

## **Appendix C**

### **Consideration of formal objections and other representations**

A summary of how the main issues of objection have been considered and where possible addressed is provided below. A more detailed response to individual objections and other concerns raised in the statutory consultation follows. The wording of individual formal objections varies but comes under the following themes:

#### **A: I do not want to have to pay to park outside/near my address**

This is the most common reason for objection (Welbeck Road 11, Coles Crescent+Drinkwater Road 7 and Scott Crescent 4). This number is reduced to 12 within the area recommended to proceed. The concern from most of Coles Crescent objector centres on visitor permits for friends, relatives and those bringing deliveries. Some of these actions would not necessitate a permit and the reduced hours of CPZ operation will allow flexibility to arrange most visits to not require visitor permits. Four of the remaining Welbeck Road objectors also complain the hours are too long so again may have their main grounds of objection addressed by the revision recommended. The comparatively small size of the CPZ recommended should also enable those residents or their visitors to park in unrestricted roads even during the operation of the CPZ if they want to avoid needing permits but it will allow those who want to purchase permits that choice. Hence it is believed some of the objections have been completely dealt with and almost all of the others substantially addressed.

#### **B There is no or not sufficient a parking problem to justify a CPZ**

This is the second largest cause of objection with 15 however only four are within the revised reduced CPZ recommended. One of these believe the CPZ should operate for a shorter period which will partially address their objection. The remaining objections need to be balanced by the much larger number stating a parking problem in the previous consultation.

#### **C The operational hours of the CPZ advertised at Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm are too long**

These operational hours came from the responses of those who considered there to be a parking problem in the previous consultation. Thirteen formal objection stated this as a reason of objection. Three of these came from addresses outside of the CPZ proposed in the statutory consultation. All six of those objecting to the hours from within the recommended CPZ area are from Welbeck Road. A reduction in CPZ hours is recommended and should largely address this ground of objection in all thirteen cases. The reduction in operational hours whilst addressing these objection.

#### **D The introduction of a CPZ is all or mainly about revenue generation by the council**

This is mentioned by 13 formal objectors but only five of these are within the CPZ area recommended. All 13 mention at least one other reason for objection and all five include at least one of the above (A to C) as reason for objection. It is perhaps an understandable view from a resident who does not see the justification for a CPZ. National legislation requires CPZs to be self-financing and any surpluses which may eventually result are ring fenced to transport issues.

### **E I will suffer from displaced parking from the Introduction of a CPZ**

This is raised by seven objectors in the statutory consultation. This is an understandable concern entirely from those outside of where the CPZ is recommended. The effects of displacement are likely to be less from the reduction in CPZ hours however some streets which are no longer within the CPZ recommended may well suffer from some displaced parking by those unable or unwilling to purchase permits. It is however the agreed approach to allow the residents of a street or section of street to decide the restrictions there rather than those in surrounding streets.

### **F Permits cost too much (7 objections)**

The necessity for charges is explained in D above. The level of charges is decided by members and is the same across the borough.

### **G Should control businesses without charging residents**

Seven objections only two of which within the recommended CPZ area. Parking on the public highway is equally available to resident and non-residents in the absence of a controlled parking zone.

### **H Rely on deliveries from pharmacy / other deliveries which will be prevented or cost money for permits**

This is reason of five objections however deliveries are regarded as loading or of such a short duration as not requiring a permit.

### **J Rely on support from family and friends visiting which will cost money for permits**

This along with H above is a concern of four objectors from Coles Crescent. The much reduced CPZ hours should substantially address this issue as will the small size of the zone.

Representations regarding proposals for controlled parking zone operating Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm - Welbeck Road, Tintern Way & nearby streets

(Five digit number is a correspondence reference)

	Source	Objections or other representations	How addressed and/or officer comment
1	Resident of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who is objecting to CPZ 10015	<p>I live opposite the main entrance to Grange First and Middle School in Welbeck Road.</p> <p>For many years we have suffered at the hands of inconsiderate parents dropping off and picking up their kids from the school. They would park across my drive or even on my drive. They park directly across my neighbours drives without a care. Often these parents are rude and aggressive if confronted.</p> <p>Add to this the workshops along the viaduct leaving cars dotted along the road for weeks on end. Now that there is no need for displaying road tax, no one would know if a car has been legally parked or dumped.</p> <p>Recently Yellow lines were introduced along my side of the road. They have had little or no impact on inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>1. The yellow line on my side DOES NOT clearly indicate when and when not to park. The signs are tiny and ignored.</p> <p>2. There is a miscomprehension as the yellow zigzag lines opposite (school side) show large signs stating the parking restrictions which people think are the same as on the residential side.</p> <p>3. Why do the parking restrictions apply on a Saturday, on the residential side?</p> <p>4. Since the introduction of the lines there has been NO enforcement what so ever. The only people to be inconvenienced are the residents. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>I now hear that parking bays may be introduced:</p> <p>5. Why should residents have to pay for the privilege of parking outside their own homes?</p> <p>6. Why should residents have to</p>	<p>Resident explains the parking problem as expressed by many residents. This is around either end of school day with people delivering / collecting children from Grange school and cars some left for long periods from businesses in The Arches. They then complain about small signs (so unclear time restriction) and lack of enforcement of recently introduced single yellow line opposite the school. The traffic order which enables enforcement for these new restrictions has only very recently been made. Yellow lines are waiting restrictions and do not prevent people being dropped off but do not allow for vehicle to be left unattended. The sign / lettering size for waiting restrictions is standard and dictated by national signs regulations. The resident questions the need for a restriction on Saturday but this is now an existing restriction and not the subject of this consultation.</p> <p>Although the above has no direct relevance to the present consultation it is perhaps why they view the proposed CPZ negatively. The description in point 8 indicates a misunderstanding of existing and proposed restriction which are all waiting restrictions. If the person's has a blue badge a vehicle can certainly be parked on the existing yellow line or the now proposed restrictions to enable the transport of a disabled person. Even if they do not have a blue badge waiting restrictions permit loading and the collection of passengers whose mobility would be considered in the time allowed.</p> <p>5. This is the first objection to the CPZ proposals. If there is a blue badge and the car is predominantly used for the transport of the couple the blue badge can be displayed and no permit is required. Otherwise the vehicle could be parked on the person's driveway and the repositioned to enable the transport of a passenger.</p> <p>6. There is a shared driveway access with a neighbour. There is at least on space solely for this resident so perhaps a</p>

		<p>pay for their guests to park outside or near their homes?</p> <p>7. I am a pensioner with a disabled wife. I already pay road tax. I will not be able to afford more outgoings.</p> <p>8. My wife could get to car when it was parked on the road as it is a flat area from where to embark and disembark. Since the introduction of the yellow line, we have to use the drive which is on a steep incline. This causes huge discomfort for her and her condition.</p> <p>I hope my objection are noted.</p>	<p>visitors vehicle could be parked off street. If it cannot as a pensioner visitors permits receive a 50% discount. Permits are only needed during the operational period of the CPZ which a number of other representations suggest should be shortened.</p> <p>The objection is perhaps focussed more on concern for effective enforcement if residents are going to get the benefits to justify the cost of permits.</p>
2	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who is objecting to CPZ 10016</p>	<p>I live Opposite Grange First and Middle School.</p> <p>Recently Yellow lines were introduced along the road directly outside my house. They have had no impact on inconsiderate parking.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Badly sign posted.</li> <li>2. No enforcement.</li> <li>3. Different controlled zone times on my side and the opposite school side.</li> <li>4. WHY Saturday as well.</li> </ol> <p>Drivers often park their cars during the controlled period. Parents in particular dropping off and picking up their kids - could care less about the yellow line.</p> <p>The only people to be inconvenienced are the residents. I read that parking bays may be introduced:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why should I have to pay for the privilege of parking outside my own home?</li> <li>2. Why should I have to pay for my guests to park outside or near my home?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that there does need to be a CPZ of sorts. However, it has to be enforced. If no one is checking and no one is being fined, then it's no wonder that people ignore the CPZ.</p> <p>I hope my objection are noted.</p>	<p>This objection from a near neighbour of 28 above follows exactly the same format, raises similar issues including lack of current enforcement and questioning the need for restrictions on Saturdays. They specifically object to paying for residents and visitor permits. There however is no disability issue raised. Very similar comments would apply. The address appear to have access to at least one off street space.</p> <p>Unlike the previous resident they state they agree with a CPZ in principle their main concern appears to be that it should be properly enforced otherwise it will be ignored and the parking situation remain unresolved. Experience shows CPZs are effective at addressing problems of non-residents parking and the amount of enforcement will be accessed on an ongoing basis. How effective the restrictions are at controlling parking from the businesses of The Arches will depend on the hours of operation with significant representation to reduce the hours of the CPZ. Waiting restrictions including CPZ controls are less effective at controlling car transport to school however yellow lines across people's driveways does provide an additional deterrent.</p>
3	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who is objecting</p>	<p>I OBJECT to CPZ proposal as it stands.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When the present yellow lines were proposed I attended open evening at Grange school. I</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The single yellow line waiting restriction opposite the school was subject to an earlier statutory consultation and is now existing. The formal objections received during the statutory period were</li> </ol>

	to CPZ and existing restrictions 10068	<p>objected to lines especially their timings more so on Saturday, why on Saturday. I raised this question at the time.</p> <p>2. I support the CPZ but it should operate Monday to Friday 10am to 11 am &amp; 2pm to 3pm. Why is it proposed 8am to 6.30pm and SATURDAY ?</p>	<p>individually addressed. It may be this “objection” was raised verbally and/or away from the statutory consultation period.</p> <p>2. The operating time for the proposed CPZ (including Saturday) came from responses to the earlier public consultation. These hours are part of the statutory consultation process and can be reduced (but not increased) in order to address objections raised. Other objections have called for reductions in operational hours.</p>
4	Resident of Welbeck Road living between the school entrance and The Arches who states objection to CPZ 10072	I strongly object to CPZ in Welbeck Road Harrow.	Although stating objection to the CPZ this “objection” is not clarified nor are any reason for objection provided. The requirements for making a formal objection were explain in the Statutory consultation leaflet. This then cannot technically be considered as a formal objection.
5	Resident of Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary who is supporting the CPZ proposals. 9948	As a resident of Welbeck Road West Harrow am very pleased to read that Residents Parking might be introduced on Welbeck Road West Harrow as parking is becoming a nightmare for us the residents. Our drive ways are always obstructed making it difficult to drive our cars in and out. I for one am very glad to have residents parking. I have no OBJECTIONS.	Representation of support for proposed CPZ which the resident sees as helping address the parking issues they face.
6	Resident of Welbeck Road living between the school entrance and The Arches who supports CPZ 10048	<p>1. I have been a resident of Welbeck Road for over 50 years and I am in full agreement with your proposals to make the road CRZ, as it would deter the vans and lorries that are parked here, as well as the number of cars when the children are going and coming from school.</p> <p>2. Also, in my opinion it is essential that all the corners, as marked on the plan, should have double yellow lines, as some of the parking now, has much to be desired.</p> <p>3. There is just one more point, will enough wardens be employed to monitor these regulations?</p>	<p>1. Representation of support of CPZ as a solution to parking issues.</p> <p>2. Also supports double yellow lines.</p> <p>3. The number of visits from Civil Enforcement officers to location is assessed once the restrictions come into affect. Enforcement here has to be balanced against needs at other locations.</p>
7	Resident of Welbeck Road living close to	<p>We object to the introduction of a CPZ in Welbeck Road.</p> <p>1. The level of parking does not</p>	1. The resident objects particularly to the length of the operational period and that it applies to Saturday. This period came

	<p>school entrance who is objecting to CPZ 10062</p>	<p>warrant this action. We particularly object to any parking restrictions at all on Saturdays and after 4.30pm on schooldays.</p> <p>2. We also object to the timings on the single yellow line opposite the school entrance. Any restriction there should be the same as those for the school entrance currently.8.30-4.30 Monday-Friday NOT Saturday. In fact there is no need for more than an hour in the morning (8.30-9.30) and an hour in the afternoon (3pm-4pm)</p> <p>3. We get frequent visits from relatives/friends in late afternoon. They cannot park on our driveway or outside our house, because of the school KEEP CLEAR markings, so has to park over the road. Similarly it would be extremely difficult to have visitors on Saturdays if the plans were to go ahead in their present form. We have lived in Welbeck Road for over 40years.</p>	<p>from responses to the public consultation however is a cause of quite a number of the objections. A reduction in CPZ time would potentially address these and some wider issues but would make it easier for non-residents to get around the restrictions.</p> <p>2. This objection is to a restriction already in place and not covered by this statutory consultation. It may be appropriate to review this restriction when and if the other restrictions have been introduced.</p> <p>3. A reduction of the proposed CPZ hours would probably allow parking in a nearby CPZ permit bay. There appears to be space for at least 2 vehicles to park off-street at this address.</p>
8	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who is objecting to CPZ 10026</p>	<p>The reasons for my objection is as follows:</p> <p>1. Welbeck Road is quite far away from the shops and railway stations and therefore it is highly unlikely that commuters and shoppers will park their cars in Welbeck Road;</p> <p>2. We are paying huge amount of council tax and therefore imposing permit will be an additional expense ;</p> <p>3. It will prevent friends and relatives to visit us during the permit restrictions;</p> <p>4. Currently restrictions are in place near the school and therefore it is unnecessary to impose further restrictions;</p> <p>5. Council did not give any valid reasons as to why the Welbeck Road needs parking restrictions.</p> <p>6. Alternatively, if council wants to impose restrictions, I suggest that parking restrictions can be imposed between 10- 11 a.m. during week days and Saturday to prevent non residents parking their car at Welbeck Road.</p>	<p>1. CPZ are introduced around shopping areas and railway stations but can be as effective at addressing problems caused by non-residents parking in other areas. Residents of Welbeck Rod in particular have been complaining to the council for a number of years. This view of parking problems was confirmed in the public consultation which also showed a CPZ as the preferred means of control.</p> <p>2 &amp; 5. It is appreciated that there are many demands on people's money however it remains the driver's responsibility to tax, insure and maintain their vehicle. The costs of motoring do include paying to park. Residents were advised in the earlier consultation about the charges for permits but still a majority of responses from Welbeck Road considered there to be sufficient a parking problem to justify the cost of permits.</p> <p>3. Visitor permits are only required for parking during the CPZ operational hours.</p> <p>4. Some safety concerns have been addressed by the recently introduced restrictions in Welbeck Road the previous public consultation whilst advising these restrictions were going ahead asked residents whether &amp; how their other parking problems should be addressed.</p>

			<p>The current CPZ proposals are being taken ahead based on the majority of responses.</p> <p>6. This last point appears to indicate a way by which the resident's issues could be addressed by reducing the hours of operation of the CPZ and is a view expressed by others.</p>
9	Resident of Welbeck Road living between the school entrance and junction with Tintern Way 10076	<p>The reason for my objection to CPZ is I have lived at my address for over 20 years - and do not see the reason for CPZ to be introduced. This is a residential street with home owners paying their council taxes - we are not that near to the station for commuters to park on our road - hence causing a problem for the residents.</p> <p>2. The only reason I see this is putting additional funds in the council treasury. What will the extra money be used for? I think enough is already contributed to the council through our taxes, to be hit with another payment charge from the council.</p>	<p>1. The resident lives quite close to the school entrance but perhaps is not at home during school travel periods. Their general assessment of parking situation is different from many of their neighbours. Although there are no stations or shops nearby parking identified as a problem by a majority of responses especially from this end of Welbeck Road.</p> <p>2. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation. Councillors decide the tariff level for permits which are designed to dissuade multiple car ownership.</p>
10 to 14	Residents of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who state objection to CPZ 10082, 10083, 10085, 10086, & 10087	<p>Five email representations consisting in their entirety in "OBJECTION to CPZ</p> <p>Ref: DP 2014-13"</p>	<p>Although stating their objection, the absence of reasons or exactly what aspect of the CPZ proposals they are objecting too mean these are not statutory objections and cannot be addressed.</p>
15	Resident of Welbeck Road living close to school entrance who state objection to CPZ 10079	<p>OBJECTION to CPZ</p> <p>Ref: DP 2014-13</p>	<p>Although stating objection to the CPZ this "objection" is not clarified nor are any reason for objection provided. The requirements for making a formal objection were explain in the Statutory consultation leaflet. This then cannot technically be considered as a formal objection.</p>
16	Resident of Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary who is opposed to CPZ. 9942	<p>I do not want any parking restrictions in my road please</p> <p>THERE ARE NO PARKING PROBLEMS HERE and I am too poor to pay this money just to park my car or for visitors to park their cars. It is nonsense.</p>	<p>1. Although clearly opposed to a CPZ not technically a statutory objection.</p> <p>2. The residents view of no parking problem is in contradiction to the majority of responses received from Welbeck Road in the previous consultation. The resident has a dropped kerb access and apparently a garage so theoretically could choose to park off street.</p>
17	Resident of	1. Strongly object to the proposed	1. The CPZ proposals have been

	<p>Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary, close to junction with Tintern Way, who is objecting to CPZ. 9917</p>	<p>parking restrictions (CPZ) in front of our house. We have been living in this house for many years and had no problems/complaints regarding parking outside our house.</p> <p>2. This appears to be mean of getting more money from residents in addition to the high council tax. This would cost me £162.20 a year and possibly going up thereafter and we have no control over it.</p> <p>3. No objection for the introduction of double Yellow lines at junctions / bends.</p> <p>4. Harrow Council has not substantiated or put forward a convincing reason for the introduction of the proposed parking bay outside my house.</p>	<p>produced in roads or sections of roads where the majority of responses said they experienced parking problem and a majority back a CPZ as a means of control. It is possible this resident does not experience the issues at either end of the school day. This address is relatively close to the main school entrance.</p> <p>2. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation. Councillors decide the tariff level for permits which are designed to dissuade multiple car ownership.</p> <p>4. Proposals bases on majority response in previous consultation. The space outside individual properties is public highway and individuals cannot opt out or in against the majority view.</p>
18	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 9985</p>	<p>Objection to the proposed controlled parking zone (CPZ) to Welbeck Road.</p> <p>1. There is not a parking problem to resolve. It is designed to increase revenue to the council at the expense of the residents of Welbeck Road.</p> <p>2. The proposed restrictions are so severe and exceed those found in some shopping areas and near tube stations. The proposal to impose Saturday parking restriction in this quiet residential area is pure greed over common sense.</p> <p>a. This is a residential area and there is no parking problem</p> <p>3. The restrictions will substantially affect the quality of life and impose financial burden on the residents.</p> <p>4. Over enthusiastic parking attendants will bring unnecessary anxiety and nuisance to the residents and visitors.</p> <p>5. I am a cancer patient. During episodes ill health, I rely on friends</p>	<p>1. The majority of responses received from Welbeck Road residents during the public consultation considered there to be a parking problem and that a CPZ was preferred means of addressing these parking issues.</p> <p>2. The operational period proposed for the CPZ in the statutory consultation reflected the responses in the public consultation where in fact Monday to Sunday was the most popular option. There is the opportunity at the statutory consultation stage to reduce the period of restriction. This seems to be a frequently raised concern raised both during this consultation and informal expressed elsewhere. Reducing operational hours would make it easier for residents to work around without the need for as many permits however would be less effective at controlling parking associated with the businesses in The Arches.</p> <p>a. Covered above.</p> <p>3. The public consultation was to establish whether people considered there to be a parking problem to justify the explained costs to residents of a CPZ. The majority of responses indicated that to be the case.</p> <p>4. The councils' civil enforcement officers will enforce restrictions agreed by the community to enable residents to achieve</p>



		<p>and relatives to visit me and care for me. I do not need the expense of purchasing parking permits for visitors and the responsibility to ensure that they are parked legally.</p>	<p>the improvement to parking conditions they requested. Drivers parking complying with the restriction need not be anxious.</p> <p>5. Carer permits are available to organisations providing care. If there are regular / frequent family / friends visits to provide care the resident can apply for a postcode permit which is transferable. If the visitor is coming to provide transport a blue badge can be displayed and no visitors permit is required. Any visitors' permits required are at a 50% discount to elderly or disabled.</p>
19	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 10013</p>	<p>1. We strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions to be introduced in front of our house We have lived in this house for over 25 years and we strongly feel that there is no need for controlled parking restrictions in Welbeck Road as this is a residential area and the residents should have the right to park their vehicles without additional costs for obtaining parking permits which will initially cost us £128 per year.</p> <p>2. Harrow Council have not provided any evidence to justify the proposed introduction of controlled parking restrictions in this section of Welbeck Road. It appears the only reason as to why Harrow Council wants to introduce the parking restrictions in Welbeck Road is to generate more income for Harrow Council in addition to enforcing a high Council Tax.</p> <p>3. All four adult occupants in our house object to this proposal.</p>	<p>1. There is no legal right to park outside of your own address although the council will try to permit as much parking as possible especially for residents. It is concerns expressed by residents and confirmed by a majority of responses from Welbeck Road that there is a parking problem and that a CPZ was the preferred means of control. It is not practical for individuals to opt out or into parking proposals agreed by the community. The resident has access to off-street parking and apparently a garage. It is only necessary to purchase permits if a vehicle is to be parked in a bay during the operational hours.</p> <p>2. The CPZ proposals reflect the responses received from Welbeck Road residents in the previous public consultation. However these may be modified by this statutory consultation.</p> <p>3. People are at liberty to each send in individual representations from the same address.</p>
20	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road located within proposed CPZ boundary, close to junction with Tintern Way, who is objecting to CPZ. 10038</p>	<p>I wish to state my objection to the proposals for a controlled parking zone in Welbeck Road, as outlined in the review circulated to this area.</p> <p>1. Many households, including my own, have more than one vehicle, and to restrict parking to CPZ bays will mean that there will be a scramble for parking places, with other users taking the places outside my house, despite my</p>	<p>This residents objection is based on their concern that the number of parking spaces provided within the proposed CPZ will be insufficient for the for the residents within the zone. They do however support the proposed double yellow lines at junctions (point 2). The instigation for the parking review was residents' complaints about non-residents causing parking problems which a CPZ would address. Another issue raised be residents was vehicles obstructing driveway access which CPZs address by allowing c 1.5m</p>

		<p>having purchased a parking permit. There simply won't be enough parking places.</p> <p>2. I would like to comment that the proposed double yellow lines at junctions and bends are necessary, as the lack of parking places often means that vehicles park on the corners, obscuring the view for other approaching vehicles.</p>	<p>either side of accesses. This does however mean that in many instances in Welbeck Road there is only distance between accesses for a single space bay whereas two vehicles may at present park though perhaps not providing much clearance either side of accesses. The limitation</p>
21	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road located between junction with Tintern Way and Twyford Road who is objecting to the CPZ proposals 10050</p>	<p>Objection, against Controlled Parking Zone in Welbeck Road (also petition organiser from residents in Welbeck Road).</p> <p>1. There is no justification for a CPZ, it is totally unnecessary and inappropriate. a - No train station within 10 minutes' walk b - Non shopping area c - Residential area</p> <p>2. As per my response to the initial consultation in March/April 2014, this is Harrow Council introducing a Stealth Tax!</p> <p>3. The area that is contentious is around the railway arches where people wish to have the CPZ. If Harrow Council really wants to help solve the issue of parking around there then they should consult Transport for London on resolving the issue. The premises under the arches are owned by TfL who collects rental income from the businesses that use them.</p>	<p>Objection with regard to residents own circumstance considered first. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. May however experience increased parking as not protected. With regard to there objection to a CPZ in Welbeck Road in general:</p> <p>1. Residents of Welbeck Road have been complaining about parking and asking for parking controls for a number of years. There was majority support for taking action from responses in the initial public consultation and a CPZ was the preferred means of control in responses. CPZs not just used where there are stations or shops nearby but anywhere where there is an issue with parking by non-residents. Across the borough, CPZ mainly do cover residential streets to make it easier for residents to park.</p> <p>2. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation.</p> <p>3. Parking space is equally available or restricted to all whether residents or not. The only way non-resident parking can practically be controlled is by CPZ which provides preferential parking rights to residents. Neither TfL nor Council has mean of control of vehicles associated to the businesses at present.</p>
22	<p>Petition from 36 residents of Welbeck Road stating objection</p>	<p>Please see attached petition signed by residents who oppose the CPZ. Number of houses in the street is 87.</p>	<p>Although petition statement states objection there is no reason given for that objection. The reasons are likely to be different for different signaturaries as</p>

	to CPZ but providing no reasons 10050	<p>Results:  For CPZ (tick) - 12 (9 from the Arches end of Welbeck Road)  Against CPZ (signature) - 37  No answer (not home) - 35  No opinion - 2  Undecided - 1</p> <p>Petition statement: We, the undersign, object to the Harrow Council's plan to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone along Welbeck Road</p>	indicated by separate representations. 17 petition signatures from addresses in reduced area where CPZ is recommended to proceed of these 11 have sent separate representation giving a variety of reasons for objection some are wholly or partly addressed by the changes to the proposals recommended. The remaining petition signatures come from addresses where the CPZ is no longer recommended.
23	Resident of Welbeck Road located within but relatively close to proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 9786	<p>Strongly object to new controlled parking zone at Welbeck Road and surrounding areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Residence at Welbeck Road for many years - there has never being a parking issue in this area</li> <li>2. Alternatively if CPZ goes ahead then at least first 2 cars parking permits per household to be given free because of the rising costs and also the council tax is very high.</li> <li>3. My neighbours on Welbeck Road not happy regarding the CPZ proposals.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Proposals based on complaints about parking from local residents and extent of proposals now upon majority of responses in earlier consultation in March 2014. Strongest support was from the section of Welbeck Road nearer to school and junction with The Arches.</li> <li>2. National legislation dictates that such parking schemes need to be self financing hence there is a charge for each vehicle. The permit costs are set on a borough-wide basis with increasing charges for second and subsequent vehicles per household to dissuade multiple car ownership. However this and all subsequent responses are from addresses outside where the CPZ is now recommended so will not have the opportunity to buy permits.</li> <li>3. It is up to individuals to make representation and advise their reasons and how they each would be materially affected.</li> </ol>
24	Resident of Welbeck Road located within but close to proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting mainly to operational hours of proposed CPZ. 9780	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Object to some of the proposals particularly the rather draconian restrictions of Monday to Saturdays 8am - 6.30pm.</li> </ol> <p>Support stopping the mindless parking around The Arches and near the school, but strongly disagree with times when few problems have been encountered. I would like to know why Saturdays have been included and why school hours are not the main target?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. People will move their cars up towards our part of the street and make it impossible for my family</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The most popular time in responses to the early public consultation was Monday to Sunday for same time however Monday to Saturday was selected as balancing some support for Monday to Friday and including Saturday, site observations and discussion with ward councillors. The 8am to 6.30pm period was backed by a majority of responses. The restrictions are not just targeted and parking associated with Grange School but also businesses from The Arches. The operating period of any new CPZ can be reduced but not increased based on representations made at this statutory consultation stage.</li> <li>2. If the resident is within the agreed CPZ they should be protected from non</li> </ol>

		<p>with their small children (who visit me frequently) to park anywhere near our house &lt;just within CPZ proposals advertised&gt;.</p> <p>3. I object to paying such high fees.</p> <p>My daughter lived in &lt;other London borough&gt; near the busy Hospital and had less restrictions and lower fees</p> <p>4. Think money making could be at the root of this, as we are not near a station or hospital.</p> <p>5. These measures will surely make it more difficult to sell our house and alter its value.</p>	<p>resident parking. Visitors could potentially park in off street parking or use a visitor permit or outside the zone nearby or arrange visit when zone not in operation.</p> <p>3. National legislation dictates that such parking schemes need to be self financing hence there is a charge for each vehicle. The permit costs are set on a borough-wide basis with increasing charges for second and subsequent vehicles per household to dissuade multiple car ownership. It is up to each council to set its permit charges mindful of funding streams available.</p> <p>4. See 3, also any surplus revenue generated from permits, enforcement etc have by national legislation to be ring fenced to transport issues, like investigating future traffic/parking schemes and concessionary travel.</p> <p>5. No definite evidence this is the case although difficulty finding parking is often sighted as a deterrent to prospective purchasers.</p>
25	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road located within but close to proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 9800</p>	<p>1. Strongly object to the proposed CPZ bays on Welbeck Road. Have lived for over 10 years, have never experienced difficulty in parking including from school therefore no reason for my part of Welbeck Road &lt;just within boundary of proposed CPZ&gt; to be restricted.</p> <p>2. Object to paying for a parking permit when CPZ not justified and suspect CPZ is to produce income for Harrow Council.</p> <p>3. Will make it difficult for visitors, tradesmen etc.</p> <p>4. Proposed operating hours of Monday - Saturday 8.30am - 6.30pm far too long. If to address Grange School parking should just be during start and finish time?</p> <p>Support proposed double yellow lines on bends and junctions</p>	<p>1 Proposals based on complaints about parking from local residents and extent of proposals now upon majority of responses in earlier consultation in March 2014. Strongest support was from the section of Welbeck Road nearer to school and junction with The Arches.</p> <p>2. National legislation dictates that such parking schemes need to be self financing hence there is a charge for each vehicle. The permit costs are set on a borough-wide basis with increasing charges for 2<sup>nd</sup> and subsequent vehicles per household to dissuade multiple car ownership. It is up to each council to set its permit charges mindful of funding streams available.</p> <p>3. Visitors/tradesmen could potentially park in off street parking or use a visitor permit or outside the zone nearby or arrange visit when zone not in operation. Permit bays and yellow lines are waiting restrictions so may well make deliveries etc easier.</p> <p>4. See response 2.1 above regarding operational hours.</p>
26	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road</p>	<p>Object to the proposed controlled parking zone on Welbeck Road.</p> <p>1. I have never had a problem with parking.</p>	<p>1. Proposals based on complaints about parking from local residents and extent of proposals now upon majority of responses in earlier consultation in March 2014. Strongest support was from the section of Welbeck Road nearer to school</p>

	and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10014	2. This would affect me as I regularly have visitors and have 2 cars. I also believe it is unfair to ask me to pay for this.	and junction with The Arches. 2. National legislation dictates that such parking schemes need to be self financing hence there is a charge for each vehicle.
27	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10046	Object to the CPZ proposals. We don't want yellow lines or permits on our Road. 1. We have been living on this Road for over 20 years why should we have to pay to park outside our house. 2. The council should impose fines on the garages that come to park their customer's cars on Welbeck Road and fine the person who sells cars from home.	1. Proposals based on complaints about parking from local residents and extent of proposals now upon majority of responses in earlier consultation in March 2014. Strongest support was from the section of Welbeck Road nearer to school and junction with The Arches. National legislation dictates that such parking schemes need to be self financing hence there is a charge for each vehicle.
28	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is close to the junction with Tintern Way but is outside recommended CPZ who is objecting to proposals 10045	My objections to the proposals are as follows: 1. I have been a home owner/resident in Welbeck Road for nearly 30 years and I have not experienced parking issues apart from the odd days. 2) I have a company vehicle which is changed on a regular basis, sometimes at very short notice. It would be very awkward and a time consuming exercise for me to get the parking permits changed over. 3) This change will prompt residents to convert their front gardens into parking spaces for cars and this is going to have an environmental impact apart from being unsightly. 4) The changes that have been done around the Grange school recently are adequate for the safety of the children, and this has not impacted on parking further up Welbeck Road.	1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. May however experience increased parking as not protected. 2. If outside of CPZ implemented would not be able to purchase a permit. 3. It is up to residents to decide what is appropriate. This and almost all properties in this section of Welbeck Road have crossovers shared with neighbour. 4. CPZ proposals not proposed outside this address.
29	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is close to the junction with Tintern Way but is outside recommended CPZ who is objecting to proposals 10074	<b>OBJECTION TO CPZ</b>  The reason for me to object for controlled parking. I don't pay to park in front my house at the moment and I don't see any problem with that, hence I would like it to continue that way in future. I am not willing to pay any money to park in front my house.  I am happy with controlled parking only if residents are given free	1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. May however experience increased parking as not protected. 2. If outside of CPZ implemented would not be able to purchase a permit. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It

		parking permit for at least for one car/household.	does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation.
30	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10067	I strongly object to CPZ in Welbeck Road.  There is not a problem with parking in the street. Introducing CPZ will encourage people to park in 'non CPZ' areas, thus making parking more difficult further up the street.	1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. May however experience increased parking as not protected.
31	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10069	I strictly objecting for CPZ at Welbeck Road. 1. We residence will be offering from our quite parking zone and we and our family guest will end up council' TRICKY game of parking penalty. Council should do double yellow parking only on blind points and turning roads. 2. Also council should take action against private car sale on residential parking zone.  I am strictly opposing Control Parking Zone on Welbeck Road, Harrow. Middlesex.	Exact meaning of objection not entirely clear. 1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. May however experience increased parking as not protected. Penalty charge notices only issued to vehicles committing a parking contravention. 2. Action is taken against commercial sale of vehicles parked on the public highway when these are reported to the council.
32	Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10070	Objecting to proposed controlled parking zone (CPZ) in Welbeck Road. 1. There is not a parking issue within the road or surrounding area and for that reason we are fully against CPZ in the area and question the motive for the introduction of such a scheme.  Following the introduction of double-yellow lines near the arches and outside Grange school earlier this year effectively managing any previous issue with visibility, there has been no consequence resulting in any excessive parking problem elsewhere within Welbeck Road or the surrounding area - negating the only possible reason for introducing a CPZ.	1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report. Parking may not have displaced to near this residents address as a result of recent restrictions. They may however experience increased parking from the introduction of a CPZ nearby. 2. Residents of Welbeck Road have been complaining about parking and asking for parking controls for a number of years. There was majority support for taking action from responses in the initial public consultation and a CPZ was the preferred means of control in responses. CPZs not just used where there are stations or shops nearby but anywhere where there is an issue with parking by non-residents. The operating time for the proposed CPZ

		<p>Having discussed the situation with a number of neighbours, there is unanimous agreement against the introduction of a CPZ.</p> <p>2. Welbeck Road is not within sufficient walking distance of any public transport or major town, and therefore does not suffer from commuter parking. The current plan (Mon-Sat, 8am to 6:30pm) is reflective of a serious parking issue, typically caused by excessive commuter/shopper parking. Introduction of such extensive proposal would not only inconvenience but also penalise residents for parking outside our own homes. Every vehicle has already paid the appropriate road duty and should be entitled to park without further charge in an area which does not have any significant parking issues.</p> <p>Myself and neighbours are against any CPZ and urge you to listen to the people for whom you serve. Please cancel plans for the introduction of CPZ within Welbeck Road.</p>	<p>(including Saturday) came from responses to the earlier public consultation. These hours are part of the statutory consultation process and can be reduced (but not increased) in order to address objections raised. Other objections have called for reductions in operational hours.</p>
33	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10084</p>	<p>OBJECTION to CPZ Ref:DP 2014-13</p> <p>Subsequent clarification after statutory period:</p> <p>I recognize there is a problem with parking in Welbeck Road, not least because many households (including mine) own more than one vehicle. My main objection is the cost to residents for parking outside their property - I suggest that a fairer option would be that each household is entitled to one free parking permit; any additional permits should be paid for.</p>	<p>Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report.</p> <p>Main objection to the charging structure for residents permits. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation. Councillors decide the tariff level for permits which are designed to dissuade multiple car ownership. The level of permit charges is decided by Councillors.</p>
34	<p>Resident of Welbeck Road whose address is between the junction with</p>	<p>My objections to the proposed CPZ are for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Parking congestion is bad problem only in the Welbeck Road</p>	<p>1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. This resident is in section where there is less support and more objection and therefore</p>

	<p>Twyford Road and Tintern Way who is objecting to proposals. 10055</p>	<p>Area surrounding the entrance to the Grange Primary School when the pupils are arriving and leaving.</p> <p>2. The necessity of a purchasing of a permit, if unable to park off road would not improve residents ability to park outside their own property. It would be just the same as it is now.</p> <p>Should the proposal be implemented and I'm unable to obtain co-operation with neighbours with whom I share a drive, I would find it necessary to buy a parking permit. As a retired pensioner this would be an added expense which I could well do without.</p> <p>3. I notice in the information given in the consultation document that discounts or reductions are given on visitor permit for senior citizens and those receiving mobility benefits</p> <p>Why cannot similar reductions be given to those who pay their council tax here?</p> <p>4. The operation times are excessively long. I am unable to think of a reason why restrictions should start as early as 8am and continue to 6.30pm on six days a week in what is a predominantly residential area.</p> <p>Have lived in Welbeck Road for more than 50 years. In 1950's things were very different then with four or five cars in the whole road" Time has moved on and virtually every house has a car or two or three and we have adapted to this situation without restrictions being imposed.</p> <p>In brief I would find it unnecessarily inconvenient and expensive to have the proposed CPZ imposed here and hope that my objections will be taken into consideration, along with those of my neighbours.</p>	<p>is now outside of recommended CPZ to proceed in this report.</p> <p>2. If outside of CPZ implemented would not be able to purchase a permit.</p> <p>3. Councillors decide the tariff level for permits.</p> <p>4. The operating time for the proposed CPZ (including Saturday) came from responses to the earlier public consultation. These hours are part of the statutory consultation process and can be reduced (but not increased) in order to address objections raised. Other objections have called for reductions in operational hours.</p>
--	--	---	--



35	Resident of Tintern Way living outside proposed CPZ objecting to CPZ 10012	<p>1. Firstly let me say there are no issues with parking in Tintern Way, it can be busy at times but no more than any other residential road in Harrow, or any other town/suburb through the UK, and certainly not busy enough to cause concern. It's a little busier between 8.30 and 8.45 on school days and the same between 3.15 and 3.30 with parents dropping kids off at school but nothing untoward.</p> <p>2. Restricting the parking via permits in Twyford, Welbeck and Coles Crescent will result in horrendous parking issues for local residents - for us it'll simply mean that residents in these other streets will take advantage of free parking in the non-restricted areas, of which outside our house is one.</p> <p>3. There is certainly no case for having any restricted parking on Saturdays as you propose - where is the sense in that? It's not as if commuters are parking in Tintern Way to then walk to Rayners Lane or West Harrow station, and there is no congestion at the weekend at all.</p> <p>4. Tintern Way is already the most neglected street in the area - all the others have been resurfaced with new driveway paving/pavements and grass verges/new raised kerbs while all we get is come flaky tar applied to some, but not all, the damaged areas (potholes) which are short term fixes which solve nothing, and quite frankly, this street is going to rack &amp; ruin because of Harrow Council's neglectful stance. One main concern is that large lorries use Tintern Way as a cut through to Welbeck Road, driving across the mini-roundabout kerbs and grass verges - if you spent some money sorting out this, now that would be money well spent for a change.</p>	<p>1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. The proposals were determined as a result of a public consultation. The results showed polarisation of opinion in Tintern Way with those living at the southern end considering there to be a parking problem whilst those living in this resident's section not recognising the same parking problem. The CPZ proposals do not include this address although it is fairly close outside.</p> <p>2. As the resident lives outside of the proposed CPZ they are not entitled to purchase permits. As a general approach we are guided particularly in determining restrictions in a section of road by responses from the residents living there. We do however recognise the potential impact on the wider area and wherever possible will adapt proposals to address the all concerns raised. Residents were given option of saying they would like to be included in the CPZ if one went ahead in an adjacent street.</p> <p>3. The operating time for the proposed CPZ (including Saturday) came from responses to the earlier public consultation. These hours are part of the statutory consultation process and can be reduced (but not increased) in order to address objections raised. Other objections have called for reductions in operational hours.</p> <p>4. The surface condition of Tintern Way is a separate issue but has been prioritised for resurfacing in 2015/16. Heavy goods vehicles are entitled to use Tintern Way for access but should not be mounting kerbs.</p> <p>4&amp;5. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation.</p>
----	--	--	--

		<p>5. This scheme you're proposing is nothing but a stealth tax for residents who get very poor service in return, and we are strongly opposed to it. My neighbours have told me they are also upset with the proposals.</p>	
36	<p>Resident from same address as 35 objecting to CPZ proposals 10071</p>	<p>1. I am writing to you to strongly object to the ridiculous proposal for parking restrictions on Tintern Way and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>2. I am both confused and appalled at these suggestions, which seem to me to be no more than another tax bestowed upon local residents with absolutely no return on investment other than extreme inconvenience.</p> <p>3. I would be intrigued to see the data collected that apparently represents a majority of the residents on the roads set to be affected by the plans, as I am sure that paying £65+ for the privilege of parking on our own streets (and having visitors) was not a suggestion that came from the tax payer - especially for residents of Tintern Way which seems to have been overlooked during recent re-surfacing of local roads, apart from the odd smattering of unsightly tarmac on the occasional section of pavement.</p> <p>4. I am wondering why your proposals suggest a controlled parking zone from 8am to 6:30pm on weekdays PLUS Saturday's, in a residential area which is barely walking distance to local stations and/or businesses - especially when residential areas around West Harrow and Rayners Lane stations only have a 10 - 11am restriction, which seemingly alleviates any congestion issues without causing a massive inconvenience for residents.</p> <p>5. Living close outside the</p>	<p>1. Parking problems reported by residents diminish with distance from The Arches and Grange School entrance. The proposals were determined as a result of a public consultation. The results showed polarisation of opinion in Tintern Way with those living at the southern end considering there to be a parking problem whilst those living in this section not recognising the same parking problem. The CPZ proposals do not include this address although it is fairly close outside.</p> <p>2. National legislation dictates that CPZs and similar parking measures are self financing. It does however take quite a number of years to recoup all the costs in introducing CPZs. Any surpluses then produced are ring-fenced to transport issues again by legislation.</p> <p>3. The results of the previous consultation were discussed with ward councillors and reported to the councils Traffic &amp; Road safety Advisory Panel. This report is public available via the council website. The surface condition of Tintern Way is a separate issue but has been prioritised for resurfacing in 2015/16.</p> <p>4. The operating time for the proposed CPZ (including Saturday) came from responses to the earlier public consultation. These hours are part of the statutory consultation process and can be reduced (but not increased) in order to address objections raised. Other objections have called for reductions in operational hours.</p> <p>5. As the resident lives outside of the proposed CPZ they are not entitled to purchase permits. As a general approach we are guided particularly in determining restrictions in a section of road by responses from the residents living there. We do however recognise the potential impact on the wider area and wherever possible will adapt proposals to address the all concerns raised.</p>

		<p>proposed CPZ in Tintern Way, which will undoubtedly be privvy to the knock on effect of those who are no longer able to park outside their own houses, and will now park outside mine. I do not find it acceptable to have an extra expense of £65+ per month on my already stretched salary, when the council tax that is already being paid is seemingly not being put to good use.</p>	
37	<p>Resident of Tintern Way located just outside proposed CPZ boundary who is opposed to CPZ. 9838</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposed to the proposed restrictions and particularly resident permit parking.</li> <li>2. Surprised residents would want to pay to park outside their own homes.</li> <li>3. Appreciate concern for children's safety when attending Grange school and the congestion caused by parent's vehicles inappropriately parking including across driveways, but charging residents will not prevent these people parking where they like, badly and across residents drives etc. Proposed restriction may well make parent parking worse. Do not experience parking congestion in my part of Tintern Way.</li> <li>4. Scheme proposals do not effect my property (yet!) although concerned that it might be extended to include his address.</li> <li>5. Concerned this may just be to raise money for council.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not a formal objection rather comments in opposition to the CPZ proposals in general. Does not directly provide reason or how they consider they would be directly affected by proposals.</li> <li>2. This is view of other people's opinions and not directly relevant. It however indicates cost of permits as a reason for the resident being opposed in principle.</li> <li>3. Supports action to address parking problems and safety issue for children at beginning and end of school day but believes proposals may make it worse. Proposals are for yellow lines across driveways so should help deter parking even for short periods there. More space may well be available in parking bays by school entrance for drop off / pick up of children.</li> <li>4. Resident does not consider directly affected by present proposals subject of consultation. Responses from residents in this section of Tintern Way did not consider there to be a parking problem to justify CPZ which is why they have not been included in CPZ proposals. It is not possible to address representations on what might possibly happen in future proposals. Any further proposals would need to go through a series of stages of consultation.</li> <li>5. CPZ's only taken forward where majority support. See also response 1.2 and 2.3 above</li> </ol>
38	<p>Resident of Chatsworth Gardens located outside proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 9918</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Object to the CPZ being brought to Welbeck Road, it does not affect me financially but will displace parking to our street (Chatsworth Gardens) a cul de sac. We observed this during pavement and road surfacing work on Welbeck Rd in the summer.</li> <li>2. The residents of Welbeck Road</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parking may well have displaced into Chatsworth Gardens during carriageway resurfacing in Welbeck Road which included the junction with Chatsworth Gardens. The CPZ as proposed is at least 140 metres from potential parking in Chatsworth Gardens and a further 85 metres from the objector address. It is therefore unlikely to suffer directly even if</li> </ol>

		<p>have parking problems because of the Arches, this will move to our street, and be used to justify a CPZ here. This would produce extra revenue for the council but it is as a further tax which as a full time carer I cannot afford.</p> <p>3. Support double yellow lines as been an improvement for driving, as there was a blind spot but has reduced parking, and suggest you place another set of double yellow lines on Welbeck Rd on the turn between Chatsworth Gardens and Tintern Way, if one was driving towards Furness Road. There are times when one cannot see around the bend if there are cars parked there. The double yellow lines suggested at the alley in Chatsworth Gardens will reduce parking too, and as it is i have difficulty when there are large cars parked in front of my drive.</p> <p>4. A number of times i am faced with drivers who speed around here despite the speed bumps, I suggest install a camera. You have installed a 20 mph speed limit, does it achieve anything?</p> <p>5. I strongly object as I take my mother to the Beacon Centre every Thursday , its a gathering for Asian Women from 1pm to 4pm, and the proposed CPZ would affect me dropping her with the ease I have now.</p>	<p>the CPZ went into the full extent advertised.</p> <p>2. The introduction of a CPZ may well displace parking but it is unlikely to displace parking problems due to businesses from The Arches as far as Chatsworth Gardens. It appears the resident is objecting to potential future proposals indirectly consequent on the current proposal.</p> <p>3. Double yellow lines were proposed within the initial consultation area of the parking review and in the immediate periphery. This included the walking route from Abercorn Crescent to Welbeck Road passing the northern entrance to the school. The bend suggested by the resident was considered beyond the remit of this parking review. It is not obvious whether the resident is against the proposed double yellow lines at the junction of the three arms of Chatsworth Gardens.</p> <p>4. Traffic calming and enforcement of speed restrictions are not part of this consultation.</p> <p>5. The CPZ proposals in Scott Crescent are being removed from the scheme. Even had they proceeded they would have been waiting restrictions so do not prevent dropping off or picking up. In fact restrictions can make finding nearby parking easier as more space is available.</p>
39	<p>Representative of West Harrow Bowling Club, Shaftesbury Avenue expressing concern about CPZ proposals 10043</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the above club regarding the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in parts of Welbeck Road and Tintern Way. It is appreciated that this is the other end of Welbeck Road to which the entrance to West Harrow Recreation Ground is located. I would assume that vehicles currently parking in the area of your proposed CPZ will encroach further up Welbeck Road. We at West Harrow Bowling Club currently have difficulty parking near the Recreation Ground and this proposal will make parking more difficult. The majority of our members are elderly and already</p>	<p>Not a formal objection, rather a raising of concerns about the potential effect of displaced parking. With their predominantly elderly membership there is concern that parking might displace making parking near the Shaftesbury Avenue entrance to West Harrow park more difficult. The reduction in the hours of restriction recommended and the reduced geographical extent should reduce the amount of parking displacement. The Shaftesbury Avenue access to park is c 500 metres from the nearest recommended CPZ restrictions so displacement unlikely.</p>

		<p>have difficulty parking near to the entrance of the Recreation Ground.</p> <p>Other options for parking in Wilson Gardens not viable as already full prior to our arrival.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Representations regarding proposals for controlled parking zone to operate Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm – Coles Crescent and adjoining streets

	Source	Objections or other representations	How addressed and/or officer comment
1	Resident of Annan Court. Coles Crescent whose address is within proposed CPZ who is objecting to CPZ 9952	<p>Object very strongly to proposed CPZ on the Rayners Lane Estate. I am a disabled pensioner and the CPZ is going to bring me hardship and a lot of unwanted problems. My friends help me with the bulky and heavy shopping. My prescriptions are delivered from the pharmacy. There are 5 households in my block who use the same pharmacy and are relying on that vital service.</p> <p>2. The books of visitor permits will incur and extra unwanted expense which I can do without. If I have more than one person visiting me at the same time, then the books of visitor permits will be finished very fast.</p> <p>3. In 2002 our landlord HOME took over to rebuild the Rayners Lane Estate as the council did not have the funds to do it. I very strongly believe that it should be our landlord Home that should have the right to issue to all the residents with parking permits instead of the council. It is to HOME that the residents on the Rayners Lane Estate pay their service charges and the rent.</p> <p>4. I personally think that the CPZ will not solve the problem as they will go elsewhere. It will be like a vicious circle.</p>	<p>1. Deliveries of heavy or bulky goods is termed loading and is allowed without a permit as long as the delivery process is obvious and reasonably continuous. Similar would even apply to medicines being delivered as parking tickets only issued after a period of observation. Alternatively the zone is relatively small and a vehicle can be parking outside the zone.</p> <p>2. In the previous consultation the majority of responses considered there to be a parking problem. They also chose a CPZ with permits as the means of control even having been advised of the costs of permits. If the resident has blue badge this can be used if the friends/family are coming to provide transport for them. It would appear the resident perhaps has overestimated the number of visitor permits they may require. All additional expenditure is unwelcome but as a pensioner they get a 50% discount on visitor permits. The zone operational period recommended has been reduced to Monday to Friday 9-10am and 3-4pm so scope to arrange visits when not restricted on Monday to Friday or throughout weekend.</p> <p>3. The roads and pavements, including the inset parking bays in Coles Crescent are public highway and as such are the responsibility of the council not HOME. HOME are at liberty to issue permit and control parking in un-adopted streets.</p> <p>4. CPZ provide preferential parking rights to residents within the zone at a cost of buying permits. There may be some displaced parking but it is surprising how little distance people are prepared to walk from previous experience.</p>
2	Resident of Annan Court. Coles Crescent who is objecting to CPZ 9999	<p>I object very strongly to the CPZ on the Rayners Lane Estate.</p> <p>1. I rely a lot on my family for help because of my health issues.</p> <p>2. I also rely on the delivery of my prescriptions from the pharmacy.</p> <p>3. The CPZ will bring me hardship and a lot of unwanted problems. I am also afraid that I will not get</p>	<p>1&amp;3. The care needs of this objector are not clear. However if there are regular / frequent family / friends visits to provide care the resident can apply for a postcode permit which is transferable between vehicles. If the visitor is coming to provide transport a blue badge can be displayed and no visitors permit is required. Any visitors' permits required are at a 50%</p>

		<p>their help anymore if the CPZ is put in force.</p> <p>The books of visitor permits will incur an extra unwanted expense which I cannot afford and do without. It will cost me a lot of money, which I do not have to spend.</p>	<p>discount to elderly or disabled.</p> <p>Additionally the proposed zone is relatively small and a permit is not required to park outside the zone or when it is not in operation. The zone operational period recommended has been reduced to Monday to Friday 9-10am and 3-4pm, so scope to arrange visits when not restricted on Monday to Friday or throughout weekend.</p> <p>2. The deliver of heavy or bulky items would be regarded as loading and remains un-restricted. Deliveries from a pharmacy would also not need a permit especially as they would be relatively short in duration. If a long period was required and not involve heavy or bulky goods, parking could take place outside the zone, which is relatively small.</p>
3	<p>Resident of Annan Court. Coles Crescent who is objecting to CPZ 9904</p>	<p>1. I object very strongly to have the CPZ on the Rayners Lane Estate. I am Disabled with severe mobility problems. The CPZ is going to bring me hardship and problems as I rely on my friends for help as I do not drive anymore. The books of visitor permits will incur an extra unwanted expense which I can do without. It will cost me a lot of money, which I do not have to spend.</p>	<p>1. The care needs of this objector are not clear. However if appropriate carer permits are available to organisations providing care. If there are regular / frequent family / friends visits to provide care the resident can apply for a postcode permit which is transferable. If the visitor is coming to provide transport a blue badge can be displayed and no visitors permit is required. Any visitors' permits required are at a 50% discount to elderly or disabled. The zone operational period recommended has been reduced to Monday to Friday 9-10am and 3-4pm, so scope to arrange visits when not restricted on Monday to Friday or throughout weekend.</p>
4	<p>Resident of Annan Ct, Coles Crescent who is objecting proposed CPZ 10017</p>	<p>I object to having a controlled parking zone in this area.</p> <p>1. I believe the proposed CPZ is just a stealth tax that is unwelcome as people are already struggling to get by.</p> <p>2. If the cars from the garages under the arches are a problem, then this is not the way to solve it. The council needs to get in touch with the garages and come to some agreement with them about how many cars they can have at any one time, and where they can store them.</p> <p>3. But to charge residents £65 to park is not fair. It's an extra</p>	<p>1, 3 &amp; 4. CPZs are relatively expensive to introduce so any net income produced from such parking schemes only occurs after quite a number of years. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. The costs of permits were explained to residents in the earlier public consultation which saw a majority saying there was a parking problem and CPZ was the preferred means of control. The objector is correct that residents do not have to buy permits either for themselves or their visitors but it does give those living with the CPZ the option of buying permits to make it easier to park near their homes. Those without permits can park in bays when they are not in operation or outside the zone.</p>

		<p>burden on car drivers who already are paying Road Tax, and Council Tax, as well as Income Tax and VAT, and now another charge.</p> <p>4. What will happen is the people who can't afford to pay, or choose not to pay, will find it even harder to find parking spaces, because all the free spaces will be taken up by the garages, and other residents who have chosen not to pay. This will leave spaces empty, that are for permit holders, and make it harder to find a space.</p> <p>5. I suggest that the council put permit spaces specifically where people are asking for them, which I believe is only at one end of Welbeck Road (the end near to the garages).</p> <p>6. Also, if there is an issue with the garages taking on cars when they don't have private space for them, then they need to be worked with, and dealt with, and don't make the residents here pay for problems caused by the garages.</p>	<p>Empty spaces within a CPZ provide good parking options for those with permit. The zone operational period recommended has been reduced to Monday to Friday 9-10am and 3-4pm, so scope to arrange visits when not restricted on Monday to Friday or throughout weekend.</p> <p>2 &amp; 6. The various businesses operating in The Arches (which is a private road owned by Transport for London) are not within the control of the council. Any vehicle is equally allowed to park on the public highway whether it is owned by a resident or not. A CPZ is only means of providing residents preferential parking rights but as explained above there has to be a change.</p> <p>5. The parking problems may be focussed around the junction of Welbeck Road and The Arches however the existing problem as reported by residents is significantly wider. People further down Coles Crescent and Serenity Close are asking to be included. The boundary of the CPZ at present proposed is based on where there was majority support in the previous public consultation.</p>
5	<p>Resident of Concord Court, Coles Crescent who is objecting to the CPZ 10078</p>	<p>Object to introduction of a CPZ Rayners Lane estate.</p> <p>1. I feel that we pay enough council tax and I am currently finding it hard to feed myself and my children's due to immense hardship. Where do you expect us to find the extra money to pay for permits, when many of us cannot afford to feed our families. Having the CPZ on Coles Crescent is unfair as there are not many people (on the estate) with vehicles.</p> <p>2. The main perpetrators are the garages which is located at the back of our homes, They park their vehicles sometimes without valid tax discs for months on end and yet we are the ones to feel it in our pockets. I personally feel you need to target the culprits and not innocent people who pays their rent and council tax.</p>	<p>1. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. The costs of permits were explained to residents in the earlier public consultation which saw a majority saying there was a parking problem and CPZ was the preferred means of control. Residents do not have to buy permits either for themselves or their visitors but it does give those living with the CPZ the option of buying permits to make it easier to park near their homes. Those without permits can park in bays when they are not in operation or outside the zone which is relatively small. It is up to people to decide if they can afford to run a car. The zone operational period recommended has been reduced to Monday to Friday 9-10am and 3-4pm, so scope to arrange visits when not restricted on Monday to Friday or throughout weekend.</p> <p>2. The business operating in The Arches</p>



		<p>3. I understand HOME is responsible for Rayners Lane estate and why are they not the one to issue us with permits to their residents as many of us pays rent to them.</p>	<p>are equally entitled to park their vehicles on the public highway as residents in the absence of a CPZ. Any vehicle parked on the public highway needs to be taxed and ensured etc.</p> <p>3. The roads like Coles Crescent where the CPZ is proposed are all public highway so it is the council's responsibility to consult, introduce and administer any such parking scheme as the highway authority. Home may if they see it is appropriate</p>
6	<p>Resident of Cerise Court, Drinkwater Road who is objecting to CPZ particularly in Drinkwater Road. 9812</p>	<p>1. Object to proposed CPZ in this area - in particular the section of Drinkwater Road next to Cerise Court.</p> <p>2. I rarely have any problem parking by Cerise Court in Drinkwater Road.</p> <p>3. A CPZ would require me pay £64.90 per year extra for no benefit.</p> <p>Introducing a CPZ will not make it easier to park in Drinkwater Road as all the residents will buy permits as they have to park their cars somewhere, so it will make no difference to the availability of spaces.</p>	<p>1. Specific objection to proposed CPZ in short section of Drinkwater Road beside the flank of Cerise Court which mainly fronts Coles Crescent.</p> <p>2. Parking on the Drinkwater Road side of Cerise Court may not, at present, be such an issue as the Coles Crescent elevation where the main entrance is located and where the majority of responses stated a parking problem. If a CPZ proceeds in the area some parking displacement is likely making parking in unrestricted streets nearby more difficult.</p> <p>3. Living within a CPZ does not compel residents to purchase a parking permit but it does provide the opportunity to buy permits which are needed if the resident or their visitors want to park in a permit bay during the operation of the CPZ. The resident lives just within the proposed CPZ boundary so along with other residents could choose to park outside the CPZ if they can find space. People's circumstances vary so every resident with a car may well not all purchase permits. In evenings and Sundays when zone is not in operation, permits not required, so residents would have the same access to parking as at present but if it has been restricted non resident parking would be unlikely.</p>
7.	<p>Resident of Cerise Court, Drinkwater Road who is expressing strong disagreement with CPZ 9886</p>	<p>Intense disagreement with proposed CPZ in my area</p>	<p>Clearly opposed to proposed CPZ but no reasons or personal implications provided. Not a formal objection.</p>
		<p>Responses below from outside</p>	<p>area of proposed CPZ</p>
8	<p>Resident of Coles Crescent whose address is outside but</p>	<p>I have been a Harrow resident for about 20 years and am objecting to the Welbeck Road Area CPZ proposals.</p>	<p>1&amp;2 . The council after receiving complaints from residents over a number of years agreed to consult residents as part of an area-wide parking review. This</p>

	<p>close to proposed CPZ area 10063</p>	<p>1. I have never been made aware that parking is to become a payable aspect of my day to day home life.</p> <p>2. Being a working family this is a additional cost to my household that I will not be compensated for. This cost will dearly affect my expenses and affect mine and my families day to day life, as we have more then one vehicle between us.</p> <p>3. We were residents of the old flat system and as part of the move to a new home were never informed that parking restrictions would come to play.</p> <p>4. The bay parallel to my home and opposite the street to my house will have no CPZ permits however despite being virtually on the street I will be paying and my neighbours will not. I can provide photographic evidence of this.</p> <p>5. How will the control stop people parking further down the road? This will not control the parking but more so create more nuisance for people like myself who just want to park outside my home. The control does not have a fair coverage of all the potential parking areas.</p> <p>6. I do not at all find acceptable or understand as to why some residences have been sent individual letters and free parking permits and some have not. I find this partiality discriminating and disgusting as I believe we should all receive the same treatment.</p> <p>7. In addition I will now have to pay for the visitors who visit my home. Yet the businesses from the arches will continue to park all down along the rest of the road for free.</p> <p>8. Also we already in the area</p>	<p>consultation asked residents if parking was a problem for them and if it was what action should be taken. The majority of responses from the section of Coles Crescent nearly up to Serenity Close said they experienced parking problems and mostly prefer a CPZ as the means of addressing these problems. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. The costs of permits were explained to residents in the earlier public consultation. Residents do not have to buy permits either for themselves or their visitors but it does give those living with the CPZ the option of buying permits to make it easier to park near their homes. Those without permits can park in bays when they are not in operation or outside the zone which is relatively small. It is up to people to decide if they can afford to run one or more cars.</p> <p>3. The redevelopment of the Rayners Lane estate and the current parking restriction proposals are unconnected.</p> <p>4&amp;7. The objector is outside of the proposed CPZ so is not eligible to buy permits. The bay described is also outside the CPZ so is not restricted.</p> <p>5. As explained above the extent of the proposed CPZ was determined for responses to the previous public consultation. Beyond this the only proposed restrictions are double yellow lines on junctions. The remaining areas including the inset bay remain unrestricted and available to anyone to park as they are at present.</p> <p>6. The same statutory consultation leaflet was sent to all residents who were consulted in the previous public consultation in March/April 2014. No individual letters offering free parking permits have been issued.</p> <p>8. The shortage for parking space for residents was a cause of complaints which led to the parking review and these proposals. Those residents living within a CPZ are generally eligible to buy permits which gives them preferential parking rights – able to park in permit bays. Although a parking space is not guaranteed experience shows CPZ generally have more spaces available to</p>
--	---	--	---

		have a lack of parking spaces and on many occasions have had to park a long distance from where I live to find space. How will the CPZ aid in ensuring that we get a parking space? It does not guarantee a space.	park even when the zone is not in operation.
9	Resident of Coles Crescent living just outside proposed CPZ in support of proposals. 9964	I would like parking permit to be introduced, as it is not fair on those who do not have more than 1 car or no cars at all. Some people use their bins to reserve their parking space, despite having more than 2 or 3 cars in one household. Therefore it would be really great if parking permit is introduced.	Not a formal objection rather in support of operation of a CPZ. This resident lives outside the proposed CPZ so would not be able to purchase permits.
10	Resident of Eliot Drive whose address is outside proposed CPZ boundary who is objecting to CPZ. 9961	<p>1. Object to the Welbeck Road Area Parking Review. I do not see a parking problem in the area near my home.</p> <p>2. The main (problem) is with Welbeck Road and not the surrounding areas due to the school but only at certain times such as the beginning and end of school, so why is not a parking time restriction placed on Welbeck Road during these times.</p> <p>3. I feel this parking issue has been brought about by residents who don't own cars and full consideration for car owners has not taken place. We did not have trouble for years, I think at least one day you should come and take a look at Welbeck Road and see if there is any parking issues.</p>	<p>1. Objector lives well outside of where CPZ proposed where people did not consider there to be a parking problem in the previous consultation and so only double yellow lines on junctions proposed.</p> <p>2. Objector makes his/her assessment of where there is a parking problem. The purpose of the public consultation was for residents to assess the parking situation outside of their address and decide if it needed restrictions having been advised the costs of permits. Responses from this consultation enabled the majority view to decide the extent of the proposed CPZ. Others especially those living in Welbeck Road have questioned the need for all day Monday to Saturday restrictions.</p> <p>3. Parking problems do not just affect those who own vehicles. Both those with and without vehicles have an opportunity to express their views.</p>
11	Resident of Coral Court, Serenity Close who is objecting as the CPZ controls do not extend to include the parking near their address 9860	<p>"Objects" because the proposed new CPZ does not cover enough road or parking bay areas in particular Serenity Close and adjacent section of Coles Crescent including in front of 65 to 81 Coles Crescent.</p> <p>Why does it not extend to cover the parking bays outside and serving Coral Court and the bays opposite serving the new houses on Coles Crescent?</p> <p>The reason and basis for objection is barely have enough spaces for</p>	<p>Serenity Close and section of Coles Crescent adjacent were within the original consultation area but the majority of the responses from here did not consider there to be a parking problem nor wanted including if people from adjacent streets decided to have a CPZ. This area was therefore not included within the area for CPZ.</p> <p>Clearly this person identifies an existing problem and is concern it will get worse if not within a CPZ. This is in marked contrast to some people living nearer to Welbeck Road. There is a pedestrian</p>

		<p>all of our own resident's vehicles at present. Any vehicle without a residents parking permit when there is a CPZ will park in unrestricted areas like around Serenity Close if not restricted. There is already a parking problem from the archway garages and their customers sometimes for extended periods of time. This means there is not enough space for residents to park. If our spaces are not restricted we will get even more parking from the businesses in The Archway and any other vehicle without a permit.</p> <p>Please could you do something to extend the restriction to this area also.</p>	<p>access from Coles Crescent to The Arches.</p> <p>Serenity Close and the parking bays in front of the properties in Coles Crescent behind the footway are not part of the public highway and therefore cannot have CPZ bays introduced. The council has no jurisdiction over this space which is the responsibility of the landowner. This could include warning signs or even their own permit scheme. The only potential CPZ bays would be in the parallel inset bays on the south east side of Coles Crescent by Serenity Close.</p> <p>At this stage it is not practical to extend the proposals without re-advertising the scheme. This would not be justified especially as the majority responses here did not want CPZ controls. If a CPZ is introduced there is potential for a future review when opinions may have changed.</p>
12	<p>Resident of Coral Court, Serenity Close who is objecting as the CPZ controls do not extend to include the parking nearby 9903 / 9833</p>	<p>1. "Objection" as that CPZ doesn't go far enough should cover Serenity Close and adjacent section of Coles Crescent We barely have enough parking spaces for all of our own vehicles as it is. Concerned that new controls will lead more vehicles without a parking permit to park where there are no restrictions like Serenity Close. There is already a major problem from the archway garage businesses. They park their customer's vehicles in our bays for days on end. Most nights there are no spaces left to park our cars at all. We need our bays including otherwise we will get all the business/customer vehicles being dumped outside our homes, along with any other private vehicles from the restricted areas that do not have a valid parking permit. The situation will only get worse for everybody concerned in this area.</p> <p>Please do something helpful and extend the restriction to this area also.</p>	<p>Serenity Close is not currently adopted public highway and cannot have parking restrictions in the same way. It is up to the owner of Serenity Close to introduce any restrictions not the council. The majority of responses from the adjacent section of Coles Crescent and Serenity Close did considered there to be a parking problem in the previous public consultation hence the CPZ proposals stopped short of this section of Coles Crescent. It is not practical to extend the proposals without re-advertising them. Opinion in this round of consultation equally divided.</p> <p>2. This concern for an existing parking problem with fear that it will get worse due to displacement is contrary to opinion of no parking problem to justify a CPZ expressed by others in Coles Crescent. The parking issues may be associated with the pathway between the two parks of Concord Terrace leading to The Arches.</p> <p>3. If a CPZ is introduced a future review could re-examine parking needs in peripheral roads. At that stage Serenity Close might have been adopted.</p>
13	<p>Resident of Serenity Close who is "objecting" the</p>	<p>1. I cannot believe that Serenity Close is not included.</p> <p>2. We were assured when our</p>	<p>1. See comments in 12 above who raises very similar concerns about parking.</p> <p>2. Any assurances given would have</p>

	<p>CPZ controls do not extent to include the parking nearby 9906</p>	<p>housing was being redeveloped in 2007/8 that we would have a parking bay outside our house. When we moved back in April 2011 parking was ok for about 6 months until "Coral Court" was occupied. The entrance onto Serenity Close used as main entrance and access to parking. There is no longer room for everyone to park. We were going to paint our numbers outside our Houses but again we were assured there wouldn't be any need.</p> <p>3. I work in *** Hospital, often unsociable hours. On arriving back at all hours day or night I cannot park anywhere near my home. I am more than willing to pay the fixed amount for a permit.</p> <p>4. The worse people for parking where they like is the Garages from The Arches when they park for days, weeks and months. I received assurances from Traffic Highways last year in Harrow Council that situation sorted". I plead with you to include Serenity Close in your plans nothing would make me feel better than going to work knowing that when I come back home my parking space is available outside my door.</p>	<p>come from housing developer as roadway is not adopted. If it does become public highway will then be equally available to all drivers unless there is a permit parking scheme. In its un-adopted state the developer can operate its own parking controls &amp; possibly permits. They can choose to mark and allocate spaces as they see fit.</p> <p>3. Permits are only available to people living within the respective controlled parking zone</p> <p>4. The only way to control parking from non-residents (if the vehicle is taxed and insured) whilst protecting space for residents on the public highway is a CPZ with permits. However these are only introduced where there is majority support which was not the case for this section of Coles Crescent. Parking in Serenity Close which is not at present public highway is outside of the control of the council. As mentioned previously parking restriction proposals cannot be extended without re-consultation for which there is no justification or budget.</p> <p>As with 12 above the parking problems viewed by this resident is quite different for those other residents in Coles Crescent who object to CPZ proposals saying there is not a parking problem to justify a CPZ and the cost of permits.</p>
14	<p>Resident of Coral Court, Serenity Close who is objecting to CPZ 10020</p>	<p>1. Object to have Welbeck Road as well as other roads to be CPZ as this will directly impact Serenity Close and the whole area. As far as I am concerned Welbeck road does not have parking problems and all of its residents can park their car's in front of their house if their road becomes CPZ. If the road becomes CPZ it will create problems on my road in terms of parking.</p> <p>2. When we bought this apartment we were told that there was no parking issues hence we bought the property 3 years ago. I still do not believe there is any problem around the area however if CPZ is</p>	<p>1. The council after receiving complaints from residents over a number of years agreed to consult residents as part of an area-wide parking review. This consultation asked residents if parking was a problem for them and if it was what action should be taken. The majority of responses from the section of Coles Crescent nearly up to Serenity Close said they experienced parking problems and most prefer a CPZ as the means of addressing these problems. The majority of residents from Serenity Close and the adjacent section of Coles Crescent did not consider there to be sufficient a parking problem to justify the costs of having a CPZ so their views were respected and they were left outside of the proposed CPZ. It was explained in the</p>

		<p>introduced this will create problems for the whole area!</p> <p>3. CPZ will cause inconvenience to my guests when they visiting they will not be able to find free spot to park easily and as result I believe my road eventually will have to become CPZ and then I would be at a loss financially which I can't afford.</p> <p>4. In this community we have a lot of disabled which will cause them problems when visiting the beacon centre hence they will not visit any more.</p> <p>5. I believe that the Council wants to make financial gains as there is no need for CPZ!</p>	<p>public consultation that parking can displace but very few residents revised their position on a CPZ. Serenity Close is not a present public Highway so restrictions or CPZ cannot be introduced here by the council. It is the responsibility of others not the council to control parking in Serenity Close if they see fit.</p> <p>2. Parking situations change over time and it is up to any potential purchaser etc. to assess the parking situation. Had such a parking review been underway at the time of purchase this would have been advised in the local authority search.</p> <p>3. Visitor permits can be purchased by residents living within the zone to make it easier for their visitors to park. Outside of the zone the only restrictions proposed are double yellow lines on junctions etc. It is up to the owner of Serenity Close to control parking within it in consultation with residents. When/whether Serenity Close becomes public highway and whether its residents want to join a CPZ is unknown. This is outside the remit of this consultation.</p> <p>4. Blue badge holders are entitled to park for free in permit bays and can park for up to 3 hours on yellow line restrictions so long as loading restrictions are not in force. The proposals may thus make it easier for a blue badge holder to find a parking space.</p> <p>5. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. From previous experience CPZs take quite a number of years to recoup the initial cost so are not good for achieving financial benefits for the council.</p>
--	--	---	--

## Representations regarding proposals for controlled parking zone to operate Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm – Scott Crescent

	Source	Objections or other representations	How addressed and/or officer comment
		All Scott Crescent is outside of	CPZ area recommended to proceed
1.	Resident of Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent who states objecting but provides no details 9856	Objects to traffic order but does not specify which proposals or provide any reason for objection. Clarification sought	Can not be considered as a statutory objection as this resident has not advised what proposals they are objecting to nor provides any reason why they are "objecting." No response received to the request for clarification.
2	Resident of Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent who is objecting to CPZ 9913	<p>1. Object strongly to the CPZ proposals, which are being imposed.</p> <p>2. We as residents of the Rayners Lane Estate do not have issues of parking.</p> <p>3. I do not like proposed CPZ as I depend on my friends and family visits to help me as a disabled person. Buying visitor permits would cost me a lot of money. I (along with other residents on the estate) cannot afford this extra cost.</p> <p>4. As parking problems not an issue for most residents I don't think that the CPZ is the best idea and solution for those who have issues with parking in this residential area.</p>	<p>1. The CPZ proposals are the subject of statutory consultation which allow for people to make representations including formal objections. These must be considered before a decision is made as to which proposals are to be implemented.</p> <p>2 &amp; 4. The resident lives in residential block at junction between Welbeck Road and Scott Crescent but does not consider there to be a parking issue whereas a resident of Serenity Close further from Welbeck Road/The Arches is concerned about existing parking problems. There are old "Resident's parking only" signs from when spaces not public highway which need to be removed. It is possible these are dissuading some parking</p> <p>3. Proposed CPZ does not extend far into Eliot Drive so unrestricted bays less than 100metres distant. Visitors would only need a permit if parking within CPZ during the operational period.</p>
3	Resident of Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent, whose address is close to junction with Welbeck Road, who objects to CPZ. 10024	<p>I object to the proposed parking permits in the Scott Crescent area.</p> <p>1. The problems that are experienced in this area are due to local businesses parking their vehicles in the residents parking spaces and on the street, anywhere they can. Why is it therefore logical to charge the residents? Why not charge the local businesses? Provide permits for the residents to distinguish between those that can park and those that can't. Then fine the people without permits or visitors permits.</p>	<p>1 &amp; 3 The various businesses operating in The Arches (which is a private road owned by Transport for London) are not within the control of the council. Any vehicle is equally allowed to park on the public highway whether it is owned by a resident or not. A CPZ is only means of providing residents preferential parking rights. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self-financing hence the need for charge for permits but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. Councillors have decided the cost of permits which were explained to residents in each consultation.</p> <p>2. Although having a permit does not guarantee a parking space experience</p>

		<p>2. Having a parking permit will still not guarantee a parking space with all the cars that park here. How is charging the residents going to stop that?</p> <p>3. On the other hand maybe people who have more than one car per household should be charged.</p>	<p>from other CPZ shows that there is substantially more space for residents and their visitors to park in the bays especially when the zone is in operation. However this greater space is also noticed when CPZ not in operation.</p>
4	<p>Representative of Beacon Centre &amp; Home Group objecting to CPZ proposals especially around Beacon Centre in Scott Crescent 9998</p>	<p>Home Group would like to object to the residents parking scheme planned to be introduced in the Welbeck Road area for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The main problem with parking in the area is caused by businesses located in The Arches. These companies consistently park their vehicles waiting to be repaired in the local streets causing a major nuisance and annoyance to local residents. The proposals would only result in these companies parking their cars in the areas not affected by the parking restrictions resulting in increased problems in these areas.</p> <p>2. Extending the scheme to the junction of Scott Crescent and Austin Road would have a severe effect on the revenue income stream of the Beacon Centre. Currently the Beacon Centre car park contains fifteen car parking spaces and two disabled parking bays. The average car usage for customers using the Centre on a daily basis is twenty-five. This problem would be increased under the proposals because the six bays to the rear of the Centre next to Unity Terrace would become residents only parking. As a business the Beacon Centre would be unable to utilise these spaces and a decrease in revenue to the Beacon Centre would have serious ramifications on the amount of community events we would be able to offer the local community. The Beacon Centre is an important feature of the</p>	<p>1. Objection is that the parking problems attributed to the businesses from The Arches will just displace to streets outside of proposed CPZ. This is a risk however experience from elsewhere suggests this is a diminishing problem the further the CPZ extends from the source of the problem. Concerns about displacement were why Councillors and officers recommended Scott Crescent should be included with other roads in the CPZ proposals going to statutory consultation.</p> <p>2. The parking area between Unity Terrace and the Beacon Centre and the road to the southwest of the Beacon Centre are all public highway. The Beacon centre cannot rely on this parking space for visitors to the centre. There are 15 spaces in a separate carpark off the public highway at the north-western end of the Beacon Centre. Any area of public highway within a CPZ would normally be controlled (ie either permit bay or yellow lines). Residents with permits would be able to use any permit bays when visiting the Beacon Centre. Blue badge holders are entitled to park in permit bay without displaying a permit. The use by visitors to the Beacon Centre of parking around the centre is a cause of complaint of other objectors to these proposals. What support in the previous consultation there was for a CPZ was confined to the Coles Crescent end of Scott Crescent. The time period of the proposed CPZ was opposed as too long by other representations. A reduction in this would provide more opportunities for visits without the need for visitor permits. The council does not want to detrimentally affect the operation of the Beacon Centre which it recognises as a valuable community resource.</p> <p>3. There is a legitimate vehicular access to The Arches from Welbeck Road. TfL have advised that some (longer) vehicles</p>



		<p>regeneration of the Rayners Lane estate and is used by a number of public and private companies located in Harrow and a reduction in events caused by the proposed scheme would have a detrimental event on the quality of life for all the community.</p> <p>3. As a counter proposal to the planned parking area we would like to put forward a couple of suggestions for your consideration. A bollard could be erected allowing emergency use only to the arches at the junction of Welbeck Road, which would mean that the business located at the Arches would use Roxeth Green Avenue has their entrance and this road already has a good residents only parking scheme in place causing little impact.</p> <p>4. Another proposal would be to finish the parking restrictions scheme at the end of Unity Terrace where it joins with Scott Crescent and allow the Beacon Centre to readopt the six parking bays at the rear of the centre, so we have a number of spaces that we can use for future events and activities</p>	<p>can only access the destinations within The Arches using this access point due to the layout of The Arches and the railway viaduct. So it is considered impractical to close this entrance to The Arches. Additionally there are several garage businesses for which this is not their access to Welbeck Road. Further from reported parking problems in Coles Crescent and Serenity Close issues can still occur if with only a pedestrian access.</p> <p>4. What support in the previous consultation there was for a CPZ was confined to the Coles Crescent end of Scott Crescent. So the CPZ may not extend even to the limits suggested here. Against this there is the concern raised earlier in this objection about parking problems displacing to unrestricted street.</p>
5	Resident of Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent who is opposed to CPZ proposals. 10019	<p>I strongly oppose the idea of CPZ in the area,</p> <p>1. It will cause a lot of problems for the residents as many people will find it hard to afford permits such as single parents or on low income. I am a single parent myself. I have a lot of family and friends visiting including my disabled mother, I would not be able to afford extra permits for my guests, this is a very unreasonable decision taken by the council, Please take a decision in favour of the residents.</p>	<p>Although clearly opposed to a CPZ not technically a statutory objection. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. The costs of permits were explained to residents in the earlier public consultation which saw a majority saying there was a parking problem and CPZ was the preferred means of control. If the disabled mother referred to above has a blue badge this can displayed when parking in a permit bay and no permit is required. In that way parking close to the resident's address may be easier to find. The CPZ is not particularly large so visitors may chose to park outside the zone but visitor permits are an option to those living within a CPZ.</p>
6	Resident of	I have a few objections to this new	1. The proposals were not specifically

	<p>Scott Crescent living fairly near the junction with Austen Road who complains about the present parking situation which is caused by the Beacon Centre and objects to the CPZ as a means of addressing it. 10021</p>	<p>scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Before the Beacon Centre was built we did not have any problems in parking our vehicles. The only times that there are parking issues are only when there are functions at the weekends, and sometimes evenings for short periods and many times the visitors to the Beacon Centre do not park at the centres parking spaces.</li> <li>2. There is ample parking for residents however when there is a function at the Beacon Centre, it causes us a great deal of inconvenience. Thus I see it as grossly unfair that we would have to be financially burdened just to park our vehicles on your proposed CPZ.</li> <li>3. We have a registered severely visually impaired person living with us.</li> <li>4. On a separate occasion due to a function at the Beacon Centre, I had to park my vehicles further away from my house. Our vehicles were broken into.</li> <li>5. We are the most suffering ones when there is a function at the Beacon centre; as we live right opposite it. Otherwise we really don't have parking issues apart from the visitors and builders taking some of the parking spaces sometimes.</li> <li>6. We totally oppose a CPZ on our street as we will UNFAIRLY suffer more by paying to park our vehicles when we DID NOT have this problem before the Beacon centre was built.</li> <li>7. If you still want to put a CPZ, then either the Council or the Beacon centre will have to pay to drop down our curbs and build us drive for us to park our vehicles, Free of charge.</li> </ol>	<p>designed to address parking issues around the Beacon Centre due to its users however residents living within a CPZ do have preferential parking rights when the zone is in operation as they can purchase permits. The Beacon Centre does have an off street car park but without any CPZ its users are as entitled as residents to park on the public highway.</p> <p>2&amp;5. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. It is quite possible (apart from Beacon Centre functions) parking is slightly easier at this end of Scott Crescent at present. Whether this may change with the occupation of the development beside Austen Road is difficult to predict. What support in the previous consultation there was for a CPZ was confined to the Coles Crescent end of Scott Crescent.</p> <p>3. If the person has a blue badge a vehicle principally being used for their transport can display a blue badge in a permit bay without needing a permit.</p> <p>4&amp;5. If the CPZ is in operation permit holders are more likely to find parking near to there addresses.</p> <p>6. The current proposals are not directly related to the Beacon Centre. The Beacon Centre is a legitimate community resource whose users in the absence of a CPZ have equal right to park on the public highway as residents.</p> <p>7. There is no obligation on the Beacon Centre or the council to provide such off parking facilities for the resident. It is the driver's responsibility to find suitable legal and safe parking for their vehicle. If and how many vehicle's a resident owns is for them consider based on their circumstances.</p>
--	---	--	---

7	Resident of Scott Crescent living towards the Austen Road end of the street who is objecting to CPZ proposals. 10022	<p>1. It is not fair to us and strongly object the proposed CPZ. So far I have never had a parking problem on Scott Crescent.</p> <p>2. Occasionally I see many mechanics - garages operated around the arches who brings their vehicles on Scott crescent and leave for good few weeks and months for resale purposes. So we are being penalised for someone else gain (profiting).</p> <p>3. Also charging us with £65.90 for 1 car and £100 for two is too high. We pay hundreds of pounds on council tax, road tax and etc.</p> <p>4. Why is there no CPZ proposed on nearby roads such as; drinkwater road, Coles crescent, Austen road, Eliot drive, some parts of tintern way and welbeck road?</p> <p>5. The restriction between 8 - 6.30pm on Scott Crescent means the garages cars will be parked at unrestricted areas as shown in the map during day time. Later on in evening they'll bring to Scott crescent after 6.30pm when restriction finishes. Why should I pay to feed someone? In fact it will be more chaos if the proposals go ahead. It feels like we are being penalised for poor reasons. For this reason I do not feel the restriction should apply to Scott crescent. The only time when we have problems is during Beacon function and mechanics cars sometimes.</p>	<p>1. This residents address is towards the Beacon Centre end of Scott Crescent and it is quite possible parking is slightly easier at this end of the road at present. Whether this may change with the occupation of the development beside Austen Road is difficult to predict. There are quite a number of on street bays at this end of the road although there is parking pressures when events on at Beacon Centre. What support in the previous consultation there was for a CPZ was confined to the Coles Crescent end of Scott Crescent.</p> <p>2. In the absence of a CPZ non residents are equally entitled to park on the public highway as residents. There are however separate regulations why prevent vehicles being worked on or being sold from the public highway as part of a business.</p> <p>3. It is part of national legislation that such parking schemes like CPZ are self financing but that any surpluses eventually created are ring fenced to transport issues. It is up to Councillors to set permit charges and they agreed escalating permit charges to dissuade multiple car ownership.</p> <p>4. The CPZ proposals in the statutory consultation do include sections of Welbeck Road, Tintern Way and Coles Crescent and short adjoining sections of Drinkwater Road and Eliot Drive where the majority of responses in the previous consultation considered there to be sufficient a parking problem to justify the costs including permits.</p> <p>5. Experience from previous CPZ shows that needing to continually reposition vehicles (even with shorter operational hours) does provide a significant deterrent to parking within the CPZ</p>
8	Resident of Unity Terrace, Scott Crescent who is oposed to CPZ 9960	<p>1. There is no need for parking permits as only occasional slight parking problems, when events on in Beacon Centre perhaps 3 times a month. Then you can park in same street.</p> <p>2. The implications of this to the residents is awful. I work full time and pay my rent and council tax I have visitors about 2-3 times a</p>	<p>Although clearly opposed to a CPZ not technically a statutory objection.</p> <p>1. This residents address is towards the Beacon Centre end of Scott Crescent and it is quite possible parking is slightly easier at this end of the road at present. Whether this may change with the occupation of the development beside Austen Road is difficult to predict. There are quite a number of on street bays at this end of the road although there is</p>

		<p>week it's ridiculous that I will have to pay for guests to visit, so technically will be cutting off some people's social lives. There is the safety element for people who can't afford a permit they will have to walk through dangerous streets to reach their homes!!!! when people paying council tax and then car owners road tax it's crazy pay to park in own street.</p> <p>3. It would be interesting how much Home group would charge. All they are worried about is their money coming from the Beacon not any of the tenants.</p>	<p>parking pressures when events on at Beacon Centre.</p> <p>2. What support in the previous consultation there was for a CPZ was confined to the Coles Crescent end of Scott Crescent. The time period of the proposed CPZ was opposed as too long by other representations. A reduction in this would provide more opportunities for visits without the need for visitor permits. CPZ by national legislation have to be self financing.</p> <p>3. The council is responsible for any parking restrictions or administration of the CPZ as Scott Crescent including the parking bays is public highway. The cost of permits is agreed borough-wide by Councillors.</p>
--	--	---	--