

APPENDIX-D

BELMONT CIRCLE AREA FORMAL OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED WITH OFFICERS RESPONSE

ROADS WITHIN THE PROPOSED PARKING ZONE

Ref.	Road	Objections and Comments	Officers Response
010191	BELLAMY DRIVE (Bellamy Court)	<p>I write to object to the proposed parking in our area. I do have a car, however our flats do not offer any off street parking and I have parked outside my flat for years without any problems. I leave for work at 9am and am home by 5.30pm, Monday to Friday. These parking restrictions do not help my cause in anyway and end up costing me more to park outside my front door. It seems highly unfair that these restrictions are forced on the residents of Bellamy Drive, none of whom seem happy with it, especially those who live in the flats. I fail to understand why those that live in the area have to pay to park outside our own door. Furthermore we do not have any tube/ train station within walking distance from us so most of us have cars. I would like to add that parking problems are not an issue during the day at all (the time in which you want restrictions). We do have a parking issues late evening when everyone returns home from work but have managed to accommodate each other where possible. I resent the fact that I should have to pay to park on a daily basis outside my own flat, especially Saturdays!? I would have to leave for work an hour early to avoid this which seems very unfair. Why should I have to pay for parking when I own a property on this road and have parked outside my flat for two decades? I pay road tax to keep my car on the road and I pay my council tax, this further cost is not something that is manageable or appreciated. It just feels like an unfair way for the council to generate further revenue. Should parking restrictions be implemented on our street, i would expect at the least that the residents have a permit they can use that is NOT chargeable so we can safely park our car outside our own door. Belmont Circle is surely not congested or big enough to merit such changes. In all the years that I have lived in this area it has been appreciated for the ample parking and easy access. I hope my views have been taken in to consideration.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>

010192	BELLAMY DRIVE	I'm a resident on Bellamy Court and object to having controlled parking on our road. We don't have a tube/train station near us and don't see why this area should be a controlled zone. Making this area a control zone is not going to help the problem as the problem with parking is only in the evening when everyone comes home. Day time is not problem to fine a parking the road is free no cars as every one is at work or anywhere. The residents have drive ways but park on the road this is the problem this makes it harder for us who live in the flats as we don't have allocated parking.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive. It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.
010193	BELLAMY DRIVE, (Bellamy Court)	I'm a resident and object to having controlled parking on our road. We don't have a tube/train station near us and don't see why this area should be a controlled zone. Making this area a control zone is not going to help the problem as the problem with parking is only in the evening when everyone comes home. By that time the parking will be free and it's only residents cars on the road. Drive on the road during the day and you will always find parking. The problem is a lot of residents have drive ways but park on the road. Which makes it harder for us who live in the flats as we don't have allocated parking. If you make this road a contolled zone it will only be to generate revenue for the council with no adequate reason. Not one single person that I've spoken to has agreed with having this road controlled. Hope you have received my email and taken into consideration what my concerns are.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive. It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.
010194	BELLAMY DRIVE	I would like to raise my objections to parking restrictions in Bellamy drive. If anyone would come to Bellamy drive during the day time, there is no problem with parking. If fact there is loads of space. It is in the evenings, and especially the evenings at the week end, that there is a problem, And as these proposals don't deal with any of the actual problems, imposing parking restrictions during the day is of no use to the residents who live in the road.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive. It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.
010195	BELLAMY DRIVE	My reason for objecting is that I am a single parent who struggles every month to make ends meet and would not be able to afford to pay for the parking permit, also I have family that visit often as I have a daughter with a chronic illness and have regular hospital visits so members of my family or friends come to look after my other daughter and this sometimes is for two whole days and it would be very difficult for them to park. Another reason is that people mostly park after 6.30pm so it wouldn,t really make a difference as the time is from 8.00am to 6.30pm. As a Resident on bellamy Drive. I strongly OBJECT to the permit parking.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive. It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.
010196	BELLAMY	I am emailing you to object to the parking restrictions that harrow	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the

	DRIVE	<p>council are trying to enforce around Belmont circle, particularly Bellamy Drive where I live. I am objecting for many reasons. I can see absolutely no parking issues around the area and never have done for as long as I have lived in the area and I have lived here for 20 years. We have no train station in the area of Belmont and the only time of the day that we do have people parking on the road that do not live on Bellamy Drive is on a Saturday night or Sunday day time. This still does not affect people living on the road as most people have their own driveways. I feel that harrow council are only doing this as a money making scheme and to have to pay to park on the road that I live on is ridiculous as there are no problems with parking at all. I also think it is unfair that we would not only have to pay for a permit but then have to supply any visitors with day permits which we would then have to pay for again! We pay for council tax and also pay for road tax for two cars therefore I completely object to this proposal!.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010197	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I am objecting to the parking restrictions being enforced in Belmont circle and surrounding roads. My reason being that i already pay council tax and shouldn't have to pay anymore to park outside of my own house as far as i can see this proposal is just a way for the council to make money out of drivers by issuing parking tickets and charging people to park on the roads that they are already paying for by council tax and car tax etc. At the moment i see no reason for any parking restrictions in this area we currently have no problems with parking in the are i feel that the council are just trying to implement a way to make money out of us.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010198	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>We formally object to the proposal to introduce restricted/residents only parking (CPZ) on Bellamy Drive. Our reasons for doing so are as follows: 1. The majority of vehicles parked in Bellamy Drive belong to residents and their visitors. The parking problems experienced by residents only/mainly occur in the evenings when the CPZ would not be in operation; 2. By far the biggest pressure on parking spaces on Bellamy Drive occurs at the end of the working day (after 6:30). The proposed CPZ (which ends at 6:30) would clearly not address this problem – calling the whole purpose and viability of the CPZ into question; 3. The suggestion that, the absence of a CPZ in respect of Bellamy Drive, would result in shoppers who currently use parking spaces in around Belmont Circle using Bellamy Drive is (at the best) “not proven”. It is unlikely that significant (if any) numbers would park in the street, walk to the shops and, laden with shopping, walk back. It is hardly convenient. Moreover, given the fact that there is no real practice of that happening now, it is somewhat a “quantum leap” to suggest</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>To facilitate safe vehicular movement, improve sightlines and to remove obstructive parking it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines either side of Bellamy Drive between property no.s 8/10 to 12/14 and 21/23 to 29/31 at the south western end and between to 64/66 to 70/72, Bellamy Drive at the north eastern end. These measures will improve access for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>

		<p>that it would occur as a result of parking restrictions elsewhere; 4. In the light of 2 and 3 (above) it is evident that the proposed CPZ has not been thought through. It does not address the key issues. There is no evidence it has been properly scoped and appears to be little more than a revenue raising device; 5. Parking issues in respect of Bellamy Drive (such as they are) could be more effectively addressed by any of the following_ (a) making the street "one way"; (b) making it subject to a "one hour restriction" in and around mid-day thereby addressing any perceived problem that it will be used as a parking area for commuters (residents have seen no evidence of this and doubt it will occur given the nearest station is 1 mile away); (c) making one side of the street no-parking at all (making it easier for larger vehicles to gain access and egress); (d) making the two "bends" in the street "no parking" at all (double Yellow Lines).</p>	
010199	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I strongly object to the CPZ being introduced on Bellamy Drive. The street does not have a parking problem in daytime. The street is practically empty in day time. The main problem is in the evening when residents return from work. There far more cars and vans on the street in the evening than in daytime. A CPZ will result in an increase in taxation through permit holder bays. Yes it is a tax, it doesnt matter how you dress it. And there will be no benefit at all to the residents. The condition od the street is appalling. With no improvements made to it for past 20 years. There i again state my objection strongly to any CPZ being introduced on Bellamy Drive. If the CPZ was active for 24 hours during weekdays. I would support that. But not during daytime as it will be useless. A CPZ will just add to the exasperation of residents. I would rather demand the introduction of a one way traffic on bellamy drive. I spoke to local councillor about the state of the street. I mentioned the really bad paving on the street. He said the coucil has given up on fixing it because cars frequently vault on to the pavement. The major contributor to this situation is that 2 cars coming from opposite directions do not have any space to pass. So one has to vault onto the pavement and drive ways to let each other pass. I have witnessed countless heated arguments between drivers who have no way to pass and refuse to go onto the pavement. I have also seen cars speed round the corners just to avoid a situation where they might meet an oncoming vehicle. All of these scenarios create a dangerous environment for pedestrians, and our children.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>To facilitate safe vehicular movement, improve sightlines and to remove obstructive parking it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines either side of Bellamy Drive between property no.s 8/10 to 12/14 and 21/23 to 29/31 at the south western end and between to 64/66 to 70/72, Bellamy Drive at the north eastern end. These measures will improve access for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p> <p>With regards to the poor state of repairs to both the carriageway and the footway on Bellamy Drive the concerns of the residents have been reported to the Highways and Asset Management Team to investigate.</p>
010200	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I am a teacher employed at a primary school in West Harrow commuting by car every day. I leave as early as 7.45 am and</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents</p>

		<p>return home after 6.30pm. Similarly my husband and son who also commute to work by car returning usually after 6.30pm. Introducing the proposed controlled parking in Bellamy Dr from 8am to 6.30pm will not benefit us at all! The street is empty during the day time anyway, the parking problem for residents in Bellamy Dr arises after 6.30! We have been residing at this current address since December 2003, over a decade paying council tax and to this day we are finding it extremely hard to find parking on this road! Sometimes I've even had to park my car in the adjacent streets. So by allowing free parking after 6.30 pm will not resolve the problem we are currently facing. The issue arises after 6.30pm when the socialising members of our public visit the Funky Brownz restaurant/bar and very conveniently park in Bellamy Dr, stripping away the rights of the residents! In addition to paying road tax and council tax we will be forced to buy residents parking permit per vehicle too? In this current economic climate where every member of a household needs to earn money to lead a decent life, we're compelled to pay for our parking?? We were better off before , at least we didn't have to dish more money out of our pockets. May I ask how does this solve our problem ?? I think it's ridiculous! I very strongly object to the current proposal and suggest that either the controlled parking idea be lifted from Bellamy Dr, or the controlled hours be extended to 8.30pm Mon -Sat. Finally I would also like to add another comment or a suggestion which is to implement one way system to Bellamy Drive. The road is extremely narrow throughout and has a very acute bend. My husband's car just recently was a victim of a hit and run case! Luckily one of the neighbours witnessed the incident and took down number plate details and left a note on the windscreen. Otherwise we would have had to endure a heavy damage. Another reason comes to mind which I have experienced and witnessed. Due to cars parked on both sides and traffic entering Bellamy Dr from both ends, drivers refuse to reverse or drive into a position to allow each other access. There have been several heated arguments and exchange of verbal abuse between drivers. Not a pleasant situation to be in or to watch! Therefore I urge you to look in to this matter immediately! I appreciate your time and anticipate that you will bring this matter up to a discussion with TARSAP and that there is a positive outcome.</p>	<p>parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>To facilitate safe vehicular movement, improve sightlines and to remove obstructive parking it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines either side of Bellamy Drive between property no.s 8/10 to 12/14 and 21/23 to 29/31 at the south western end and between to 64/66 to 70/72, Bellamy Drive at the north eastern end. These measures will improve access for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010201	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I am extremely concerned about the implications of the proposed CPZ in my street. Although a small road, most of the parking problems we get are in the evenings, not during the day – and therefore I do not see what the new CPZ will actually solve. The</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p>

		<p>proposed hours of operation (Mon – Sat 8am – 6.30pm) are far too long, and will cause much hardship for residents. The scheme will cost us money for parking permits, and mean that it will be almost impossible for visitors to be able to park without providing them a permit. It is also notable that none of the other residential roads around the area are having this draconian measure placed on them. I urge you to reconsider this proposal – at the most, was an hour restriction (11am-12pm for example) ever considered? If not, why not. I do not feel that the measure is appropriate for the road, and it will cause financial implications for my household..</p>	<p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010202	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I object to the introduction of controlled parking in my street for the following reasons: 1. The proposal for CPZ during the day will not solve our parking problems which only occur in the evenings and at weekends. This is probably what some of the original complaints were referring to. 2. I do not think people will cause a problem parking in our street during the day because of restrictions on Belmont Circle. The Circle is not a busy shopping area and there is neither a station nor a hospital nearby. Most people come and go quickly and I doubt they will seek to park in Bellamy and walk there and back (especially as it involves negotiating our treacherous pavements!) If they want to park during the day there's plenty of space and it's not a problem. Parking for the pubs and restaurants is mainly relevant in the evenings when CPZ would not be operational anyway. 3. I object to having to pay for visitors to park when there is no need. Personally I have a drive, but sometimes visitors need to park on the road and this would mean added stress. I'm also thinking of the other residents - remembering to get a ticket, calculating the time, worrying about parking wardens. This would be acceptable if we were struggling or could foresee problems, but this is not the case. How frustrating to have to pay on a virtually empty road! 4. Paying for a permit is not even a guarantee of a space, so there is no benefit for the residents, especially on a Saturday. They will be forking out to be in the same predicament and if they have paid there could be more heated arguments over limited spaces. 5. The cost of implementing this scheme would be much more usefully spent and appreciated on renewing the pavements, which have been damaged by tree roots. One elderly neighbour that I know of has tripped over twice already and others might sue. 6. Another safety issue which affects us all is the 2 blind corners of the crescent. One day there could be a bad accident and all that's needed to prevent this is to make the street one-way.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>To facilitate safe vehicular movement, improve sightlines and to remove obstructive parking it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines either side of Bellamy Drive between property no.s 8/10 to 12/14 and 21/23 to 29/31 at the south western end and between to 64/66 to 70/72, Bellamy Drive at the north eastern end. These measures will improve access for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p> <p>With regards to the poor state of repairs to both the carriageway and the footway on Bellamy Drive the concerns of the residents have been reported to the Highways and Asset Management Team to investigate</p>
010203	BELLAMY	<p>We strongly object to the implementation of a CPZ in the area for</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the</p>

	DRIVE	<p>these reasons:- 1. The Residents will need a Parking Permit to park within their section of the zone. This means, in addition to the Council Tax and Road Tax, it will be another cost for households.</p> <p>2. There will be fewer spaces available within the zone for Residents to park with no guarantee that they will find a space, causing problems in other streets without CPZ like Uppingham Avenue, Wetheral Drive and Florinston Gardens. 3. We will need to buy Visitors Permits for our friends, family and visitors (such as central heating or washing machine engineers). When visiting people in neighbouring zones we will face similar problems. There will be a loss of freedom to park as long as required unless more money is paid for permits or parking meters. 4. Currently we have no problem in finding a parking space during the day. By introducing a CPZ, a parking problem will be created where none exists. There may be a parking issue at the Belmont Circle shopping parade, which can be solved by having parking restriction up to an hour or less.</p>	<p>statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010204	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>With regards to Controlled Parking Zone we are happy to have it the way it is at the moment. I oppose the Controlled Parking Zone and we feel that a controlled parking zone will not lead to any benefits to the residents on the road.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010205	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>OBJECTION - I'd like you to record our objections to the proposals put forward. As it is there isn't enough parking in our street and this will not help. It would certainly help if you could arrange to meet the residents of Bellamy Drive to hear their views.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010206	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>Hi I would just like to add my overwhelming support for controlled parking to be introduced on Bellamy Drive, we are experiencing major issues with residents and their visitors deliberately blocking our drive. Can you please confirm if restrictions would be placed on our side (no 10) where people currently park or the opposite side, odd number houses? Also your diagrams seem to indicate no waiting restrictions on our side (even no houses) is that correct?</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>To facilitate safe vehicular movement, improve sightlines and to remove obstructive parking it is proposed to introduce double</p>

			<p>yellow lines either side of Bellamy Drive between property no.s 8/10 to 12/14 and 21/23 to 29/31 at the south western end and between to 64/66 to 70/72, Bellamy Drive at the north eastern end. These measures will improve access for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010207	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to a CPZ on Bellamy drive. I do not feel we have been adequately consulted and feel is another back door way of paying another form of tax and income generation for the council .I do not feel it will deal with the parking problem and on a residential street the times proposed are ridiculous . We have 3 cars in the house, bus 186 is not reliable and can't understand why restrictions have to be from 8 - 6.30. I will definitely be expressing my displeasure at the next council election. Why was a meeting not called with locals on the street? We then have to pay exorbitant costs for permits for our guests . Please respond to my concerns and I am opposed to these proposals.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010208	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I oppose to the CPZ on Bellamy Drive. Having lived on Bellamy Drive for 34 years, we never had any problems with parking. We manage by talking to neighbours if there is no parking spaces. I do not agree paying for any parking permit because of complaints by a minority of residents. Is it another way of making money from the motorists? Instead of worrying about the parking permits, why not look at the dangerous foot paths. all pave stones and drives are uneven. I have stopped taking my mother for walks on this road and am sure is dangerous to other senior citizens. All other streets round Belmont Circle have had footpaths re-laid. How about doing this on Bellamy Drive rather than putting all your resources on creating CPZ.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>With regards to the poor state of repairs to both the carriageway and the footway on Bellamy Drive the concerns of the residents have been reported to the Highways and Asset Management Team to investigate.</p>
010209	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>OBJECTION I FORMALLY OBJECT TO YOUR PROPOSAL BASED ON THE FACT THAT IT IS NOT NEEDED NOR REQUIRED. THE BUSINESSES ARE NOT IN FAVOUR AND NEITHER ARE RESIDENTS. IT IS PURELY BASED ON YOU TRYING TO RAISE INCOME THROUGH THIS MEANS WHICH IS NOT REQUIRED. STILL WAITING FOR BELLAMY DRIVE ROAD TO BE FIXED! THERE ARE TWO CAR PARKS AND PAY AND DISPLAY BAYS - WHAT MORE DO YOU NEED?!!!!!! IT IS A VERY SMALL SHOPPING AREA WITH ONE SIDE OF THE ROUNDABOUT WHERE IT IS UNSAFE TO PARK. WE SIMPLY DON'T SEE THE NEED FOR THIS AT ALL. STOP WASTING TIME AND MONEY AND SPEND IT ON THINGS THAT DO NEED IT.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>

010219	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>OBJECTION DUE TO: not all of us can afford or should have to pay to have our driveway paved to enable to park in our street. Also the fact that even if we buy a parking permit to park in the street we are still not guaranteed a space, not alone anywhere near outside our own door. There also seems to be no limit as to how many parking permits can be purchased. This still leaves the problem of too many cars/vans in the street. Why can we not have the permits registered to the house so say the likes of us in our house we have 2 cars but we buy 1 permit so whoever of us is home from work first can park on the road and the other person in our shared drive. We are supposed to be getting our street re-surfaced and the pavements replaced, Is this because if the controlled parking gets the go ahead then the monies gained from this will pay for this, so saving HARROW COUNCIL money! If a large van parks in our street and goes over the marked bay, hanging over our shared driveway, making it impossible to reverse or drive out will they get a ticket. Will council and company vans be barred from parking in the street. when we have visitors it will be a nightmare as many of my relatives are elderly and will put them off visiting us. I am opposed to the controlled parking and feel it will go ahead and probably the surveys and all of our views will not be taken into account as it is already a done deal!</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>With regards to the poor state of repairs to both the carriageway and the footway on Bellamy Drive the concerns of the residents have been reported to the Highways and Asset Management Team to investigate</p>
010225	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>OBJECTION: I live at the opposite end to Belmont Circle and cannot understand why we have been included in the proposed restrictions. We are nowhere near the Circle and if you include our part of Bellamy drive why have you not included Uppingham Avenue and Ventnor Avenue which is closer to Belmont Circle than I am!! I park my car on my drive but why should I have to pay for a permit so that family can park outside of my house when they visit or if I have to get any workmen in the same applies. Why also is it necessary for us to have controlled parking on a Saturday? Why not put pay and display parking in both the car park behind the Assembly Hall and next to the health centre car parking if you are trying to stop parking at Belmont Circle ? Please reconsider your proposals - would you like it in your road?</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010227	BELLAMY DRIVE	<p>I was quite shocked to learn of your plans. The majority of people who park on Bellamy drive park live on the road. And quite a few like me have older children who park there cars on the road. This would add unnecessary costs to us parents who finance them and would have to pay for permits. I am totally against the control zone and believe it is a form of tax. If this is implemented I certainly would not vote for the majority party in the next local elections.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>

010275	BELLAMY DRIVE	I am a resident on Bellamy Drive and I would very much prefer not to have the road become a controlled parking zone. Please accept this email as my opposition to the change.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010276	BELLAMY DRIVE	OBJECTION I haven't seen said leaflet however if it becomes a controlled parking zone do residents, of which I am one, receive free parking? I am a resident at Bellamy Drive, I OBJECT TO A CPZ ON MY STREET.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010278	BELLAMY DRIVE	OBJECTION Because pay enough money to the council. This is an objection to the cpz.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>
010341	BELLAMY DRIVE	I would like to make a formal objection, on behalf of myself and the residents of my home, of the proposed plans for the area, specifically Bellamy Drive. I reside at Bellamy Drive and am greatly concerned with how these plans will affect the residents of our street. I do not understand why any restrictions would need to be put in place on Bellamy Drive at all. There is no double parking issue, there is no issues with accidents and blockages and the only people that park along the street are the residents themselves. I believe that the only result of these restrictions will be that residents will have to park on streets in the surrounding area with the restriction simply causing more problems. Specifically I do not understand why the restriction would be from 08:00am to 06:30pm – this is an excessive time frame that will solely affect the people living on the street. The only times that the street ever gets congested at all is in the evenings during the week when we are all home – therefore your proposed controlled timings are pointless and will only effect people at awkward timings. For example I do not leave my home until 08:30am every day and return at 06:00pm – therefore I will need to move my car	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for residents parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Bellamy Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed not to proceed with the proposed residents parking controls in Bellamy Drive.</p>

		<p>before the 08:00am or simply park on a neighbouring street to avoid the issue. I also understand that these restrictions will include permits for residents but I object to this severely, especially if we will be required to pay for permits to park on our own street (please advise). This is something that is normal in streets neighbouring tube stations where people park for commuting but this is not an issue in our area! To summarise, I object to the restrictions as I do not think they are necessary and I actual believe they will cause more problems than you believe they will solve. I understand that there is an issue around Belmont circle but Bellamy drive does not suffer the same issues and the only people effected will be the residents which is highly inconvenient. Please confirm receipt of this mail and advise what, if any, costs we will be expected to pay for residents permits.</p>	
010337	BELMONT CIRCLE	<p>OBJECTION we received today the BCAPC with drawings, my objections is for lack of business car spaces. You have looked at all options to make Resident permits around the area, however you have failed to show us as business keepers, where do we park or keep our business commercial vehicles, we drive from miles to do our business and our commercial vans which is crucial for our business and keeping our businesses running, but there is no plans, or permit bays to accommodate all shops and their vehicles around the circle! Have you physically walked around the shops and asked shop keepers, or gave them alternatives, or is it just a money machine taxation plan? And attempt to close down local business? I would like to hear your reply to this or declaration that there will be measures taken to protect small business</p>	<p>The proposal was not intended to facilitate business parking. In general terms commercial premises would be expected to provide off-street parking for vehicles connected with their businesses. The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses.</p>
010211	DOBBIN CLOSE	<p>I object to this scheme in the strongest term possible and question the logic and wisdom to this proposed plan. - This plan is about making money for Harrow Council and will affect business in Belmont Circle and the local community. - It will also then push more traffic into unaffected roads like Grasmere Gardens, Kenton Lane and Locket road. - This will pave the way for Harrow Council to create more permit zones. - The proposal does not mention about the two car parks in Belmont if they are set to become pay and display as currently they are free to park which helps plenty of local businesses. - With regards to Dobbin Close my objections for more permit holder parking. What can I say I have lived on this street for 30 years and not really had a problem with parking even at school peak times. The parking issues arose when Harrow Council in their wisdom decided to introduce permit parking in the three main car parks on Dobbin Close which are designated for the three flats only. I have always believed this to be an</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report and the low level of response to the consultations undertaken it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce residents parking controls in Dobbin Close be abandoned.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that the existing school keep clear markings be revised in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions and no waiting "At any time" restrictions be introduced at the southern end of Dobbin Close (turning head) to remove obstructive parking and facilitate safe turning movement.</p>

irresponsible and divisive idea which has brought much unnecessary tension to the residents of Dobbin Close. It has pitted the people who live in houses up against those who live in the flats. Those who live in the flats are still aloud to park outside of those three car parks taking up much needed space for the rest of the residents on the street in Dobbin Close. The irony being that this idea has never actually resolved the problem and in fact has made matters far worse. The school parents still park in all three car parks regardless of it being permit holders. On top of that when I look outside the car park next to number 36 it has eleven parking bays but only two cars ever parked in it at any one time even on the weekends and busy times. If you look at the car park opposite number 36 it is the same one or two cars parked in it. It leaves me dumb founded that all these car parks are near empty with ample space for all the residents however Harrow Council seem to be delusional that creating more permit holder bays on the main street on Dobbin Close will solve the parking issues because it won't. I also hold Harrow Council responsible for creating more anti social and criminal behaviour on the street. Due to those car parks now being completely empty even at nights we have had people use them to deal drugs in and also on a few occasions couples parking up to have sex. I have had to report these issues to the Police and also told them since the car parks have been hardly used they are not busy and are now attracting the wrong sort of people to the street. I always believed that Harrow Councils aim should be to bring harmony and cohesion to the street not create divisions and a breeding ground for criminal behaviour.

- The proposed "No Waiting at Anytime" I object to this from number 36 all the way to the end of the street is not required or necessary as the street has managed without any issues. In 30 years I have only had my driveway blocked once and I hardly believe that is reason to paint even more lines on such a small road anyway. Also the end of Dobbin Close has never been used for turning it has always been used for parking. I have never seen anyone struggle to turn on this street and that includes Lorries and emergency vehicles.
- The "Proposed Restriction as per Zone Time" on Dobbin Close which is currently 8.30am to 9.30am and 3pm to 4.30pm. I object this to be increased to Mon-Sat 8am to 6.30pm as unnecessary and excessive. Plus this will create issues for people visiting Dobbin Close who will struggle to park and then will have to park in nearby roads like Kenton Lane and Mountbell Road. All this will do is shift the problem to the surrounding streets which will then get busy and Harrow Council will have a brainwave

		<p>to put up even more permit zones in other streets. My suggestions and the best way forward to meet the needs of Dobbin Close for present and the future are as follows: If the whole street is to become a controlled zone and a permit holder area is to be introduced on the street. Then Harrow Council must respect and acknowledge the rights of all the residents on the street and put them on equal footing. So if the whole road was to become permit holders then every single resident on the street regardless if living in a flat or house should be entitled to park anywhere on the street including the three main car parks. As the original issue were people from other streets parking on Dobbin Close. By doing this we will be maximising all available space on the street to benefit the residents of Dobbin Close. This will also stop people from Dobbin Close parking on other streets which is not solving the problem but just moving it along into the next street. It will also keep those car parks in use and help move along the criminal elements. This is the best and most logical way forward and if this was the case then I would not have an objection to "No Waiting" and "Parking Times" as the residents would have ample space to park. I have faith that Harrow Council can work with me and once again restore harmony to this street.</p>	
010224	DOBBIN CLOSE	<p>OBJECTION I would like to object for the following important reasons: It will make resident even more difficult than it is at present. There are several car parks which are usually either empty or mostly empty which we cannot use. Residents should be given free passes to use these spaces when they are free. We are a 4 car adult family who all need our cars for work and struggle to park in the Close already. Friends often come to visit and have to leave because there is no parking for guests either. The parking should be restricted between 8 and 9.30am and in the afternoon and between 3 and 3.45pm. This would ensure that local parents would leave their cars at home when taking and picking up their children from the school. The school parking is the only time that people park in the close who should not really be there. I do not wish to be told that I cannot park across the kerb outside my own driveway.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report and the low level of response to the consultations undertaken it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce residents parking controls in Dobbin Close be abandoned.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that the existing school keep clear markings be revised in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions and no waiting "At any time" restrictions be introduced at the southern end of Dobbin Close (turning head) to remove obstructive parking and facilitate safe turning movement.</p>
010212	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I would like my objection to the proposed Parking restrictions in the Belmont Circle area noted. There are a few reasons why I feel this would have a negative affect on not only the residents but also the businesses in the area. 1: By restricting the parking in Elgin Avenue for houses upwards of number 60 this will have a negative affect on the rest of the street / surrounding area as drivers will try to find any parking where there are no restrictions. 2: The only</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p>

		<p>problem that has been highlighted in this area is the junction with Kenmore Avenue which can be remedied with double yellow lines. 3: There will be an increase in cars parked over residents drive ways as drivers seek to find a parking space that will not cost them money. 4: The shops at Belmont Circle rely on passing trade which will be greatly reduced if there are no free parking spaces available. 5: Most of the residents I have spoken to feel this is an excuse to generate revenue in either parking fines or charges. Why charge residents (Council tax payers) and their visitors to park.</p>	<p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010213	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I am writing to lodge an official objection to the Belmont Circle area parking consultation. I don't believe the only viable option is to issue a controlled parking zone operating all week apart from the evening. I am not in the zone but the surplus parking will flood outside mine and my neighbours house. The people in the controlled zones will begin parking outside our homes, reluctant to buy permits which are forced upon them. Forcing people to buy permits to park outside their homes after they pay taxes for their roads is ludicrous. The council should provide permits for households regardless of how many cars they own. Shoppers and workers will continue to park further down the road and walk the extra 1 minute to Belmont Circle. This change is causing bitterness, if Belmont circle had improved parking and car parks that were efficiently used none of this would be a problem.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010214	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>Objection to Belmont Circle Area Parking Review - We are writing to object to the proposal to introduce resident permit bays to the north end of Elgin Avenue, from Kenmore Avenue to numbers 60 and 63. The proposal was introduced because a small number of residents from the north end of Elgin Avenue (11 out of 17 replies we believe) complained about the number of vehicles parking there to visit Belmont Circle. In fact of the 27% of Elgin Avenue residents who replied only 5 supported Controlled Parking Zones and 15 voted in favour of doing nothing. However the introduction of Resident Permit Bays as proposed by the Council would simply push the problem further down the road. Not only would there be the vehicles visiting Belmont Circle, there would also be vehicles belonging to residents of the north end of Elgin Avenue who did not wish to buy residents parking permits for the full number of cars that they owned. In fact under the Residents Parking Permit scheme residents with permits are still not guaranteed a parking place. The Council recognises that this would happen as it gave exactly that reason for proposing the introduction of resident</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>

		<p>permit bays in Kenmore Avenue (from Belmont Circle to numbers 236 and 279 Kenmore Avenue, even though they did not complain about parking problems there. We suggest that the proposal to introduce resident parking permit bays in Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue be abandoned and people are allowed to park where they wish. Finally we strongly agree with the proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the north corner bend of Elgin Avenue and at all junctions. This is long overdue from a safety point of view. I am copying this email to Bob Blackman MP, Councillors Kantilal Rabadia and Vina Mithani as this issue came up when they were canvassing for the recent Council elections and they strongly recommended that we make our views known to the council as they had received similar feedback from our neighbours.</p>	
010215	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>We strongly object to the proposed CPZ in the Belmont Circle Area. The reasons we are opposing are stated below: 1 Our property will decrease in value compare to our neighbours who live few doors away from us. 2 We have to pay for permit when our neighbours will get to park free in their front door and yet we pay same taxes and live on the same road! 3 Our social life will be affected as we can not invite friends and family due to lack of parking as we can not afford to buy permit for the guests. 4 We lived on the road for nearly 3 years and never had problem with parking, witnessed any disputes or arguments about parking. Some of my elderly neighbours lived here for 30 or more years and they says the same! If we have a broader look it still does not make sense at all or feel need for all this parking restrictions. I work at Belmont Tesco for last 10 years and can see that all the shops and small businesses will suffer terribly! At Tesco's so many customers come shopping and spend considerable time around the shops and cafes. Businesses do well because of this which is so convenient for the residents around the area. By bringing CPZ restrictions Harrow Council sees the way of making extra income which will not long last as very few residents who do not have driveways and people will avoid coming to the Belmont Circle if they have to dig out extra for parking. In conclusion we would say by bringing CPZ to Belmont Circle Area Harrow Council will create problems when there aren't any! All existing restrictions are adequate and council will save lot of money and local businesses by ditching the idea of creating CPZ in the area. We would also appreciate a feed back regarding the response and objections breakdown.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010216	ELGIN	<p>I am submitting the attached pdf file subject heading 'ref DP 2014-</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the</p>

	AVENUE	06, Objection and Counter Proposals.' I also want you to know that I am seeking signatures from every resident on Elgin Avenue in support of either my Counter Proposal One or Counter Proposal as listed in the attached document. I intend collect and submit these signatures by 17 September 2014.	<p>statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010217	ELGIN AVENUE	One question for clarification..... As someone who lives at the address below with anticipated resident parking bays in the road, will there be a charge to residents using a parking bay, and if so, how much? How will this actually work? I look forward to hearing.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010218	ELGIN AVENUE	OBJECTION Please note my strong objection for Controlled parking Zone in Elgin Ave. I together with other residents of Elgin Ave have signed a petition, managed by Mr Matthew Irvine objection to Controlled parking zone in Elgin Ave. Comments In case, Harrow Council ignores residents plea for rejection of CPZ It is legal requirement that a free and fair REVERSING AND ENTRY access is given to a driveway. Harrow Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure that drive of 72 Elgin AVE IS NOT BLOCKED BY any vehicle parked on opposite side of the drive, so as to make reversing or entry, of the car on to road, or drive is impossible or difficult. Normally a driveway has another driveway on exactly opposite side of the road. In case of my drive- way, there is no driveway on the opposite side. Therefore, it is very difficult, or impossible, for me to reverse the car, due to the	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency</p>

		<p>obstructing vehicle. Sometimes, if a lorry or van is parked, I am unable to reverse, as there is no reversing space as three quarters of my reversing area is blocked by other parked vehicle exactly opposite my drive. There is a simple solution, which is a win win for everyone. Parking bays, will be painted, when controlled parking zones are introduced. The graphic, attached is self explanatory and happy to elaborate, should there be a need. Please find attached a pdf document, which, if implemented, may help me and definitely is not a policy issue, budgetary issue, nor resources intensive for Council.</p>	<p>vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010228	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>We object to the proposal to introduce resident permit bays to the north end of Elgin Avenue, from Kenmore Avenue to numbers 60 and 63. The proposal was introduced because a small number of residents from the north end of Elgin Avenue (11 out of 17 replies we believe) complained about the number of vehicles parking there to visit Belmont Circle. In fact of the 27% of Elgin Avenue residents who replied only 5 supported Controlled Parking Zones and 15 voted in favour of doing nothing. CPZ would simply push the problem further down the road. Not only would there be the vehicles visiting Belmont Circle, there would also be vehicles belonging to residents of the north end of Elgin Avenue who did not wish to buy residents parking permits for the full number of cars that they owned. There would not be enough room for 2 parking bays between drives. However, this is something that residents manage to deal with themselves at present, allowing 2 cars to park between drives. Again, the CPZ would therefore cause more parking problems. Introducing a CPZ would have a detrimental effect on local shops and businesses. The knock-on effect if shops are forced to close, would be that we would have to drive to shops instead of walking, as we do now. Residents with permits are still not guaranteed a parking place. The Council recognises that this would happen as it gave exactly that reason for proposing the introduction of resident permit bays in Kenmore Avenue (from Belmont Circle to numbers 236 and 279 Kenmore Avenue, even though residents did not complain about parking problems there. We suggest that the proposal to introduce resident parking permit bays in Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue be abandoned. Finally we strongly agree with the proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the north corner bend of Elgin Avenue and at all junctions. This is long overdue from a safety point of view.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010229	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I strongly object to the proposed restrictions in Elgin Avenue, some who visit their elderly parents to help out with various</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident</p>

		<p>chores, you will be taking away the community well being of the residents. Our shared drives are not wide enough to park cars between the houses. A few years ago the residents got together and made a proposal for double yellow lines on the bend. This would allow traffic to pull in safely to avoid on coming vehicles. This is a dangerous corner and it is the only parking restriction required in this road. DO NOT TAKE AWAY OUR RIGHT TO HAVE OUR FAMILIES VISIT!</p>	<p>parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010230	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed CPS for the stretch of Elgin Avenue which runs from the bend adjacent to 115 Elgin Avenue to 60 & 63 Elgin Avenue. This would incur unnecessary expense to address a problem that does not currently exist and would create another problem further down the road I strongly support the proposal for double yellow lines to be introduced on Elgin Avenue at the bend adjacent to 115 Elgin Avenue</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010231	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I wish to object to the intention to impose resident permit bays. I believe this will affect the property prices in the area as it could deter any buyer due to the expensive cost of a resident permit bay. It will also affect any visitors to these properties Monday - Fridays between 8am and 6.30pm. The businesses around Belmont circle will suffer due to parking restrictions and would generally be detrimental for the area of Belmont. I do agree with maybe double yellows on the corner of the roads as the parking at present can be a hazzard for traffic where cars are parked on bends and corners.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>

010232	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>We would like to oppose the proposed Controlled Parking Zone on Elgin avenue, harrow (Between 60-63 to end of Elgin Avenue joining Kenmore Avenue) due to: 1) We have never experienced any parking issues during the daytime or evening. 2) A CPZ would be detrimental to the property prices on Elgin Avenue. 3) It would be inconvenience to friends and family. 4) It would make it hard for tradesmen to visit homes i.e. Builders/Plumbers/Alarm servicing, if they know that they would have to pay for parking on the road, and the cost are likely to be passed onto the householders. 5) The CPZ will displace parked cars onto the other side of Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue which are outside the CPZ and will only worsen the parking situation, it will cause tension between residents of Elgin Avenue. 6) There would be loss to local businesses as the amount of passing trade could drop with the introduction of a CPz. 7.) We already pay one of the highest Council Tax in the London Boroughs. There would be further financial loss to householders who would have to pay permits, for their cars as well as visitors which is a disgrace. Why should homeowners have to pay for parking on their own road, to prevent the so called 'Parking Problems' which we feel do not exist.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010233	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>We would like to oppose the proposed Controlled Parking Zone on Elgin avenue, harrow (Between 60-63 to end of Elgin Avenue joining Kenmore Avenue) due to: 1) We have never experienced any parking issues during the daytime or evening. 2) A CPZ would be detrimental to the property prices on Elgin Avenue. 3) It would be inconvenience to friends and family. 4) It would make it hard for tradesmen to visit homes i.e. Builders/Plumbers/Alarm servicing, if they know that they would have to pay for parking on the road, and the cost are likely to be passed onto the householders. 5) The CPZ will displace parked cars onto the other side of Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue which are outside the CPZ and will only worsen the parking situation, it will cause tension between residents of Elgin Avenue. 6) There would be loss to local businesses as the amount of passing trade could drop with the introduction of a CPz. 7.) We already pay one of the highest Council Tax in the London Boroughs. There would be further financial loss to householders who would have to pay permits, for their cars as well as visitors which is a disgrace. Why should homeowners have to pay for parking on their own road, to prevent the so called 'Parking Problems' which we feel do not exist.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010234	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>We would like to oppose the proposed Controlled Parking Zone on Elgin Avenue, Harrow (Between No. 60-63 to end of Elgin Avenue joining Kenmore Avenue) due to many factors: 1) Firstly as</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the</p>

		<p>residents of Elgin Avenue on the side closest to Belmont Circle we have never experienced any parking issues during the daytime or evening. 2) We believe that having the CPZ would be detrimental to the property prices on Elgin Avenue. 3) It would be great inconvenience to friends and family who may be visiting our house for gatherings and functions. 4) It would also make it harder for tradesmen to visit homes ie. Builders/Plumbers/Alarm servicing, if they know that they would have to pay for parking on the road, and the costs are likely to be passed onto the householders. 5) Introduction of a CPZ will only cause an overflow of cars parked on the other side of Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue which will not be part of the CPZ and will only worsen the parking situation, not to mention it will cause tension between residents of Elgin Avenue. 6) There would be a considerable amount of loss to local businesses as the amount of passing trade could drop with the introduction of a CPZ. 7) We already pay one of the highest Council Tax in the London boroughs. There would be further financial loss to householders who would have to pay for permits, for their cars as well as visitors which is a disgrace. Why should homeowners have to pay for parking on their own road, to prevent the so called "Parking Problems which we feel do not exist.</p>	<p>two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010339	ELGIN AVENUE	<p>I am writing to object most vociferously to the proposals for CPZ on Elgin Avenue where I live & Belmont Circle & surrounding areas. Your proposals are completely unnecessary & will create a new parking problem & congestion. . On Elgin Avenue there is no congestion problem during the day and enough car parking for residents day & night . However the proposed restrictions will reduce space & create a parking shortage & therefore a big problem & stress for residents. Furthermore any restrictions in surrounding areas especially on Belmont Circle would create problems & congestion in the surrounding roads including Elgin Avenue. . All that is needed is a little more free parking to be created on Belmont circle to enable the businesses there (which we all appreciate) to survive..Some will not survive if the parking restrictions go ahead. I hope the money ear- marked for this scheme can be used for parking improvement instead of creating misery & expense for residents. Speaking to my neighbours & fellow residents ,most of us feel the same & feel the consultation has been rushed & pushed ahead too quickly. Many of us on Elgin Ave are very unhappy that planning permission seemed to be granted for the site opposite Tesco on Kenton Lane despite so many of us protesting in writing because the proposed high building would directly affect our properties. .. This site could be</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the statutory consultation there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue. This was also reinforced by the two petitions received from the residents of Elgin Avenue who strongly objected to the CPZ. The petitioners, however, also strongly supported the double yellow lines at the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines be introduced either side of the bend adjacent to 115, Elgin Avenue and its junction with Kenmore Avenue to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>

		used for parking for the community.	
010241	KENMORE AVENUE	I do think that there will be lots of problems with parking in the Belmont area, and mostly it will all come down to all the large vans that park, They are an eye sore out side your house they stop the light and the vans just stay there 24 hours a day, you then have problems getting out of your drive way as you just can't see if any thing is coming, and again the traffic lust wont let you out as 90% are travailing at well over 30 m p h and half of those are vans and lorries who don't give a dam. I know that there will be winners and losers but this is something that will affect the whole area. What ever you do will not be good for everyone as all you are doing is moving the problem to some one ells. Could there be more use of cameras to target parking round the circle at the top of Kenmore Avenue, it all so could help with the fly tipping. Have resident parking only Monday to Sunday and not just 100 yards from Belmont Circle as that will cause problems down the roads, it wants to be more like a mile and stop all vans from parking, It would be a big help if it was a van free parking area and stop vans from all side roads Kenmore Avenue is now a cut through to Miss Kenton lane, like council dust carts and large vans there are private coaches and large delivery vans, And with the parking as it is now, there is a problem with two small cars passing each other, and with all the large 4x4 it becomes a single lane only.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue. In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.
010242	KENMORE AVENUE	I am objecting to the proposal of the Belmont Circle parking zone on Kenmore Ave. Your proposed controlled zone from Belmont Circle up to No. 236 and 279 Kenmore Ave is an area mainly rented by eastern Europeans, who all work in building industry. Each house has aprox 3 vans/lorries which causes traffic congestion in the evening making the residential street look like a building site. By your proposal this will only move the unsightly parking problem of lorries and vans further down Kenmore Ave, and I for one object to having a lorry / large van parked outside my property blocking my sunlight and view. This will cause disputes between property owners and van and lorry owners. These drivers have no concerns for property owners in this street. If your going to make it a controlled zone then do it for the whole street or not at all, don't just move the problem further down the road, otherwise be prepared to deal with the disputes that will arise from your badly thought out plan.	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue. In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.
010243	KENMORE AVENUE	We object to your proposal of Parking Restrictions to the Belmont Circle Area. My family and I have been residents of Kenmore Avenue since 2004 and we have never experienced any issues with parking in the area. The current parking measures in place	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.

		are more than adequate for the area. Furthermore your plans for parking around our area will have a detrimental effect on the house prices in the area and the businesses surrounding. Belmont Circle is fine as it is and we do not want any of these changes implemented. We also certainly object that the parking restrictions should extend all the way to 236 Kenmore Avenue - it is enough to extend down Kenmore Avenue upto the corner of Elgin Avenue (as is currently). We most certainly do not agree with the introduction of parking permits, especially the one being proposed to be put right outside our house. We believe this to be just another way for the council to raise money. It's an absolutely ludicrous idea because we have three cars in our household and to have permit bays will only make matters worse.	In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.
010244	KENMORE AVENUE	We object to your proposal of Parking Restrictions to the Belmont Circle Area. We have lived at Kenmore Avenue since 1990 and never had any issues regarding parking in the area. The current parking measures in place are more than adequate for the area. Your proposals will only make matters worse as it will ruin the business community just as new businesses are starting up and bring the life to the area. We certainly do not agree with the introduction parking permits and believe this to be just another council way of raising money. It will also have a negative effect on the house prices in the area and to the businesses. We certainly object that the parking restrictions should extend all the way to 238 Kenmore Avenue - it is enough to extend down Kenmore Avenue upto the corner of Elgin Avenue (as is currently).	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce a CPZ in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned. However, it is recommended that double yellow lines together with peak hour loading restrictions be introduced at the northern end of Kenmore Avenue between Elgin Avenue and Belmont Circle roundabout to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010245	KENMORE AVENUE	OBJECTION Reason: Overflow parking during these times will back up in front of our property and beyond. I have read the proposals and wish to object. During these times the overflow of the people not willing to park in these areas will increase the parking in front of other residents properties to include ours. There are already fast moving cars along this road (yes over the humps) and having to walk quite a way to our property with young children could cause even more of a danger including having to cross the road to find a space. I understand about that there will be permits for other residents etc but we will have no control over who parks in front of our residence! My proposal is to consider the time limitations and adjust accordingly as like taken up by Brent on road "The Highlands" where restrictions are between 10-11am and 2-3pm therefore people cannot park for the whole day, yet still	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses.</p>

		allows for some leeway for residents and visitors. As a suggestion perhaps no parking between certain hours for a longer period of time eg 8-11am and 3-6pm allowing those people who wish to visit the area to do so. This has worked quite well in other areas rather than a longer period of 8-6.30pm. For the residents that live in the permit area, i'm sure that this will be more of a compromise and will allow for their visitors to visit at reasonable times too. Other councils that have adopted the idea is Ealing, more. I have also seen that you have already implemented it in other areas such as Stanmore, and Dennis Gardens. We don't have nearly as much footfall as these places and you have implemented it here.	
010246	KENMORE AVENUE	OBJECTION The reason for my objection is that I do not own a car which I would have told you if asked. The car seen parked in Kenmore Avenue between 8am to 6pm belong to people working in the parade of shops or people living in the flats.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p>
010247	KENMORE AVENUE	I'd like to express my objection to the introduction of the Controlled Parking Zone in the Belmont Circle area. I am concerned about how this decision will affect the businesses in the Belmont Circle area. I have been talking to some of the neighbours and we feel that it can only be a negative impact on businesses as they will lose passing trade on the basis that: - 1. The two free car parks are already full even with no CPZ. 2. Non Residents will take their business elsewhere due to the inconvenience of parking and the added expense of parking meters. I fear that the quality of the businesses and shops will deteriorate due to loss of trade and the added economic difficulties resulting in the loss of the current unique character which Belmont Circle possesses. Secondly, the proposed parking bays are to be terminated outside my home. This would mean that I may now be subjected to parking displacement, moving this "parking problem" at the beginning of Kenmore Avenue, to the area directly outside my home. Even if the parking bays terminated slightly closer to the start of Kenmore Avenue, I believe I would still be susceptible to the displacement. The material impact to my household would be increased expenses to park our own vehicles outside our own houses. We already pay for the privilege of having additional motor vehicles in the form of taxes so it is unfair that now we have to potentially buy parking permits. Over and above this, I will have to pay for my visitors to be able to park. I for one shy away from visiting friends	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that double yellow lines together with peak hour loading restrictions be introduced at the northern end of Kenmore Avenue between Elgin Avenue and Belmont Circle roundabout to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p> <p>The proposed pay and display parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses.</p>

		<p>and family who are unfortunate to be in a much needed CPZ; I would hate to think that due to the Belmont Circle CPZ, my visitors would also show reluctance. For your information, I am fully aware of the permit pricing and visitor parking books to be able to conclude the impact it would have on my household. I truly do not think there is parking problem in the Belmont circle area. I am sure nearly all houses on Kenmore Avenue have driveways so I fail to see what parking situations maybe effecting those apparently in favour of the CPZ. Adding to this, the restrictions imposed by the borough/council regarding front gardens, its increasingly impossible to park more the one car into the front drive. Having a shared drive complicates the matter also. In short, I do not have a parking problem right now hence I do not want a financial burdon forced upon me for a problem that I am not effected by. People directly affected by this parking problem should adapt to the situation and balance the benefit of themselves being so close to the wonderful amenities that Belmont Circle offers against the few parking problems that they may be facing.</p>	
010248	KENMORE AVENUE	<p>I fully support the plans laid out in the Belmont Circle Area Parking Review and look forward to this being implemented. We are constantly frustrated by never getting a parking space outside out property. Quite often it is builders Vans left over the weekend or people who badly park over the drive making it difficult to get cars on or off our driveway, or cars parking taking up 2 spaces making it impossible for anyone else to park. The other problem we find is cars park at the top of the road leading on to Belmont circle at the ramp making it difficult to turn into Kenmore avenue and there is normally always a commotion outside. The only one concern we have if we were to get a residents parking permit this would need to be planned out carefully as one of our cars is a company car that gets changed every 3-6 months so would make putting a permit on this car difficult. I am more than happy to provide any other feedback if necessary.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that double yellow lines together with peak hour loading restrictions be introduced at the northern end of Kenmore Avenue between Elgin Avenue and Belmont Circle roundabout to remove obstructive parking, improve sightline and vehicular access especially for larger vehicles and emergency vehicles where response times are critical.</p>
010249	KENMORE AVENUE	<p>We are writing to object to the parking restrictions you are planning on introducing in our area. We object due to the following reasons: 1) It will cost us money and restrict our guests from easily accessing our house. It will cause unnecessary admin for everyone. We get a lot of guests and so we don't want them worrying each time they come round about being clamped or getting a ticket! 2) Also, we own 3 vehicles in our household and only have one parking space, therefore, the other 2 vehicles will need to be on the road, again, hassle for getting a permit/ pay and display ticket etc...and not to mention the money we have to fork</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p>

		<p>out! We manage fine at the moment and there is always parking spaces in our vicinity. Therefore, besides us feeling that the council will be doing this for money making purposes, we can't find any other reason, as it won't make things better. It will be a huge inconvenience to us all year round, just because you're worried about every now and again, people use the free parking facilities to nip to the shops and back again for 5 mins. It is not worth ruining the friendly neighbourhood with these unnecessary parking restrictions! We strongly don't want the parking restrictions to apply.</p>	
010250	KENMORE AVENUE	<p>Please find the attached document as my formal written statutory of objection. I am a resident of Kenmore Avenue. If you cannot access the attachment I have copied and pasted it below. My details are on the word documents. Please bare in mind the interest of the residents not the council for making money! To whom it may concern, I am writing to you in regards to the public consultation for parking in the area of Belmont Circle. I believe there will be a controlled parking zone on Kenmore Avenue and a few other streets, and Belmont circle itself. I write to you to put my objection forward. Myself and my family have been living on Kenmore Avenue for many years, where we have no problems what so ever parking, so we fail to understand the reason for why there needs to be a controlled parking zone put in to practise. There are no difficulties with parking on the road, and it never gets too busy so it would be useless to use the council's money on implementing a parking area. I am currently not affected but if these parking restrictions were to be implemented it would affect our household severely. I would not be able to park my car on my road and any road near Belmont circle for free, especially on my road or outside my house when I live there, it is ridiculous. I will then need to pay for a residence permit which shouldn't even be applicable because it is using resident's money to make money when such a parking restriction does not even need to be implemented. I will then find it difficult to park on the road due to the parking restrictions and will have to look elsewhere to park even though I live on Kenmore Avenue, it is extremely unfair. I would like the council to rethink their decision on this as it is unfair for residents. First of all it is there road and to be asked to pay to park on their road is unacceptable, it is simply a way of the council of making money. Secondly there will also be a problem to find free parking on Kenmore Avenue as the restriction is only for a few residents on Kenmore Avenue, this is not ethical. Thirdly if there is no problem with parking and we have no such issue with it, why</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue.</p> <p>In view of the responses received it is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce resident parking controls in Kenmore Avenue be abandoned.</p>

		would you want to go and implement such a restriction? Please do not implement this it is not good for the residents.	
010251	KENTON LANE	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of a controlled parking zone in the Belmont Circle area. As a local business trader I am aware of the current parking issues affecting both businesses and residents and the need for change but object to the proposed scheme for a number of reasons as I feel they do not address the full issue. My primary concerns areas follows. Firstly the scheme does not allow for an overall increase in car parking spaces. A frequent complaint of our customers is the lack of available parking spaces and that the car parks are not big enough. The two car parks are always full, in the Belmont Circle car park a majority of spaces being used by Health Centre staff and patients and by residents who live above the shops around the circle. It would be ideal if the car park were later extended down towards Parnell Way and a pedestrian entrance incorporated. Secondly I also object to the proposed shared use bays at the front of the shops nos. 17 -27. Not to the bays but to the terms of usage. I feel strongly the bays should be exclusively pay and display and not shared usage. The residents will be well catered for by the parking zones in the surrounding areas and the availability of regular parking spaces for customers of all businesses may go some way to alleviating the issues highlighted above. It would also allow for a greater use by trade customers with larger vans that are unable to access the car parks because of height restrictions. In addition I am opposed to the extent of the time the parking zone will be cover. The proposed time frame of 8.00am – 6.30 pm is too restrictive in its terms. A restriction to park in a residents area only between 9.30 to 4 pm say, would I feel be more agreeable to all parties. As a trader whose business has traded for over forty years in Belmont Circle I am concerned that in general the proposed changes will have a negative impact on our business. We are already experiencing the twin pressures of rising costs and internet use for home shopping. We are reliant on customers travelling to us for our goods, services and knowledge and without the ability to park customers will drive by leading to a loss of custom. I am concerned that this additional pressure on us and other shops would see us unable to maintain our businesses and be forced to close. This in turn would lead to a degeneration of the area with the associated problems already well documented and so often seen in other parts of the borough.</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010252	KENTON	I want to object to the plans to introduce CPZ's in my local area. I	As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the

	LANE	believe the inconvenience in finding parking or navigating through traffic at peak times is relatively minor and tolerable. I am concerned the plans will affect local businesses and the community as customers choose other areas with more convenient parking arrangements. The plans may cause overspill prompting extension of the zone in the future. I do not always get to park directly outside my home, but the distance is always not too far to walk with shopping. I do not ever want to have to pay to park my car near my home. Please do not impose this on the area.	<p>consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010253	KENTON LANE	We at Russell Black Ltd of 399 Kenton Lane place our FORMAL OBJECTION to the proposed plans for Belmont Circle Area Parking. This plan will materially affect the already poor facilities in Belmont Circle. It will keep shoppers away from the area due to POOR access and we and all the traders of Belmont Circle will loose business and passing trade.	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010254	KENTON LANE	As both a local business owner and a local resident I object to the Belmont circle area parking review. At present we are experiencing a lower than normal level of trade and the above proposals will only add to the issues. We have disabled customers that will no longer be a able to park alongside the shop and will be forced to take their cleaning elsewhere. We will no longer be able to park on Kenmore avenue on Sundays near to the shops and I will longer be able a to park after 18:30 to load my vehicle to carry out	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay</p>

		<p>my deliveries All this will lead to me struggling to keep my shop open. The introduction of resident permits will mean my customers will no longer be able to park in nearest location to my shop again forcing them to take their business elsewhere. At present we attract customers that drive through the area, this will no longer be attractive to them as they won't be able to park. I am sure that harrow council has the best intentions in supporting their local businesses so I urge you to rethink the above proposal</p>	<p>parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>It is also proposed to introduce measures to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines and to regulate loading at the northern end of Kenmore Avenue between Elgin Avenue and Belmont Circle roundabout (see paragraph 2.30). Loading can take place outside the controlled hours and disabled people with valid blue badges can park on Kenmore Avenue (north western side) on the proposed double yellow lines for up to 3 hours provided they do not cause an obstruction (except where there is a ban on loading or unloading or other restrictions).</p>
010343	KENTON LANE	<p>We would like to strongly OBJECT to the Belmont Circle Parking Review. As a business owner for 8 years and a resident for over 30 years living within the area, Belmont Circle has always struggled with lack of trade and footfall within the circle. Retailers and businesses here have always found it difficult to survive with the lack of trade, retail competition from the high streets and insufficient amount of consumers. Recent new corporate businesses (Costa coffee) have opened in the parade and this has certainly helped in getting customers to the area. Unfortunately with the already reduced parking spaces we have along the roads, as well as a free car park (which is not sign posted clearly) and is full with commuter cars parked all day with no restrictions that apply. This review is detrimental to the future of small business owners of Belmont Circle. We agree that there is a lack of parking in Belmont Circle but by introducing residents' permit holders only (which is only to the benefit of a handful of residents) and controlled parking (only in selected part6 on the circle) and "at any time" restrictions will stop passers-by from even bothering to stop in the area altogether. Many of the local residents who do drive to the circle and do their regular shopping in the local Tesco and other shops, they are more like to go the a bigger branch and not have to pay or risk a penalty fine in case they overstay. Listening to what our customers have commented regarding the parking - They have</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>

		<p>strongly suggested that, if they had to pay or not be able to get parking conveniently in the area, they would not be able to support my business and would be forced to shop elsewhere in multiple outlets where parking would be more readily available as they can get all their shopping there. Please please reconsider your proposal and review and leave Belmont Circle alone and not do anything regarding controlled parking or permit holders. We do not have any commuter travel facilities or any such transport route like other areas where controlled parking is required and we are only able to generate a small amount of trade so please do not impose this and force businesses to have to close.</p>	
010395	KENTON LANE	<p>OBJECTION - I am writing to you today in regards to the Belmont Circle Area Parking Review. Eeing the owner of Belmont Superstore, I can inform you of the lack of business we have experienced recently and how this will only make it worse. This new proposal will make it incredibly difficult to run a business. Many of our customers have already expressed their concerns and are unhappy about the idea of being forced to shop elsewhere. Having a business in Belmont Circle is already very difficult due to the lack of exposure so we rely heavily on our regular customers and word of mouth. This is the reason why I highly object to introducing residents permit holder only as this is will only benefit the council rather than being beneficial for the residents. This in return will have a detrimental effect on the small businesses in Belmont Circle. The controlled parking will discourage customers from shopping at our business due to inconvenience- Therefore this will stop customers from shopping with us all together. Another reason being that we don't have a train station nearby so there isn't an issue of commuters, the facility is simply used by customers who spend no longer than 10-15 minutes doing their shopping. Nor we do have any big banks or a shopping centre that requires customers to leave their vehicle for any longer than 1G 15 minutes. These customers have now been shopping with us for years and as a business owner it is my responsibility to keep them happy. So I would strongly suggest that you reconsider your proposal as this will lead to small businesses closing and make it incredibly difficult for our customers to shop</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010698	Kenton Lane (Belmont Health Centre)	<p>We have discussed this and would like to state that we do not have any issues as long as the entrance road to surgery parking is not restricted. But overall we our concern with the limited parking restrictions in the outskirts since this could effect our doctors when the visit home visits to see patients. You mentioned about the</p>	<p>As outlined in the TARSAP report of those that responded to the consultations there was no majority support for parking controls in Kenton Lane (including Station Parade and Warwick Parade). Those that responded in writing stated that the proposed measures would have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p>

		<p>parking permits for doctors (Health Emergency Badges) when the do home visits but I please note that the body which issue these badges (London Councils) restrict the numbers issued to a GP practice. We have 07 doctors and were given only 03 Health Emergency Badges. Hope you could look in to this if you are progressing with this new plan.</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ROADS OUTSIDE THE PROPOSED PARKING ZONE

010210	BEVERLEY GARDENS	<p>The proposals do not take sufficient account of the effect of the proposed restrictions on adjoining roads such as Beverley Gardens which have not been included within the scheme There are already parking problems and congested traffic in Beverley Gardens particularly at peak school times due to St Joseph's school and nursery, the NHS Kenton Lane clinic and increasing commerce in and around Belmont Circle I note limited waiting time restrictions at the entrance to Beverley Gardens and the junction with Felbridge Avenue are proposed However without parking control in Beverley Gardens from the Kenton Lane end until at least the junction of Beverley Gardens with Hermitage Way, the controlled parking within the proposals will merely shift parking into Beverley Gardens and overload parking and traffic within Beverley Gardens, particularly at peak school times</p>	<p>The results of the public consultation in Beverley Gardens did not indicate support for parking controls and hence was not included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The double yellow lines proposed at the junctions, bends, turning heads and road narrowing's for safety reasons are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads in accordance with the Highway Code. This will make access easier for larger vehicles and emergency services where response times are critical.</p>
010221	CROWSHOTT AVENUE	<p>OBJECTION: we object to the proposed 'no waiting at anytime' restrictions for the junctions of Crowshott Avenue and Kynance Gardens and Crowshott Avenue and Braithwaite Gardens. We believe that such restrictions are unnecessary as there are currently no problems in this location. restrictions could encourage parking that obstructs or partially obstructs driveways of the properties in between the proposed restrictive zones - those of Nos 82, 80, 78 and 76 Crowshott Avenue. This would reduce visibility for residents driving from and into their property. We therefore register our objections most strongly against this proposal.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines proposed at the junctions, bends, turning heads and road narrowing's for safety reasons are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads especially for larger vehicles and emergency services where response times are critical in accordance with the Highway Code.</p>

010235	FELBRIDGE AVENUE	<p>We write to formally object to the proposals the current parking proposals. The reason for the objection is as follows: Introducing the Pay and Display Bays on Belmont Circle and outside Tescos will have a detrimental effect to the area. With competing shopping areas nearby that have easy parking options (for example Edgware, Harrow, Stanmore and Wealdstone) the amount of people that 'drop' into Belmont Circle (both passing trade and local people) will reduce. This in turn will lead to loss in businesses in the area which will then mean that the quality and number of businesses/ shops will diminish; some will inevitably close creating a 'ghost town' affect to the area. Ultimately the attractiveness of the area will also reduce and may have an effect on house prices for residents. I have spoken to a number of the local businesses on the circle and they have echoed my concerns around the impact on the area and their livelihoods. Belmont Circle is a unique area and doesn't have the transport links the level of those areas I have mentioned above. Please reconsider the proposals and do not proceed with the plans laid out I note there are other proposals, albeit less significant, which should be considered and are included in the proposal, such as preventing cars parking on the junction where Felbridge Avenue and Beverley Gardens meet.</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The double yellow lines proposed at the junctions, bends, turning heads and road narrowing's for safety reasons are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads in accordance with the Highway Code. This will make access easier for larger vehicles and emergency services where response times are critical..</p>
010222	FLORISTON GARDENS	<p>OBJECTION: My reasons for the objection are as below: 1) The introduction of parking controls will push the users and parking problem out to surrounding streets just outside the parking control zone. 2) Additional volume of people parking on surrounding streets will increase as a result and cause more difficulties for people entering or exiting their driveways, or into adjacent narrow residential streets such as Floriston Gardens and Floriston Close where there is not sufficient parking space at the moment and these proposals will further compound this. 3) The proposal will put greater pressure on limited space available in surrounding streets, increasing the number of times their driveway is blocked by parked vehicles and causing access problems for the residents. I live on Floriston Gardens, which is adjacent to Bellamy Drive where parking controls have been proposed and therefore I am materially affected by the proposals for the above reasons.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p>
010223	FLORISTON GARDENS	<p>OBJECTION: My reasons for the objection are as below: 1) The introduction of parking controls will push the users and parking problem out to surrounding streets just outside the parking control zone. 2) Additional volume of people parking on surrounding streets will increase as a result and cause more difficulties for people entering or exiting their driveways, or into adjacent narrow residential streets such as Floriston Gardens and Floriston Close</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p>

		<p>where there is not sufficient parking space at the moment and these proposals will further compound this. 3) The proposal will put greater pressure on limited space available in surrounding streets, increasing the number of times their driveway is blocked by parked vehicles and causing access problems for the residents. I live on Floriston Gardens, which is adjacent to Bellamy Drive where parking controls have been proposed and therefore I am materially affected by the proposals for the above reasons.</p>	
010236	GOLF CLOSE	<p>OBJECTION I frequently visit the circle to visit the belmont community hall and the shops and restaurants. If the scheme was implemented then I would find it difficult to park and would take my business elsewhere. I feel many people would do this and the prospect of the shops closing down is very high. There are few small shopping communities like belmont left in harrow. I do not see that the cpz will have any benefit to anyone.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010220	HERMITAGE WAY	<p>OBJECTION: to the proposed pay & display meters that you have proposed. . Across the country there is strong evidence that councils are using parking fines, pay n display meters and other measures to raise revenue. I feel the pay and display meters are being placed in my local community for these same reasons to raise revenue. these pay & display meters will drive away local shoppers like myself to buy my goods from places that do not charge or charge very little on parking, simply put this is unfair for local residents as well as the wider public who are choosing to spend their money in Belmont circle</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010334	HONISTER PLACE	<p>I wish to OBJECT to the No Waiting proposals for Honister Place for the following reasons. 1) Of the 44 properties consulted in October 2013 only 2 responses stated there were parking problems in the street. There is clearly insignificant demand from</p>	<p>The results of the public consultation in Honister Place did not indicate support for parking controls and hence was not included in the statutory consultation.</p>

		<p>the residents for the proposed parking controls which would therefore be implemented in defiance of the overall wishes of the residents. 2) Honister Place is heavily parked on street to the extent that the pavements are used for parking in order to accommodate residents' vehicles. The proposals would reduce the capacity of the street for on street parking thereby increasing the pressure for parking elsewhere. 3) No justification for the proposals has been put forward by the Council in terms of local safety by, for example, accident records or evidence of obstruction of the free flow of traffic by parked vehicles. 4) The Council appears to have given no thought to the consequences of the proposed restrictions in terms of the living conditions of residents of the street who own a vehicle. 5) Honister Place is an attractive cul-de-sac whose appearance is enhanced by the areas of green open space. The visual impact of the proposed yellow lines would be detrimental to the appearance of the street, and the reduction in on street parking capacity would in my view lead to pressure to convert the green spaces into parking areas, to the further detriment of the character and appearance of the street. I trust the Council will seriously consider the above points and as a consequence withdraw its No Waiting proposals for Honister Place.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines proposed at the junctions, bends, turning heads and road narrowing's for safety reasons are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads in accordance with the Highway Code. This will make access easier for larger vehicles and emergency services where response times are critical.</p>
010237	IVANHOE DRIVE	<p>-The 8am to 6.30pm CPZ restriction is draconian. - I agree with parking restrictions applied to roads which have shops situated on them but there should be 40 minutes free parking. - Your proposals will hit businesses in Belmont Circle it is very insensitive, heartless. - This is money making means for the council - In the relevant roads near to Belmont Circle I would agree with parking restrictions but only for 100 yards from Belmont Circle and should only have 1 hour restrictions in the morning and 1 hour in the afternoon to stop people parking for the whole day. - it is outrageous residents have to pay to park outside their own houses. - It is a money making exercise by the council</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The on street parking charges would be £0.10p per 20 minutes. The first 20 minutes are free across the borough on a daily basis.</p>
010255	KINGSHILL DRIVE	<p>I have spent some time studying the proposed review. Although it does not affect me directly, it does have consequences. Why is it necessary to introduce parking meters into the area? The local traders are finding it difficult as it is, and pay and display parking meters will not help. Are you going to introduce parking meters into the two car parks on Belmont Circle? This would be a very</p>	<p>As outlined in paragraph 2.46, Two petitions had been submitted by businesses both during and prior to the statutory consultation requesting the council convert the existing uncontrolled free bays to pay and display bays to remove stagnant parking and to attract passing trade.</p>

		<p>retrograde move. What is of concern is the double parking that occurs on the circle itself. I have sometimes been blocked in when legitimately parked by selfish inconsiderate people. Where are the traffic wardens when you need them? Another concern is Kingshill Drive where I happen to live. I can see bumper to bumper parking in my road and invariably some of these people will park over driveways. Finally, being the elderly cynic I am, why do I get the horrible feeling this is a done deal and our comments will have no effect whatsoever on Harrow Council. Please tell me I am wrong.</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The on street parking charges would be £0.10p per 20 minutes. The first 20 minutes are free across the borough on a daily basis.</p> <p>The proposals to introduce parking charges in the Belmont Circle car park and the Kingshill car park were not supported at the public consultation stage.</p>
010256	KINGSHILL DRIVE	<p>I am writing to you regarding the proposed controlled parking zone in the Belmont Circle area. As a resident of Kingshill Drive, three doors down from Belmont Community hall car park, I object to the proposed parking zone (Mon-Sat) not covering my home. I have witnessed a growing number of vehicles parking outside my home to access the facilities in Belmont Circle. This has led to many cars poorly parked and blocking my drive making it extremely difficult to access my driveway. Your planned parking zone will make my problem even worse and lead to more people choosing to park outside my house as an alternative. Also, with the future development of the block of flats opposite Tesco, this will create even more demand (from the visitors of those living in the flats) to park outside my house as this is the closest unrestricted zone nearest to Belmont Circle. I request for my house to be included in the Mon-Sat parking restriction zone.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p>
010277	KINGSHILL DRIVE	<p>I am objecting on the grounds that it is unnecessary to charge for currently free parking outside of the shops in the bays and service road and that this is not appropriate and does not support small businesses. I am also objecting on the grounds that costs for traffic enforcement should come from parking fines and council funds, not an additional tax on the motorist I am also objecting on the grounds that this scheme is not justified for the whole of the hours that it applies. I've just read about this new scheme and I must say that I am incensed that the council intends to charge for</p>	<p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end)</p>

		<p>parking in the service road which is currently free. How does this support local business? I accept that parking enforcement needs to be funded, but money for this should come from parking fines not parking fees. In the thirty years I have lived here, I have seen Harrow planners totally muck up traffic flow around Queensbury, there is always congested between the library and the shops. The Kenton lane and Christchurch avenue junction is yet another example of a traffic planning disaster, with lanes reduced to single lanes blocked by right turning. Don't even get me started about how Harrow council knocked the stuffing out of Wealdstone with the poorly thought out flyover. So why does the council need to charge for a space in Belmont circle that is currently free, it's a pure tax on the motorist. No wonder so many are turning to UKIP</p>	<p>and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The on street parking charges would be £0.10p per 20 minutes. The first 20 minutes are free across the borough on a daily basis.</p>
010291	KINGSHILL DRIVE	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce resident permit bays to the north end of Elgin Avenue, from Kenmore Avenue to numbers 60 and 63. The proposal was introduced because a small number of residents from the north end of Elgin Avenue (11 out of 17 replies we believe) complained about the number of vehicles parking there to visit Belmont Circle. In fact of the 27% of Elgin Avenue residents who replied only 5 supported Controlled Parking Zones and 15 voted in favour of doing nothing. However the introduction of Resident Permit Bays as proposed by the Council would simply push the problem further down the road and into neighbouring roads. Not only would there be the vehicles visiting Belmont Circle, there would also be vehicles belonging to residents of the north end of Elgin Avenue who did not wish to buy residents parking permits for the full number of cars that they owned. In fact under the Residents Parking Permit scheme residents with permits are still not guaranteed a parking place. The Council recognises that this would happen as it gave exactly that reason for proposing the introduction of resident permit bays in Kenmore Avenue (from Belmont Circle to numbers 236 and 279 Kenmore Avenue, even though they did not complain about parking problems there. We suggest that the proposal to introduce resident parking permit bays in Elgin Avenue and Kenmore Avenue be abandoned and people are allowed to park where they wish. For your information, the people visiting Belmont Circle, do not park for long and in fact park to collect medicines etc and leave and it therefore does not make sense to introduce permit bays.</p>	<p>There was no majority support for the proposed resident parking controls in Elgin Avenue.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that proposals to introduce a CPZ in Elgin Avenue be abandoned.</p>
010333	KINGSHILL DRIVE	<p>I would like to strongly object to the Belmont Circle Area Parking Review. I've lived in this area for 14 years and don't know what the problem is. I work so travel at the busiest times of the day and</p>	<p>.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for</p>

		<p>don't have any problems apart from perhaps the school traffic and crossings. I think that the controlled area is far too large & the hours of restriction are way too long. Is it because the Council generally needs to raise so much revenue that they have made the area so large? I don't think we need any parking restrictions in this area just parking wardens to move the people who are not parking in the correct areas, and have the children use the underpass (this should be renovated to make it clean bright and useable on both sides) to cross the road in the mornings. Parking restrictions are going to have a very negative effect on the shops on the circle (perhaps the people who asked for this didn't think this through in the last consultation), which will not be good for the area on the whole, Wealdstone being a perfect example of this. Also, this will just push any parking issues to the adjoining roads, just moving any potential problem on. Belmont is not in a commuter area where people come to park to catch transport for work, we're nowhere near a station and I don't think the range of shops on offer at Belmont Circle is attracting an un-manageable amount of cars. Please re-think this and come up with a much better solution to whatever this problem is.</p>	<p>Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010257	KYNANCE GARDENS	<p>OBJECTION -My concern about this plan is the rapidly expanding parking permit zones in the area. The proposal has not made it clear what will happen to the two car parks in Belmont Circle and if these will become pay and display as currently both car parks are free to park in which is great for local businesses. So more clarity on this issue is needed. Also the proposal does not give in detail what options will be on the roads with regards to pay and display or shared bays etc. This needs to be made clear so people can voice a opinion. I have objections to the plans on Dobbin Close. I regularly visit the street to see friends. I have never had a issue parking. However recently it has become very hard to park especially since the council have made the car parks on Dobbin Close permit holder only for the residents of the flats. Other residents have to park on the road which actually creates lack of parking spaces and this in turn gives issues to access on the street. All these problems and issues have been created by Harrow Council and the way forward is not by adding more permit zones or road markings as this is not a solution. The best way is to for those car parks which are not even full to be opened to all residents on the street and visitors either pay and display or can get visitor permits. That is the ideal solution to the problem. I think this proposal needs more discussion and debate rather than a knee-jerk reaction. As a mistake could affect many business and</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposals to introduce parking charges in Belmont Circle car park and the Kingshill car park were not supported at the public consultation stage.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>

		also local residents. I hope my objection is noted.	
010238	MOUNTSID E	<p>On the north side of Vernon Drive at the junction of that road and Beverly Gardens (i.e. at the bottom of the footpath leading to Gordon Avenue) there is an area that is currently used for parking. It is mainly used by people bringing their dogs for a walk. Parked cars in that area present no problems for the residents and no danger to the other road users. It is now proposed to put double yellow lines on that section of the road. What will happen if this goes ahead (given that there are also plans to introduce double yellow lines on various other sections of Vernon Drive) cars will be parked in spaces available nearby which will cause problems for the residents. As it is there are only a limited number of parking spaces available and this will exacerbate the shortage .</p> <p>Consequently more households in the area will have to pave their front gardens for parking cars which is very costly both for the residents and ultimately for the environment. I would urge you then please not to put double yellow lines on that particular small section of the road which I referred to above.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines proposed at this location are intended to keep the area clear of parked cars to facilitate parking for council and other maintenance vehicles. This will also help remove obstructive parking which could hinder the through movement of pedestrians, especially mothers with prams and wheel chair users.</p> <p>The double yellow lines at the junctions, bends, turning heads and road narrowing's are proposed for safety reasons and are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads in accordance with the Highway Code.</p>
010239	MOUNTSID E	<p>OBJECTION Having carefully studied the proposals, I have concluded that it is an over-kill. There are some parking issues at Belmont Circle area which can be easily overcome. These measures however, exacerbate and expand the problem to streets and neighbourhoods further away. I personally will lose the parking space outside my property unnecessarily, and the general reduction in on-street parking facilities will force more households to pave their front gardens which will be just one of the unintended consequences of what has been proposed.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p>
010240	MOUNTBE L ROAD	<p>I OBJECT to the proposed controlled parking zone plan in the Belmont Circle area. My road is very close to the proposed restriction area and this will mean that if people are restricted to park in the Belmont area they will move further down the area to seek parking. This will cause my road to be congested and I will also not be able to find parking for my own car and any relatives that wish to visit me will also find it difficult to find parking near my house. I would also like to ask why the proposed plan is from Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm, why does the proposed plan include Saturday why can't this be free from restriction? This is when residents have family over and it's already a problem to find parking for them why cause further obstacles. We haven't experienced any problems on our road but strongly feel that with the proposed controlled parking zone this will create problems for us, therefore we object. I hope that the council take our views into consideration.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking</p>

			spaces
010274	ST ANDREWS DRIVE	I would like harrow council to give thought to parking around belmont health centre! I visit the practice quite often and what should be a 1/2 hour appointment could end up to be an hour Does this mean the sick people in this neighbourhood will be penalised like we are at north wick park hospital! Please give some thought about the community and there needs to visit the doctor! Also I pick up medication from Lloyds pharmacy, which could be a while to be served Again I stress to you at helping the local sick people by relaxing the parking and maybe offer a free 1/2 hour or so	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The proposals to introduce parking charges in Belmont Circle car park and the Kingshill car park were not supported at the public consultation stage.</p>
010258	UPPINGHAM AVENUE	I strongly object relating to proposals within Belmont Circle area parking review. I use to park my car for shopping (tesco and, pharmacy etc) and use services (opticians and dry cleaners etc) in Belmont circle. I never had any problems of finding park places. If parking restrictions are brought in I will be using all the above services using larger stores where free parking is available and use online services for ordering pizza from other takeaways. I can understand that Harrow council is using the parking restrictions to raise revenue and has nothing to do with increasing the flows of traffic, as there are no stations nearby and people drive through the circle to go to other areas. It will only shut shops just like the public toilets next to tesco parking restrictions will drive people to use larger stores where there is free parking and will be ordering more online.	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010259	UPPINGHAM AVENUE	OBJECTION I strongly object relating to proposals within Belmont Circle area parking review. I use to park my car for shopping	The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were

		<p>(tesco and, pharmacy etc) and use services (opticians and dry cleaners etc) in Belmont circle. I never had any problems of finding park places. If parking restrictions are brought in I will be using all the above services using larger stores where free parking is available and use online services for ordering pizza from other takeaways. I can understand that Harrow council is using the parking restrictions to raise revenue and has nothing to do with increasing the flows of traffic, as there are no stations nearby and people drive through the circle to go to other areas. It will only shut shops just like the public toilets next to tesco parking restrictions will drive people to use larger stores where there is free parking and will be ordering more online.</p>	<p>included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p>
010260	VERNON DRIVE	<p>OBJECTION I have received the proposal to convert the roads around the Belmont Circle into a controlled parking zone. We are frequent users of the shops located in the Belmont circle and use the roads surrounding it to park while we use the shops. As of now there is no restriction and your letter informs that this will be put in place soon. I would like to point out that this will severely affect our custom to these locally owned small shops. If there is no place to park the vehicle, then we will be forced to turn our attention to the supermarkets where car parking is not a problem. In most high streets around London and Greater London, shopkeepers resist the increased parking tariffs and parking restrictions and it is evident from our shopping pattern that we have stopped using shops which are not walk-able distance from our house while carrying heavy groceries. A 15-30 minute parking facility near the shops ensures regular visits and revenue to these small shops. I strongly object to the enforcement of a restricted zone in the streets surrounding these shops. And if you continue with your plan, you will be ensuring decreased shoppers. Even the local transport does not conveniently run from our houses to these small shops, of which we can take advantage. The free car park near the Belmont Health Centre is always full. This indicates the need for more parking rather than a need to cut it down.</p>	<p>The overall results of the statutory consultation did not show majority support for parking controls in the roads which were included in the proposed CPZ. It is therefore recommended that the proposals to introduce a CPZ in these roads be abandoned.</p> <p>The proposed shared use (pay and display / permit) parking for Belmont Circle and Kenton Lane focuses on providing short stay parking for customers of nearby businesses which was a concern demonstrated to the Council through a petition received from the businesses. This will help to remove long stay parking and to encourage passing trade.</p> <p>It is proposed to revise the proposals for shared use bays to be pay and display bays only on Belmont Circle roundabout (northern end) and the service road off Kenton Lane between property no.s 396 to 412 in order to maximise the availability of short stay parking spaces</p> <p>The proposals to introduce parking charges in Belmont Circle car park and the Kingshill car park were not supported at the public consultation stage.</p>
010279	WETHERAL DRIVE	<p>About 4 years back, I had requested you to introduce CPZ in and around Wetheral Drive, HA7. I have today received Belmont Circle Area Parking Review but it does not show Wetheral Drive. Please let me know when you are introducing CPZ that would cover W Juthetheral Drive. I shall be thankful if you will consider the</p>	<p>The results of the public consultation in Wetheral Drive did not indicate support for parking controls. This was also reinforced in the petition that was received from the residents of Wetheral Drive.</p> <p>The double yellow lines proposed at the junctions, bends, turning</p>

	<p>introduction of Controlled Parking Zone in this area. This is because the resident/s have converted their garage/s into a room or ware house because they can park on street with no let or hindrance. Moreover, all resident/s have two or more cars. Further to my earlier email, I wish to state something more : On one occassion, an Ambulance was held up for about 4 to 5 minutes because of wrong parking. This was about 2 or more years ago. We are two Disabled Persons (myself and my wife). We are registered with the Harrow Council and our registration numbers are 375105 and 371085. Please ensure that at lease one Disabled Parking space at Wetheral Drive, HA7 2HN. Even Bin Collectors are facing problems while collecting rubbish.</p>	<p>heads and road narrowing's for safety reasons are intended to remove obstructive parking, improve sightlines lines and to facilitate safe/easier access into and out of the side roads in accordance with the Highway Code. This will make access easier for larger vehicles and emergency services where response times are critical.</p> <p>A disable bay cannot be provided as part of this scheme. Those that request a disable bay must first meet the council criteria before such provisions can be made.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------