen Grove and East Glade exacerbating what is already a pretty hazardous situation. I would therefore ask that you seriously consider extending the double yellow lines by adding them between Beechen Grove and East Glade as part of the Pinner Area Parking Review.</p>	<p>space could be created on the property to be able to turn a vehicle around to exit in a forward gear.</p>
<p>We favour that the double yellow lines at the junction of Amberley Close and Moss Lane Pinner should extend towards Blackgate footpath to prevent cars parking near the Moss Lane brow of a hill. This will help to avoid accidents which currently are "just waiting to happen"</p>	<p>Moss Lane has a variety of locations identified for the installation of double yellow lines</p>
<p><u>NORTH WAY</u></p>	
<p>I object to the additional permit bays planned for North Way. There are sufficient bays to meet the needs of the residents and these bays are often unused.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. In this instance the bay is near the junction of High View and would be available to more residents than just those in North Way. It also ties the end of the proposed double yellow lines and the permit parking bay together</p>
<p><u>NOWER HILL</u></p>	
<p>I live at Nower Hill and have done for 26 years. We have always been able to park on the road outside. We are the only house without either a garage or driveway in which to park so have no choice about where to park. I feel this is very unfair.</p> <p>To be forced to pay quite a large sum for parking for just one hour a day is unreasonable now that I'm retired, and if I don't get a permit I would have to move the car during the day. To park further away is not acceptable as I suffer with my back and have shopping to carry. I hope you understand my point of view and concerns.</p>	<p>Residents of Nower Hill within the proposed cpz area would be eligible to purchase residents permit for parking. It should be remembered that no one has an automatic right to park on the public highway and the council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose town or park on the public highway. Other residents in the area have complained to the council about the congestion and lack of parking for residents due to non-resident parking in the area. Loading and unloading of passengers and goods is permitted on single yellow lines within a CPZ providing it can be seen it is a continuous process.</p>
<p>I wish to object to the plan to extend the CPZ to cover Nower Hill. I do not feel that this is necessary as there are no problems with parking or congestion in this area. This would mean that I would be unable to park outside my own home during the week which I feel is ridiculous. I do not understand why this is felt to be necessary and what it will achieve.</p>	<p>Residents of Nower Hill within the proposed cpz area would be eligible to purchase residents permit for parking. It should be remembered that no one has an automatic right to park on the public highway and the council cannot control the number of vehicles residents choose town or park on the public highway. Other residents in the area have complained to the council about the congestion and lack of parking for residents due to non-resident parking in the area.</p>
<p><u>PAINES CLOSE</u></p>	
<p>Re Pinner area parking review I would like to make the following comments. 1. There is very often traffic congestion in Pinner High Street due to cars being parked on</p>	<p>1.Already part of proposals for this area 2.Double yellow lines proposed for one side of road at this location which should help ease congestion</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>both sides of the road. This is especially problematic at evenings and weekends with the many restaurants in the High Street. I would like to suggest that parking at any time is restricted to one side of the High Street.</p> <p>2. At the top of Pinner High Street / beginning of Paines Lane (between the junctions with Church Lane and Paines Close) cars park at evenings and weekends on the bend of the road. This means there is insufficient room for two cars to pass, and because of restricted visibility around the bend of the road, there are often situations where cars coming in opposite directions reach an impasse. This has led to near-accidents, cars mounting the pavement, and some heated exchanges between drivers. I would like to suggest that there is no parking on either side of Paines Lane between the junctions with Paines Close and Church Lane.</p> <p>3. Another traffic issue is the junction of Paines Lane and Uxbridge Road. Turning right out of Paines Lane is a dangerous manoeuvre as traffic on Uxbridge Road is fast flowing and visibility to the right is restricted. I would like to suggest some measure is taken to slow traffic on Uxbridge Road at this point to make this a safer junction.</p>	<p>3. Double yellow lines are being proposed at this location to improve sightlines.</p>
<p>It was with dismay that I checked the above report and found that nothing was being proposed regarding the area of Paines Lane between Barrowpoint Avenue and Oakhill Avenue. As you will be aware there is a traffic calming width restriction very near to Barrowpoint Avenue, we now have cars parking on the road between Barrowpoint and Oakhill sometime all day and occasionally overnight as there are no yellow lines. This causes chaos as the cars which have to give way to those travelling up to the Uxbridge Road often end up blocking the road entirely as there are cars parked. Today at one time we had 5 cars parked in this small area. This will lead to a serious accident some day. The parked cars have often been hit by other cars trying to manoeuvre to get out of the jam that has been created. But if they don't park there again others take their place. Not to mention trying to get out of the drive for the residents of 44-48b Paines Lane. This problem will only get worse when the new proposed restrictions come into place. I would be grateful for your comments.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are being proposed at this location.</p>
<p><u>PINNER ASSOCIATION</u></p>	
<p>The Pinner Association also submitted substantial comments on all the statutory recommendations. All their comments have been considered as part of the statutory consultation and where possible their suggestions have been incorporated into the recommendations in this report. As with all comments received it has not been possible to include all their suggestions as they may differ from the responses and objections received from the residents of the relevant road. Where they have submitted suggestions or comments these have been reported directly in the report under the relevant road or section</p>	<p>Inclusion of their comments are in the main body of the report under the relevant road or section.</p>
<p><u>PINNER BRIDGE CLUB</u></p>	
<p>29 members from The Pinner Bridge Club submitted a variety of objections with most using a standard form letter (below). The other objections were based around this with other personal comments but all relating to how additional restrictions would be of inconvenience to them using the club as most were elderly and unable to walk from the car parks in Pinner</p>	<p>The Pinner Bridge Club operate out of a residential style semi-detached property with only off-street parking space for only one maybe two vehicles. It is the second property from the junction of Marsh Road and Eastcote Road, which is one of the busiest junctions in the area.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>I wish to object to the following proposals which are part of DP 2014-02 to restrict parking near Pinner Bridge Club. These restrictions will make it very hard for me to continue to use the club, as there is very little alternative parking available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Double Yellow Lines on Grove Avenue, Pinner Grove and parts of Marsh Road. 2. Controlled Parking Zone (8:30am-6:30pm) on Ashridge Gardens and Holwell Place. 3. Extension of the Controlled Parking Zone in Cecil Park to operate from 11.00am-12.00noon, and 3.00pm-4.00pm. 	<p>1-Double yellow lines are required for safety and emergency vehicle access to remove dangerous or inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>2-An extension of cpz times was requested by residents in the previous consultation and is still to be decided depending on the results from the results to this consultation.</p> <p>3- An extension of cpz times was requested by residents in the previous consultation and is still to be decided depending on the results from the results to this consultation.</p> <p>The use of the motor car and the demands for parking has increased in the time since the bridge club opened. As the highway authority we must try to keep the network moving as freely as possible particularly at such a busy location. This junction is also used by four bus routes through the area. The current location of the club may not be as suitable as it once was if more people need to, or are, driving to the area. It would be advised that the club themselves look at providing parking for its more vulnerable members rather than relying on free parking on the public highway.</p>
<p><u>PINNER GREEN</u></p>	
<p>Please note I write this email to you as a resident at Pinner Green, Pinner Middlesex HA5 2AF. Please note our entry/exit to the flat is through the bell close. I object to the plans to introduce a controlled parking space on Bell close. This will cause a big impact on to me and my family as we use bell close to park our cars as we do not have drive ways. This is going to cause a great inconvenience to all of us especially when we have kids. Hence I object to this plan.</p> <p>I urge you to overturn your decision.</p>	<p>Outside of the proposed CPZ control hours anyone will be able to park in Bell Close with or without a permit so it may be possible that the residents above the shops will still be able to park in Bell Close as long as they do not cause any obstruction of the road or driveways.</p> <p>All the businesses and residents that submitted objections from Pinner Green do have limited off street parking.</p> <p>Engineers have taken account of the objections and are proposing that the CPZ starts at the beginning of the residential properties in Bell Close, not the start of the road as advertised. This will leave some free parking for businesses or other residents. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>Having been a resident at XXX, Pinner Green, Pinner Middlesex HA5 2AF since the past 7 years, your plan to introduce a controlled parking space on Bell Close will adversely impact me as the entry to my flat is through Bell Close and this would not only hinder my day to day activities but also financially impact me by raising my car insurance premium if I were to park elsewhere. Please note our entry/exit to the flat is through the bell close. Hence, I object to the plans to introduce a controlled parking space on Bell close. I believe that its a hindrance to most membera of the street than not to introduce it. I urge you to request getting an opinion from each member rather than making a change without it.</p> <p>I hope that you will overturn your decision.</p>	<p>Outside of the proposed CPZ control hours anyone will be able to park in Bell Close with or without a permit so it may be possible that the residents above the shops will still be able to park in Bell Close as long as they do not cause any obstruction of the road or driveways.</p> <p>All the businesses and residents that submitted objections from Pinner Green do have limited off street parking.</p> <p>Engineers have taken account of the objections and are proposing that the CPZ starts at the beginning of the residential properties in Bell Close, not the start of the road as advertised. This will leave some free parking for businesses or other residents. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p>We wish to object strongly to the proposed restricted parking in Bell Close,Pinner Green. We have been trading in Pinner Green for over 40years and have gradually seen parking in</p>	<p>It is difficult for the council to balance the needs of the community with the direct requests from residents for the council to deal with the non-resident parking</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Pinner Green become harder and harder for customers wishing to shop . We have seen yellow lines introduced, loading restrictions introduced, the road was widened to accommodate Tesco's a few years ago and a layby put across the road, only for it to be unusable during the day Our customers are only ever parked in Bell Close for half an hour and are our life blood, we need them. We also have staff who work in our shop who rely upon being able to park in Bell Close. We let two flats above the shops we own, number 3 and number 5, and the residents in those flats also need to use the parking in Bell Close when they are not working. There is no where else in Pinner Green for people to park for any length of time until after 6.00pm. Tesco's only allow two hours. The front two car parks ,which we were told would be made available for local parking are full of their own employees cars, so no one local can use them. If you go ahead with these proposed changes you will not improve the parking, but only cause a lot of problems for people who work and live in Pinner Green. If you wish to improve parking then please put a parking layby in front of 3, 5 and 7 Pinner Green with a twenty minute stay only and please leave Bell Close as it is .</p>	<p>occurring in their road particularly when it is not necessarily short term shoppers but the staff of the shops themselves as the business does not provide any staff or customer parking of its own and relies on the public highway to park their vehicles. The council should not be expected to provide any on street parking for staff of local businesses where it may not necessarily be appropriate to do so. Not all the footway in front of the shops is public highway and would require the businesses to relinquish part of their forecourt to allow the council to have some land to relocate the footpath in front of the shops. Non-regulated short stay parking is also extremely difficult to enforce and it just becomes somewhere else for staff to park. All the businesses and residents that submitted objections do have limited off street parking. The business premises like so many over the years have been extended out the back to create extra internal space or used for covered storage</p>
<p>Please note I write this email to you as the owner of Newpoint, a news agents shop on Pinner Green, Pinner Middlesex HA5 2AF. Please note our entry/exit from the shop is through the bell close. I object to the plans to introduce a controlled parking space on Bell close. This will cause a big impact on my business as some customers use parking in the close while shopping. The parking in the close is used by me and my staff. This is going to cause a great inconvenience to all of us and my business will suffer because of this. This also decreases the value of my lease. Hence I object to this plan. I urge you to overturn your decision.</p>	<p>The main public entrance is from Pinner Green. There is a small off-street parking area to the rear of the property accessed by Bell Close. This could be utilised for some staff parking. It is difficult for the council to balance the needs of the community with the direct requests from residents for the council to deal with the non-resident parking occurring in their road particularly when it is not necessarily short term shoppers but the staff of the shops themselves as the business does not provide any staff or customer parking of its own and relies on the public highway to park their vehicles. The council should not be expected to provide any on street parking for staff of local businesses where it may not necessarily be appropriate to do so.</p>
<p>I would like to strongly object, to your proposal , item c ,in your recently published parking review. I am a Business owner on the corner of Bell close, Pinner My customers will have no where to park if this review is actioned. We have already lost the parking facility opposite on Pinner Green. This proposal will have a huge effect on my business. We need more parking in the area , NOT less</p>	<p>It is difficult for the council to balance the needs of the community with the direct requests from residents for the council to deal with the non-resident parking occurring in their road. All the businesses and residents that submitted objections from Pinner Green do have limited off street parking. Engineers have taken account of the objections and are proposing that the CPZ starts at the beginning of the residential properties in Bell Close, not the start of the road as advertised. This will leave some free parking for businesses or other residents. It is for the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to accept or reject the recommendation.</p>
<p><u>PINNER HILL ROAD</u></p>	
<p>I have received a copy of the Pinner Area Parking Review and although I think I have read it fairly carefully, I don't think I can see any plans for the Pinner Hill Road. Please tell me I'm</p>	<p>Parking restrictions were not supported by the majority of residents. Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions along Pinner Hill Road</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>mistaken and we will be part of a revision. The traffic flow is now very fast, bad tempered, noisy and increasingly dangerous as drivers constantly race each other for tiny passing spaces. Please please put in yellow lines, bays, humps, extra traffic crossings, restrictions of any kind in the stretch between the bend after Tudor Road and the bend at Potter Street its a rat run. The situation is constant now and the extra parking generated from the new developments in the Windmill area together with people who are now parking this far out in order to catch buses to the village for whatever reason is only making matters much worse.</p>	
<p>I object to the proposed pay and display spaces on Station Approach. The reason is that they will make getting out of the station even more difficult than it already is at busy times. I go to the station twice a day usually to drop off my children going to school and collect them coming home from school, and this will materially affect me as it will have increase my journey time and the stress of the journeys, and I would think will result in an increase in accidents in the vicinity as tempers flare.</p> <p>My husband Stuart parks at the station during the day, and he objects also, the reason being that he will have increased difficulty in getting away from the station, which will materially affect him as it will add to the length of & stress of his journey home.</p> <p>Please take our comments into consideration,</p>	<p>Only part of this road is public highway. There is currently some illegal parking activity occurring opposite this site in front of the small businesses. This will formalise the parking as double yellow lines and other loading restrictions are also planned for this section of road. The P&D may benefit the immediate local businesses, including those through under the rail bridge, because with the current 20 minute free parking period for all on-street P&D within Harrow this will encourage a turnover of short stay parking in the area during the day.</p> <p>The road width at this location is more than wide enough to cater for this proposal and by removing illegal parking it should not increase congestion in this area.</p>
<p><u>ROCHESTER DRIVE</u></p>	
<p>As a resident of Rochester Drive, Pinner, I am happy to see the provision of yellow lines around corners such as Eastcote Rd, Colchester Drive & Cranbourne Drive, however I am concerned that there may be a possibility of 'mission creep' which results in more yellow lines appearing in Rochester Drive.</p> <p>I do not feel that Rochester Drive should ever be part of the Pinner CPZ. It also concerns me that cars may be pushed from Cranbourne into Rochester Drive.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not proposed extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.</p> <p>Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions and bends within the area to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained. This will also improve sightlines at junctions for all road users.</p>
<p>We are very concerned about some of the changes detailed in the Pinner Area Parking Review relating to Rochester Drive, Pinner.</p> <p>Rochester Drive is a narrow road; if the Controlled Parking Zone is extended to Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive the knock-on effect is likely to result in more cars being parked for long durations in Rochester Drive; this will be dangerous. Dustcarts and safety vehicles would have difficulty getting through as drivers are so thoughtless in the way they park. For instance, if thoughtless drivers park opposite our drive, I am unable to get out safely.</p> <p>We are relieved to see that double yellow lines are planned for the end of the road where Rochester Drive and Cranbourne Drive meet. Double yellow lines are urgently needed at the other end of the road where it meets Eastcote Road. Cars trying to leave Rochester Drive are often forced into the right hand lane because of selfishly parked cars and sooner or later this situation is bound to cause an accident when a car turns into Rochester Drive from Eastcote Road and encounters a car on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>Any increase in parked cars in Rochester Drive will cause more safety problems and we</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not proposed extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.</p> <p>Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions and bends within the area to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained. This will also improve sightlines at junctions for all road users.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>hope that these objections will be taken into consideration at this stage. Please could you be kind enough to acknowledge receipt of this objection?</p>	
<p>Covering letter Pinner Area Parkine Review - Rochester Drive Response I am the contact person (Neighbourhood Champions liaison) on our road for notifying issues to the Council A number of residents have approached me with concerns over proposals to extend the Zone A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to neighbouring streets in our area, specifically Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Following consultation with other residents on our street we are submitting the attached response dated 13 September 2014. Every household I was able to contact has signed this. We are not asking for the CPZ extension to be scrapped, nor are we asking for the zone to be introduced into Rochester Drive. Our main concern is that the proposals outlined will not solve the problems associated with commuter parking but will instead transfer them to neighbouring streets such as our own. We request therefore that you consider the knock-on effects these proposals may have and the safety and access issues outlined in our response. We also ask that you consider all options to address the problem of commuter parking, including how to safely accommodate those who are determined to leave their cars in Pinner. For instance, numerous residents I spoke to said that car park charges are too high and should be reduced. Signed attached document We the undersigned residents of Rochester Drive, Pinner, wish to register our severe concerns and reservations to proposals outlined in the Pinner Area Parking Review. Specifically these relate to the intention to extend the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into the neighbouring streets of Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. We recognise there is a problem with commuter parking in specific streets around Pinner. The current situation - in Cranbourne Drive especially - is unsafe and needs to be addressed. However, we are concerned that the proposals outlined will not solve this issue but merely transfer commuter parking to adjoining non-CPZ streets such as our own. It should be noted that prior to the introduction of a CPZ in Pinner there was no parking problem in either Cranbourne Drive or Malpas Drive. This problem only arose after commuters were prevented from parking in newly designated CPZ streets such as West End Avenue. There is every reason to believe that a similar outcome will occur if the CPZ is extended as planned. There is a very real possibility that the problem will not be solved but rather transferred to neighbouring streets such as our own. We already have safety issues with parking on Rochester Drive. At one end -adjoining Cranbourne Drive - is a blind bend. Cars parked on or near this bend create a visibility issue for drivers approaching from both directions. At the other end is a T-junction with Eastcote Road, a busy main road with fast moving</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not proposed extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time. Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions and bends within the area to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained. This will also improve sightlines at junctions for all road users.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>traffic. Cars exiting Rochester Drive are often forced into the right hand lane by the presence of parked cars on the left. This creates an issue with oncoming traffic entering Rochester Drive from the Eastcote Road. Increased parking on our street will only exacerbate these problems if not properly addressed.</p> <p>Another concern is that along most of Rochester Drive it is possible to park directly opposite residents' driveways. This happens infrequently at present! however, if commuter parking arrives we foresee this could hinder and potentially block vehicular access by residents. We ask therefore, as part of the Statutory Consultation stage, that you consider the knock-on effect these proposals are likely to have on safety and access in our street.</p> <p>We are not opposed to parking restrictions per se, however, we see no merit in simply moving a problem from one area to another.</p> <p>We request that those involved with managing this review consider our concerns carefully before implementing any changes. We also ask that this letter be kept on record for future referral if necessary.</p>	
<p>Traffic Scheme Consultation — Reference DP 2014-02</p> <p>I write in response to the proposed traffic scheme amendments set out in the above consultation plan, specifically to the proposed extension of the Zone A Controlled Parking Zone to include Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive, amongst others. Whilst I have no doubt the residents of Cranbourne Drive will delight in the removal of the blight of parking (mainly commuter) from their throughfare, I wish to object to what I see as the short-sighted view taken not to include other roads on the 'Buckley Estate'. It would be naïve in the extreme to imagine that the imposition of parking restrictions in Cranbourne Drive will not result in the immediate transfer of car parking to the adjacent narrower roads, such as Rochester Drive, Winchester Drive and Colchester Drive. As a resident of Rochester Drive, I write to point out the difficulties that will undoubtedly arise following the introduction of the above proposals. Given not all of Rochester Drive is fronted by housing, it may occur that cars will park on opposite sides of the road; whilst such parking may be negotiated by cyclists and car owners, how do you imagine larger vehicles for example, fire engines, ambulances, delivery trucks, might cope? One can almost see the headlines in the local paper. You may be aware the roadway outside numbers 27 to 35 Rochester Drive is used regularly by driving instructors as a hill start procedure, and indeed many formal driving tests utilise that part of the road each day. Increased parking would render that part of the driving test even more difficult and dangerous. In short, I wish to object to the extension of Zone A Controlled Parking to include Cranbourne Drive WITHOUT the addition of the narrower Rochester Drive, Winchester Drive and Colchester Drive. I am fully aware that the control of parking in the Pinner area resembles a minefield, but it is my view that current proposals appear short-sighted and will result only in the immediate transfer of the current parking problem into adjacent narrower roadways.</p> <p>I would very much appreciate your views on my comments.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not proposed extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time. Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions and bends within the area to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained. This will also improve sightlines at junctions for all road users.</p>
<p><u>THE CHASE</u></p>	

APPENDIX E

<p>Please see some 3 points to consider within these planned parking changes I cannot fully make sense of the detail so I apologise for any misunderstandings: I live in "The Chase" and I see no issues day, night or week end in this road that add any value making it a controlled zone. (zone 12) The roads nearby that offer off street parking do not cause any traffic jams, blockages or accidents so I see no reason to change a system that works. Family & friends can visit through out the week at any time with no issue or risk of ticket. This adds a tangible value to lifestyle. I implore you not to make change in the whole area in this matter. The main problem in Pinner is on the high street (café rouge, carluccio etc) where people park on both sides of the road especially at night time. It would make sense to turn this into a pedestrian or one sided parking. There are plenty of spaces in the various car parks such as Sainsbury's, Love Lane, near the Oddfellows etc. I would also suggest following Hillingdon's strategy of supporting the local town shops by allowing 30 minutes free parking. This encourages quick use but not hogging spots.</p>	<p>During the public consultation there was no support from the residents of The Chase for any parking controls in their road so none have been proposed except for double yellow lines at junctions. Waiting and Loading restrictions are proposed in the High Street because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking. Harrow currently offer a 20 minute free parking period for all on street P&D to encourage a turnover of short term customers to shops.</p>
<p>I am writing to you to object to proposed double yellow lines you are planning on putting in on the Chase in Pinner. Firstly there is no need to put them in. I have lived on the chase for 8 years now and there has been no incident on the chase that would warrant adding these in, we are a cul de sac, not a main thoroughfare. secondly the addition of these lines would further reduce what parking there is. thirdly and most importantly, with the introduction/ extension of CPZs on Nower Hill and Cecil Park, means there will be even more vehicles parking on the Chase. Therefore by restricting parking further on The Chase will make parking for residents a nightmare. Therefore I can only conclude that the reason for adding these in would be as a revenue raising scheme and penalising residents, rather than as a benefit for the residents. If this is the case then i would expect to see my council tax reduced (which will be unlikely). Before you implement these lines, could you tell me what legal rights I would have if i am unable to access / leave my property due to some one blocking me as i am fortunate enough to have off road parking, unlike some of my neighbours. As far as i am aware, as a street we did not ask for these and I see no justifiable reason for there implementation other than the the reason stated above. Please do not put them in.</p>	<p>Other residents in the area have other views and requested the council do something about the non-resident parking in their road. The Chase did not support any additional controls so except for the double yellow lines at the junctions there are no other restrictions proposed for The Chase. By national legislation CPZ must be self-financing to cover the costs of the back office work, which this consultation is part and is being funded by the existing cpz in Harrow, the Traffic Order to enable the scheme to be enforceable, and all the installation and maintenance of the lines and signs associated with such a scheme. Any surplus money from cpz must be used on transport schemes and in Harrow it part subsidises the Freedom Pass for the elderly. If parking across driveways occur residents can contact the Parking Operations team who may be able to send a Civil Enforcement Officer to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) to any offending vehicle. It is not possible to automatically issue a PCN to any vehicle across a driveway as it may be a person with connections to the property.</p>
<p>I have strong concerns over your new proposals for added parking restrictions to the Pinner area. I am a home owner atThe Chase Pinner HA5 5QP . I strongly feel this is a money making scheme only to benefit yourselves and not the community. The cost of Harrow Council Tax is already way above the surrounding Councils in the other areas. Now you will be adding another cost to the Harrow residents who this will effect. I myself and other neighbours in my street have never had a problem with parking and are always courteous to each others needs. Since you have put these restrictions in place this is now affecting parking in The Chase and the adjoining roads close by. The more parking you are taking from one area you are now causing limited parking in</p>	<p>Other residents in the area have other views and requested the council do something about the non-resident parking in their road. The Chase did not support any additional controls so except for the double yellow lines at the junctions there are no other restrictions proposed for The Chase. By national legislation CPZ must be self-financing to cover the costs of the back office work, which this consultation is part and is being funded by the existing cpz in Harrow, the Traffic Order to enable the scheme to be enforceable, and all the installation and maintenance of the lines and signs associated with such a scheme. Any surplus money from cpz must be used on transport schemes and in Harrow it part subsidises the Freedom Pass for the elderly</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>another. I speak for myself and Neighbours of The Chase Pinner that we object to the proposals you are planning to set in place.</p>	
<p><u>THE SQUIRRELS</u></p>	
<p>I make this objection on the basis that it will materially affect me. Whilst I can see, understand and accept the need for changes to parking restrictions the scheme should, in my view, include Wakehams Hill and The Squirrels. The proposals as they stand will virtually certainly mean that people who currently park in Nower Hill and Moss Lane will simply move upwards into Wakehams Hill and The Squirrels both of which are cul-de-sacs with an already increasing parking problem. Cars parked at the foot of Wakeham's Hill already pose a serious threat to safety. Cars approaching from Nower Hill cannot see cars descending Wakehams Hill until they are already beginning to turn into the the Hill. There have already been a number of very close incidents. Tradesmen, delivery services, even the refuse collectors are already finding it difficult in these two roads. The current proposals simply ease the problem for some by moving it onto others.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed for Moss Lane junction with Wakehams Hill and also at junction of Wakehams Hill and The Squirrels There was no support from the residents of these roads for any other restrictions so none have been proposed at this time.</p>
<p><u>WAXWELL LANE</u></p>	
<p>We live at waxwell lane ha53en Its proposed to have double yellow line outside our house and also reduced parking bays. With a young family it will make it quite challenging to have no parking outside ourhouse and any time. An obvious solution would be some specific parking bays in the car park behind the house. It would also make sense to maintain single yellow on at least one side. The main problem is (I've live at no 8 for 14 years) the fitness first gym. There are peak and non peak times. A solution could also be to install parking restrictions on single yellow in this area from 11-12 and 7-8pm. Would stop the mass parking and also encourage people to use the fitness first parking. Not sure if lidl own the carpark. Anyway, we are a small terrace in an ever increasing traffic area. But we do need to be able to access our properties.</p>	<p>It is difficult when a property is a traditional small terrace with no off-street parking for the council to allow parking on the street when it is in a location just off a busy shopping area that could cause congestion on the highway network. Property owners should not expect the road conditions to remain the same when over a similar period the use and volume of motor vehicles has increased, as the resident themselves have said, and demand for on-street parking far out strips supply and it should be remembered that no one has a right to park on the public highway. Additional permit parking bays are being installed near this property to try to help with resident parking during the control time. Although the council operate the Waxwell Lane Car Park adjacent to this property it does not allocate public parking space for residents.</p>
<p><u>WEST END AVENUE</u></p>	
<p>I refer your pinner parking review and there is one area of concern - that is in our road (west end avenue) opposite entry to the park and the footpath into west end lane. This area is covered with parked cars between 3 and 4 pm picking up school children. Parking is a particular hazard on the road- I would like to think that double yellow lines will be introduced to restrict parking in this area.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed for the inside of this bend to ensure there is still a route through when vehicles are parked on the footpath side of the road.</p>
<p>I wish to object to the proposed extra proposed permit bays situated outside XX West End Avenue and the proposed bays in the bend in the road to the South, outside no's 59 etc. I am materially effected by the proposal, as I reside at XX West End Avenue and a bay will be directly outside my home. I intend soon to remodel my front garden with a proposed drop curb for an in/out driveway and a parking bay would not be tenable.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. The property currently has off-street parking for two vehicles. Until application for second vehicle crossover is approved then plan for an additional permit parking bay will continue and it will not preclude owner from current on-street parking practices or affect the crossover application as the bay markings can be removed as part of the</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>In addition, I park outside my house from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. the following day on Monday to Friday on the existing yellow line and also park all weekend outside my house, this will no longer be possible.</p> <p>I further object to the parking on the bend - I am a ROSPA advanced driver, and it is abundantly clear that allowing parking on a bend, will cause accidents, on a bend which often has near misses and on previous occasions collisions.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that extra parking in West End Avenue is necessary and you should restrict the parking permits that you are issuing (too many to occupants of flats in West End Court etc. Also, planning permission was granted for No 73 on the proviso that no permits would be issued to the occupants, whereas it is clear that you have issued permits to these occupants.</p>	<p>crossover works. A permit is only required if a vehicle is parked on street in a CPZ during the control time.</p> <p>Current road width at this location does not reduce ability of additional parking bay to be installed as proposed.</p> <p>Engineers have taken account of the objection in relation to the additional parking bay outside No59, on the bend, and are recommending that this not progressed.</p>
<p>I am writing to object to the proposals set out in the Pinner Area parking review to the addition of extra residents' parking spaces in West End Avenue. I live at number XX West End Avenue and there is a proposal to put 3 additional parking spaces between my house, No XX and next door, No 60. I live at the beginning of a bend in the road leading down to West End Lane. On a number of occasions since I have lived here, over 20 years, I have witnessed a number of accidents on this bend usually caused by cars coming along the road and having to swerve to avoid traffic coming from West End Lane. On 2 occasions, cars have gone through walls at houses 2 away from us. Over the years more and more cars have parked on the road. At weekends, when there are no parking restrictions, the corner is extremely dangerous as cars park along the road including the bends. The flats at West End Court have their own off street parking so there is no reason for them to park their cars on the road and indeed they don't during the week. It is only laziness which makes them want to park on the road, not a lack of parking.</p> <p>It is extremely dangerous to consider putting more spaces on this bend and I wouldn't park my own car outside my own house because it is not safe to do so, either to my car or to other road users. It is my view that there should be double yellow lines along this stretch of the road, not additional parking, which will inevitably lead to accidents.</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. In this instance engineers have taken account of the objection in relation to the additional parking bay outside No59, on the bend, and are recommending that this not progressed.</p>
<p>I was recently informed by a neighbour that there was a proposal to provide a parking permit bay across the drop down kerb leading to our drive and garage. I live at 64 West End Avenue, HA5 1BW and our vehicle access is from the rear of the property in Meadow Road, next to 40 Meadow Road, Pinner.</p> <p>I have reproduced part of the appropriate Harrow Council document showing the proposal. This is attached to this e-mail in order for you to easily identify the issue and rectify the matter before a contractor paints an inappropriate permit bay.</p> <p>I can only assume that this is in error and would like confirmation that a bay is not being created across our drop down kerb and drive.</p> <p>I look forward to your early response on this issue.</p>	<p>The resident has been supplied incorrect information by the neighbour. The engineer has spoken with the resident and assured them no permit parking bay will be install across the access to the rear of the property in Meadow Road</p>
<p>Creating parking spaces on the 'bends' of West End Avenue Pinner will be a dangerous step. These sections of the road should already have traffic calming measures, never mind creating parking spaces on these dangerous bends. The traffic motoring around these</p>	<p>When reviewing an existing CPZ it is customary for the council to try to install more on-street parking where possible. In this instance engineers have taken account of the objection in relation to the additional parking bay outside No59,</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>bends, in some instances, is travelling too fast. Increasing parking spaces anywhere on West End Avenue increases the likelihood of an accident occurring as cars reverse from their forecourt onto the road.</p>	<p>on the bend, and are recommending that this not progressed. If residents have difficulty reversing out of their driveway then the Highway Code suggests it may be more practical to reverse into the property and drive out in a forward gear.</p>
<p><u>WEST END LANE</u></p>	
<p>I wish to object to the proposed removal of the disabled parking spaces in Love lane and High Street in Pinner. I may be able to still drive but I find it difficult to walk. I drive very little but need to get down to the village at times. I am 82 years old. I am sure that there are many others with the same problem. Hoping you will give this some thought.</p>	<p>The existing disabled parking bays in Love Lane are being reorganised and limited to three hour maximum stay. This will encourage a turnover of vehicles using the bays and preclude people using the bays all day at the expense of other users. A blue badge holder will also be able to park free of charge in the proposed pay and display bays in Love Lane, thus potentially opening up more spaces for them to be able to use in the area.</p>
<p><u>WEST TOWERS</u></p>	
<p>in response to the proposal for parkin restriction on West Towers DP 2013-02 We at the above address strongly object to any kind of parkin restriction on West Towers. By having parking restriction on West Towers it will cause an on going problem with resident.</p>	<p>The only restriction in West Towers is for double yellow lines at the junction with Eastcote Road and is not near this property. Double yellow lines are being proposed for all junctions and bends within the area to ensure emergency and service vehicle access is maintained. This will also improve sightlines at junctions for all road users.</p>
<p><u>WESTBURY LODGE CLOSE</u></p>	
<p>I am writing to object to the plan to put two additional parking bays in Mansard Close (plan 10). I live at Westbury Lodge Close but my house backs onto Mansard Close. The proposed bays would block access to several neighbours' driveways and make it hard to manoeuvre in and out of my parking space behind my house. Mansard Close does not have a lot of room for manoeuvre already. Please could you amend these plans. I would appreciate an update once this has been reconsidered.</p>	<p>Engineers have reviewed this proposal and in light of this objection the proposed bays will not be progressed and the existing cpz single yellow line will remain..</p>
<p>Please take this as a formal objection to the suggested additional parking bays in Mansard Close (plan 10) Although my address is 14 Westbury Lodge Close, and my front door is on Westbury, my drive and access to my integral garage is on Mansard Close as is no 15, where you propose to block my access as of those who live near me. Please therefore amend your proposed plans and confirm amendments.</p>	<p>Engineers have reviewed this proposal and in light of this objection the proposed bays will not be progressed and the existing cpz single yellow line will remain.</p>
<p>I wish to object to the TMO DP2013-02. Two of the proposed new parking bays in Mansard Close will block driveway and hence garage access for number 15 and possibly 13 and 14 Westbury Lodge Close. Dependent on exact location they may also block 5 Mansard Close from accessing their driveway. The implementation of these new bays could make parking even worse since the two bays being introduced will be at the expense of losing up to 4 existing off road parking spaces making it a net negative effect.</p>	<p>Engineers have reviewed this proposal and in light of this objection the proposed bays will not be progressed and the existing cpz single yellow line will remain. The legal traffic orders are written in a standard format that is used throughout the country. The Pinner parking review is the largest review carried out in recent times documents had to be delivered to approximately 6000 properties within the consultation area. As part of the statutory consultation process street notices are</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Apart from being an action that will cause unnecessary stress to the homeowners (plus cause them to lose their private parking reducing the value of their homes and increasing their insurance costs), I would imagine that these two additional bays will contravene section 86 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.</p> <p>I would also like to add that the TMO in its entirety was not well publicised (the notices were not in plain English and mentioned only changes to waiting restrictions). The documentation was also not available on your website for some days after the notices were put up on lampposts which led to confusion and timewasting as we tried to find the full proposal.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.</p>	<p>also put up throughout the area. This must be completed before the legal start date of the consultation. The information on the public website is programmed to be open during the statutory consultation period only.</p> <p>Engineers telephone contact details are included in the documents and residents could have contacted the engineer direct to discuss this aspect.</p>
<p><u>WHITTINGTON WAY</u></p> <p>I am a little confused at the public notices which have been put up along Whittington Way in Pinner.</p> <p>The notices are on the lamp posts but facing the service road on both sides of the road, this is what has caused some confusion for myself and other residents.</p> <p>It is not clear where the proposed parking restrictions will be situated.</p> <p>Are the slip roads on both sides of Whittington Way to have parking restrictions implemented, or just the main road and junctions? I am not able to check the link suggested on the notice as it states internal server error.</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p>	<p>All the junctions in and out of the service roads will have double yellow lines to ensure access and visibility will be maintained. Double yellow lines will also be introduced at the pedestrian crossing point near the entrance to the park.</p> <p>The Pinner parking review is the largest review carried out in recent times documents had to be delivered to approximately 6000 properties within the consultation area. As part of the statutory consultation process street notices are also put up throughout the area. This must be completed before the legal start date of the consultation. The information on the public website is programmed to be open during the statutory consultation period only.</p> <p>Engineers telephone contact details are included in the documents and residents could have contacted the engineer direct to discuss this aspect.</p>
<p>I OBJECT to the overzealous use of double yellow lines (DYL) along Whittington Way (WW) particularly affecting the service roads.</p> <p>The DYL look too long when turning onto the parking sides of the service roads.</p> <p>I have lived here for 30 years and have not seen an issue with Lorries e.g. for dustbin collection using these service roads even at the bends as they are fairly wide. Certainly if DYL are needed they DO NOT need to extend very far along, maybe only enough to allow pavement ramp access.</p> <p>There appears to be DYL far too extended from Compton rise into service road outside 71 all the way to 81 WW for no apparent reason.</p> <p>The line from 93 WW does not need to start so early at the bend.</p> <p>The DYL from St Michael's Crescent to outside 160/162 WW & from 168 WW DO NOT need to be very long on the parking side .</p> <p>The impact of making the DYL too long, if even needed (they have never been needed since the roads were built from the 1930's) will remove more purpose built off road parking places at great cost for little gain with no real benefit to the local community. It will just create more parking congestion.</p> <p>Looking at the amount of yellow lines from the Dawlish drive to Cannon lane (CL) junctions this will push more cars into the service areas or more likely further along the main road of WW which is a very busy bus route, narrowing the road further along its route. It does not help having a car sales & maintenance business located there.</p>	<p>All the junctions in and out of the service roads will have double yellow lines to ensure access and visibility will be maintained. Double yellow lines will also be introduced at the pedestrian crossing point near the entrance to the park.</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>My suggestion would be to save money on this scheme & consider painting mini roundabouts at the busy bus route junctions of CL & WW , CL & Eascote Road and possibly Lyncroft Avenue and Eascote road. This would make a far greater contribution to road safety.</p> <p>Taking into account all the above points a re-evaluation along WW is necessary.</p>	
<p><u>WILLOW DENE</u></p> <p>We wish to object to the proposal to introduce pay and display bays on Station Approach, Pinner, as proposed in the review.</p> <p>Our grounds for objecting are as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Station Approach, Pinner, is a busy road with traffic constantly going to and from the station. 2. The necessary space for parking will reduce the traffic flow on this busy stretch of road, causing congestion back onto Bridge Street/Marsh Road. 3. In Winter, with snow and ice on this stretch of road, which is not gritted, parked vehicles will increase the hazard of negotiating the steep slope up and down for vehicles and pedestrians. 4. Adequate spaces are available in the large car park co-used with Sainsbury store. 5. Parking spaces exist outside Pinner Station which are adequate for short-term parking and drop offs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed and the parking needs to be more formal 2. Double yellow lines are proposed opposite the proposed pay and display bays to ensure at least two lanes of traffic should be possible 3. If there is any potential hazard during these winter events the parking bays could be suspended to reduce the risk of any vehicle parking there 4. The proposed bays are opposite a small number of shops, so may provide a better facility for their customers rather than risking parking on the existing yellow lines or parking further away in the Sainsbury's car park. With 20 minute free on-street parking period this may also be an attraction for customers to these premises 5. Parking directly outside the station is not controlled by the council and may be removed at any time by the freeholder.
<p><u>WINCHESTER DRIVE</u></p> <p>Many thanks for your response. I really appreciate you taking the time to come back to me. The questionnaire, I believe, also asked would Winchester Drive want a cpz if the cpz is moved closer to our road (I believe that was the last question). According to the Pinner residents association it reported that most residents said they would want cpz if the cpz moved closer to them. I really am very concerned on the impact on our road.</p> <p>What is the benefit, if you live in Winchester Drive, of supporting this proposal, when all that will happen is the cars that currently park in Cranbourne Drive will migrate to Winchester Drive.</p> <p>Your records will no doubt indicate that Winchester Drive is not as wide as the other roads in the current proposal for the cpz and therefore will become more congested and more difficult to local residents to access and egress their properties.</p> <p>Also the commuters previously parked in cranborne drive have not parked considerably and it has been difficult to pull out of junctions as you cannot see. I am concerned that this is a health and safety issue for kids walking to school.</p> <p>Again I really appreciate your consideration. We are very concerned.</p> <p>As a resident of Winchester Drive I wish to lodge my strong objection to the Pinner Area Parking Review. There is no logic to move the CPZ to include Cranborne Drive and Malpas Drive and not to include Winchester Drive or Colchester Drive. all that will happen is that the commuter cars that park currently on Cranborne Drive and on Malpas Drive will be forced to park in Winchester Drive. This causes a serious health and safety risk as Winchester Drive</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time.</p> <p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>is significantly narrower than the other roads. Cars will not park only on one side and will therefore create blockages and chicanes. The rubbish truck will not be able to get down this road and it will be very dangerous.</p> <p>I hope you will take this strong objection into account. If you would like to meet in our road I would be happy to point out exactly what I mean.</p>	
<p>Ref DP 2014-02</p> <p>I object to proposal (a) within the Pinner Area Parking Review, to extend the Zone A CPZ to include Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive.</p> <p>Reason.</p> <p>It will materially affect me as it will transfer the problems currently affecting Cranbourne Drive into Winchester Drive, where I live.</p> <p>The proposal will not provide a solution to the current issues, it will merely re-locate them.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>
<p>OBJECTION to Extension of CPZ to Cranbourne Drive & Malpas Drive</p> <p>The parking situation in Winchester Drive has significantly worsened during the past 12 months. I had difficulties getting out of my drive due to inconsiderate parking on a number of occasions. This is mainly due to the fact that the parking of commuter vehicles is spilling over from Cranbourne Drive which now has reached saturation point on weekdays. I have counted up to 18 cars being regularly parked on both sides of Cranbourne Drive between West End Lane and Malpas Drive.</p> <p>If the proposal to extend the CPZ to Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive is introduced, this will only worsen the situation in Winchester Drive, as it has a carriageway width of only 4.6 metres. It could cause</p> <p>a) a total blockage, if vehicles are parked opposite each other on both sides of the road</p> <p>b) impede access for the Emergency Services, the Borough's Refuse Collection and other HGVs, if there is inconsiderate 'staggered' parking.</p> <p>I, therefore, OBJECT on the basis that the extension is insufficient and should include Winchester Drive and also Colchester Drive.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>
<p>OBJECTION to Extension of Controlled Parking Zone to Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive (Plans 10 and 13)</p> <p>At present parking in Cranbourne Drive can mean that up to 20 cars are parked during the day between Monday and Friday causing difficulty in turning out of Malpas Drive in view of the lack of visibility of other vehicles.</p> <p>If the scheme as envisaged is implemented this is likely to result in the transfer of parking into Winchester Drive and in all probability into Colchester Drive and Rochester Drive as well.</p> <p>Winchester Drive is under 5 metres wide and at present inconsiderate parking is often seen which means that access to emergency vehicles, Council refuse collection services and HGV's can be severely limited with current traffic often having to treat the road like a chicane. Another point is that drives are not opposite each other and therefore cars reversing out of one drive will only have a very narrow turning point onto the road if a car is parked opposite.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>Colchester Drive is similarly narrow and Rochester Drive is used as a cut through between Eastcote Road and West End Lane.</p> <p>The sensible option on road safety grounds is to include Winchester, Colchester and Rochester Drives in the CPZ and I therefore OBJECT to the present proposal. The suggestion may mean that parking is transferred to Francis Road / Barnhill, a much wider road, which would provide footpath access to Pinner .</p>	
<p>Thank you for the information on proposed parking changes in Pinner. With regard to Cranbourne and Malpas Drive, we agree with the proposal to make them Zone A CPZ but are concerned at the “ripple effect” which might affect our own road. Winchester Drive is a very narrow road - lorries and rubbish clearance vehicles have great difficulty in passing parked cars and space for emergency vehicles will not exist if other cars parked there. Indeed we would recommend that Winchester Drive should also be designated a Zone A CPZ to prevent people from Northwood or Hatch End parking. If not, we fear an extension of the chaos, which is currently affecting Cranbourne and Malpas Drives</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>
<p>Below is outlined the reasons for my OBJECTION to the parking review reference DP 2014-02.</p> <p>I specifically OBJECT to the extension of zone A CPZ to include Malpas Drive and Cranbourne Drive.</p> <p>Currently although commuters/drivers are able to park on those roads, the roads are still wide enough to allow flow of traffic to cars and lorries without problems.</p> <p>Any extension to include them into the zone A CPZ will transfer those cars onto Winchester and Colchester drive, given that the added walking distance is minimal.</p> <p>This will lead to access issues for larger vehicles including ambulances/fire engines given that both winchester and colchester are narrow roads. Commuters are likely to park in a staggered manner and may compromise access to drives.</p> <p>I believe that the above represents a safety issue as well as an access issue which will cause serious problems to surrounding residents.</p> <p>I would suggest an alternative plan to deal with the parking issues that this new proposal is aiming to deal with</p> <p>The OBJECTION (in relation to reference DP 2014-02 and in particular related to the extension of zone A CPZ to include cranbourne and malpas) is therefore made based on the above serious concerns.</p>	<p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>
<p>Rcv the proposed parking plans for Pinner in post today these should make it easier to turn out onto Malpas because at the moment people park right on the corners however I live in Winchester which is a very narrow road for parking anyway surely everyone will just park there instead?? Sarah Reeves 8 Winchester Drive Pinner Middx HA5 1DB</p>	<p>Helpful comment regarding access to Malpas Drive</p> <p>The residents of Winchester Road, Colchester Road and Rochester Road were given the same opportunity to request parking controls as Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive. Malpas Drive is included because residents there indicated in their previous questionnaire responses that if an adjoining road was to be in a cpz then they would change their No to a Yes they would want a cpz in their road. It is not possible to extend the cpz into these adjoining roads at this time</p>
<p><u>WOODHALL AVENUE</u></p> <p>We are residents of XX Woodhall Avenue, HA5 3DX in Area 3. Our neighbours at 22A and</p>	<p>There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and</p>

APPENDIX E

<p>29 Woodhall Avenue have informed us that they will be requesting single yellow lines outside of their respective properties on Woodhall Avenue. We would prefer that rather than single yellow lines that residents parking bays (with 11am-12noon restriction to deter commuter parkers) are put in place instead so that residents are still able to park. If the request for single yellow lines by our neighbours is accepted then we would like to request that residents parking bays (with 11am-12noon restriction to deter commuter parkers) are also put on the south side of Lawn Vale along the borders of our house 24 Woodhall Avenue and that single yellow lines are put on the north side to prevent the road from being blocked (as the road is very narrow) by cars parked on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Given the importance of these changes could a trial period be considered (e.g. 1-3 months) to assess the impact of the changes after which feedback is gathered and the parking restrictions finalised.</p> <p>We would appreciate an acknowledgement of this email and then responses to the comments that we have made. Thanks.</p>	<p>Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road.</p>
<p>This is a formal objection against the suggested parking restrictions for the road Woodhall Avenue, Pinner. There have been no problems or concerns with the parking on this road since we have lived here. Therefore I am thoroughly shocked as to why parking restrictions would even be suggested for this street, other than for moneymaking schemes. Woodhall Avenue is a beautiful spacious street and I strongly feel the atmosphere will be affected with parking restrictions outside our home. As also discussed and agreed with our neighbours, there is absolutely no reason to place any limitations on this road.</p>	<p>There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road.</p>
<p>I would like to make a formal complaint against the parking restriction suggested and applied to Woodhall Avenue, Pinner. We have lived here for 8 years and not had any issue with parking on the road here at all. This parking restriction will cause nothing but inconvenience and we strongly object to any change to the parking rules here.</p> <p>(Same response received from two residents of the same property)</p>	<p>There seems to be some confusion between the residents of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. The only proposed measures in this area are for double yellow lines on the junction in line with others throughout the consultation area. Any requests for extension of the existing CPZ at this statutory consultation cannot be progressed at this time. They would need to be considered separately as the measures proposed in this consultation are as a result of the majority views expressed during the previous public consultation ie there was no support from the residents that responded to any parking controls being installed in the road.</p>
<p>As a resident of Woodhall Avenue, Area 3 (29 Woodhall Avenue, Pinner, HA5 3DY), I am disappointed to see that the CPZ is unlikely to include Woodhall Avenue. In my original consultation I pointed out that it can be very difficult to get in and out of our driveway (particularly Monday to Friday) due to the fact that commuter cars park very closely to the entry of our drive and opposite our driveway. On several occasions we have actually been blocked in due to inconsiderate parking. We are the last road with "free" parking and whilst I appreciate this situation does not affect the majority of residents on Woodhall Avenue it affects us on a daily basis.</p> <p>We also have cars abandoned outside our house (it is the end of the cul de sac) which is</p>	<p>Unfortunately it is not possible to object to something that is not being proposed in the Traffic Order</p> <p>There was no overall support for any cpz or other parking controls in Woodhall Avenue</p> <p>Double yellow lines proposed for one side of road at this location which should help ease congestion while still allowing some parking for evening and weekend activities/residents</p> <p>There was no overall support for any cpz or other parking controls in Paines Lane although there are additional double yellow lines at the width restriction</p>

APPENDIX E

dangerous and unbecoming for the area, and this needs to be addressed and deterred. I notice that you are proposing to install double yellow lines around the corner of Lawn Vale and Woodhall Avenue. Unfortunately, I do not think this will be enough of a deterrent. It appears from the plan that the double yellow lines running from the north side of Lawn Vale will not run all the way in front of Number 22A until this property's dropped kerb. I object to this and feel that the double yellow line should run all the way in front of No. 22A until their driveway entrance. If this does not happen it will mean that there will be one space available for a commuter to park their car directly opposite our drive. As single yellow lines are not proposed either this is just going to make matters worse for us. Human nature, as such is to cram your car as close to the CPZ as possible, without having to pay, to cut down on walking time to the station!

As restrictions are being put in place in Barrowdene Close this is bound to throw more commuter cars in our direction. I did mention in the original consultation that if other roads were to be included in the new CPZ then we should be too, and on this basis object to Woodhall Avenue not being included in the CPZ.

However, I appreciate that this does not affect the majority of residents in the way that it affects us and therefore, the optimum would be for double yellow lines to run round the corner from the alley way which leads to Waxwell Lane next to 24 Woodhall Avenue, to round the corner on the south side of Lawn Vale, plus double yellow lines from the corner of the north side of Lawn Vale until the dropped kerb of Number 22A's driveway, and have a single yellow line with the restrictions of 11.00 am – 12.00 noon as per the majority of Pinner, in front of our property No 29 to prevent the commuter parking which gives us such daily grief.

If this was instigated it would deter cars from being abandoned on our road and also prevent commuters from inconsiderate parking, but not prevent others from parking the majority of the time which I believe is fair.

With regards to Area 7, in my original consultation I pointed out that the corner of High Street leading into Paines Lane should have double yellow lines on both sides of the road. I notice that double yellow lines are only being considered for one side of the road. Surely this is just going to throw the week-end/evening parking onto the opposite side and then negate any benefit from installing the double yellow lines. This is a very dangerous corner and I strongly believe that double yellow lines should be installed on both sides of the road and object to the double yellow lines only being installed on one side.

With regards to Paines Lane (Areas 3 and 7), as this road is a main artery leading into Pinner village and, I believe, a busier road than Waxwell Lane, I feel that it should be treated the same way as Waxwell Lane and have a single yellow line running along both sides of the road from High Street to the Uxbridge Road with occasional resident bays. Commuter parking along Paines Lane has significantly increased in the last few years and with the width restrictions in place means that the commuter parking is dangerous to all other road users. There have been several serious accidents in the last year or so where cars have been written off and the commuter parking does not help as it impedes the road view of the motorist. With the increased CPZ in other areas of Pinner it will throw more dangerous

and other key locations along the road.

If parking across driveways occur residents can contact the Parking Operations team who may be able to send a Civil Enforcement Officer to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) to any offending vehicle. It is not possible to automatically issue a PCN to any vehicle across a driveway as it may be a person with connections to the property.

APPENDIX E

<p>commuter parking onto Paines Lane. I therefore object to Paines Lane not being treated in the same manner as Waxwell Lane. Please address our concerns in particular to our home Woodhall Avenue.</p>	
<p><u>WOODHALL GATE</u></p> <p>We wish to register our objection to the proposed new car parking schemes for Pinner / Hatch End. The scheme seems to have a priority to give householders in the areas near to the stations the right to monopolise parking in the roads outside their houses. The roads are not theirs to monopolise - they have their drives, but they do not own the roads ! Other people need to park their cars to use the public transport facilities. Commuters can use the station car-parks, but it is certain that these are inadequate and will get filled-up very early in the day. People who want to use public transport in the middle of the day will have nowhere to park at all. It seems that in the rush to accommodate the huge influx of population to the area, no thought has been given to the non-commuters. Why not adopt a scheme like in Northwood, where residents of the area get preferential arrangements over outsiders when using parking facilities. The twin CPZ times means that it will be impossible for people to use public transport for day-time trips to Watford or London - and there will no alternative whatsoever. We live outside of the immediate area around the stations, but are acutely affected by the proposals. As Harrow residents, we think we ought to have been included in the consultation process. The whole thing needs to be re-thought and the priorities agreed with all the residents of Harrow - not just the householders in the immediate vicinity of the stations.</p>	<p>It is difficult for the council to balance the needs of the community with the direct requests from residents for the council to deal with the non-resident parking occurring in their road.</p>
<p><u>Not in Harrow</u></p> <p>Re: Parking in residential roads I hereby object to the restrictions to be applied to parking in residential roads for the following reasons: 1: If one works in Pinner and needs their car during the course of the day, where can they park? Car park too expensive 2: The road I park on 'Cranbourne Drive' is wide enough for cars to be parked either side of the road and still enough space for a fire brigade to pass through comfortably. 3: If the side roads have restrictions for parking, then people will park on the main road ie Eastcote Road which does not have yellow line. This road is more important and is more of a main road than the side roads. 4: At any one time, I have never seen anyone parking in the residential roads without any inconsideration. All the cars are parked without blocking any driveways inconsiderately. 5: All the houses in Cranbourne Drive have driveways therefore plenty of space for other cars to park at any time. 6: If we pay road tax, then why can't we park in the road? 7: People who park on these side roads are to be encouraged as they are the working class and at least they are going to work. Why should we get penalised for working?</p>	<p>It is difficult for the council to balance the needs of the community with the direct requests from residents for the council to deal with the non-resident parking occurring in their road.</p>

APPENDIX E

8: If these few roads are having restrictions put in, people still need to find parking space therefore other roads are going to be used.
I hope you take the right decision and instead of penalising those who work, maybe the residents can learn to be a bit more understanding.