

APPENDIX C

Source	Summary of Objections/Comments	Officers Response
<p><u>Petitions</u></p> <p>Petition from Canons Corner containing 14 signatures representing 7 businesses and 5 residential properties</p> <p>Petition in the form of a letter signed by the 9 businesses in Canons Corner.</p>	<p>The petitioners explain that “if Canons Corner is not included in the proposed parking restrictions in Stanmore, there will be major repercussions for both the residents and shops in this area.” The petitioners are requesting that Canons Corner be included in the proposal “by making Canons Corner a Pay and Display and Residents Parking area only between the hours of 8.30am and 6.30pm.”</p> <p>The “parade of shops has been given little forethought”. Trade “will certainly be lost”.</p> <p>“We propose ‘Pay and Display’ be put in place in front of the shops and in Court Drive and Snaresbrook Drive.”</p>	<p>Canons Corner was not included in the proposals as the respondents to the consultation were two to one against parking controls. The residents of Court Drive and The Spinney were also against a scheme and they too have been excluded from the proposed extension of the zone. Re-consultation has shown that London Road respondents are also against parking controls. This leaves only one road (Snaresbrook Drive) in favour of inclusion in the Stanmore station area zone (zone H). Consequently, the impact of the extension of the zone on Canons Corner would be unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>Provision of “pay and display”/residents’ parking in front of the shops would not resolve the parking problems here. There are competing demands for parking from shoppers, businesses, residents and visitors. There is room for only 6 parking spaces in front of the shops and this would not be adequate to meet demand.</p> <p>Consultation carried out in September 2004 included proposals for shared use “pay and display”/business parking in Canons Corner and shared use “pay and display”/residents/business parking in Court Drive. The majority of respondents from both these roads did not support the scheme. Only one trader responded to the consultation. Therefore, these roads together with The Spinney were dropped from the</p>

<p>Petition from Green Lane Area</p> <p>The petitions from some residents of Green Lane, Woodside Close, Benhale Close and Culverlands</p>	<p>The proposed “no parking zone along The Spinney, Snaresbrook Drive and Court Drive at certain times of the day” will affect the businesses as “8 a.m. to 6 p.m. are shopping hours”.</p> <p>The heading of the petition is in the form of a question rather than a request for parking controls. It reads as follows: “THE QUESTION IS DO YOU WANT PARKING CONTROL BETWEEN 10 am. to 11 am. 3 pm. to 4 pm. MONDAY TO FRIDAY. PLEASE ANSWER YES OR NO.” The petition contains 48 signatures answering “yes”</p>	<p>proposed extension. As the Court Drive respondents are against parking controls, it would not be possible to impose a scheme as suggested.</p> <p>There is only room for 6 cars outside the shops for the 20 or so business and residential frontages. Considering about half of these are residential, shared use “pay and display” and residents’ parking would not make a significant difference here. It would also be in isolation from the proposed extension of Stanmore CPZ. London Road, The Spinney and Court Drive will not be included in the scheme. Given the zone will be some distance from the parade of shops and that it operates for two hours per day, Monday to Saturday, the impact would be minimal. Residents of Canons Corner and shoppers would be able to continue to park (as they do now) in London Road, Court Drive and The Spinney, all of which would be outside the proposed CPZ.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the objections be set aside and Canons Corner be considered for parking controls as part of a future review of the scheme.</p> <p>The Green Lane respondents to the September 2004 were 20 for and 21 against. There are three culs-de-sac in Green Lane (Woodside Close, Ben Hale Close and Culverlands Close). All of these taken together show that there are 29 responses in favour and 26 against. Two petitions from Green Lane against parking controls were also received. In view of this Green Lane and associated roads were not included in the proposed extension of the CPZ.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Close</p>	<p>representing 47 properties out of 145.</p> <p>The head petitioner in his covering letter explains that the consultation was not clear “as many residents thought that parking meters and traffic wardens would be outside of their houses if parking controls were brought in.”</p> <p>“If the problem is the cottages at the top of Green Lane then these could be excluded from the scheme and controls would be from the bottom of Green Lane up to Culverlands Close.”</p> <p>“There is a major accident waiting to happen as traffic is mounting the pavement in order to drive up Green Lane.”</p>	<p>This is not what was explained in the consultation document which provided information about how a residents’ parking scheme would work. That normally means residents’ parking spaces and yellow line waiting restrictions in residential streets. Parking controls would require enforcement, without which they would come into disrepute.</p> <p>There are 51 properties north of Culverlands Close, most of them without off-street parking. Parking controls would displace parking to this part of the road and would be unacceptable to those residents.</p> <p>There have been no reported personal injury accidents in the last three years (to December 2004) in Green Lane. A residents’ parking scheme would comprise residents spaces in Green Lane which are likely to be occupied at times by residents or their visitors. Such parking would similarly create access difficulties which could lead to some drivers mounting the footway. To achieve unhindered two way traffic parking would need to be banned on both sides of the road for most of the day. This is unlikely to be acceptable to the majority of the residents. Driving along the footway is an offence that the police have powers to deal with and this would be referred to them.</p> <p>It is recommended that the objection be set aside.</p>
--------------	---	---

<p>Resident of Stanmore Hill</p>	<p>Proposed double yellow lines in Stanmore Hill will displace parking into Hilltop Way. Vehicles will park in Hilltop Way “blocking my drives and Garage”. I request that parking controls be extended “up to my garage entrance”.</p>	<p>Double yellow line waiting restrictions are proposed to prevent obstructive parking at junctions and to improve visibility. The proposal was substantially modified in response to the consultation. Short sections of double yellow line waiting restrictions are proposed at four junctions only (see Appendix D). At Hilltop Way, they would be only 10 metres long. The objector’s garage is about 40 metres away from the junction. Extending the proposal to cover this distance would unduly prohibit parking in a section which would not normally be problematic. Obstructive parking across driveways is an offence that under the new regulations the Council has powers to deal with and action will be taken against offenders. It is recommended that the objection be set aside.</p>
<p>Resident of Sandymount Avenue</p>	<p>If “provisions for Event Days are likely to be required, then it is clearly good sense and “Best Value” to incorporate them with the current proposals, Traffic Order-making procedures and physical works.”</p> <p>It would be a “waste of public resources to consider the impact of Wembley Stadium (Event Days) as a separate issue.” When “the former Wembley Stadium was in operation (pre-Oct 2000), the Stanmore Station area suffered significant parking problems on Major Event Days. A “major CPZ is to be</p>	<p>Combining the Wembley Stadium Event Days scheme with the consultation carried out recently would have been confusing. In the existing zone the consultation sought views on the adequacy of the hours and days of restrictions . Elsewhere the residents were asked whether they wanted to be included in the zone. These questions generated many complaints about the complexity of the issues and confusion about what was being proposed culminating in 19 petitions against, which is the very information the consultation was designed to seek out. Adding a further dimension (Event Days) would have created even more confusion and complaints.</p> <p>The impact of the stadium in Harrow would not be the same as the areas around the stadium itself. Not all events at Wembley affected Harrow</p>

	<p>completed in Brent in 2005 covering a huge radius around the Stadium.” “The Stadium is programmed to be operational in 2005/06, and a major impact on the Stanmore area is anticipated once it is open. However, the current CPZ proposals do nothing to address the likely problems.”</p> <p>“I also object to the waste of public resources by carrying out these parking schemes” separately. “The “current CPZ proposals should be put on hold, and that the Council should carry out an urgent consultation on Wembley Event day parking issues.”</p>	<p>before the stadium was demolished. The majority of respondents around the Stanmore station extension area and many within the zone wanted a CPZ operating shorter times than the existing zone. One of the reasons for further consultation was to remind the residents about the events at Wembley stadium which are likely to generate parking problems similar to the pre-demolition days. Given the comments and opposition to further controls arising from this consultation, it is doubtful that acceptance for Event Days restrictions can be achieved until problems associated with them manifest themselves. As the parking problems in Stanmore associated with the stadium were occasional, unlike the area surrounding the stadium itself, it would be difficult in this climate to convince the local community that further controls are necessary or justified. For this reason Event Days restrictions have not been included in this round of consultations.</p> <p>The scheme was last reviewed in 1996. The proposal has been generated by years of lobbying from members of the local community and local councillors to address a number of parking problems, for example around the college, the area between Marsh Lane and Canons Park Station and certain streets north of the shopping area and station.</p> <p>It would not be acceptable to the majority of those in favour of the extension of the zone to delay the scheme until such time that an Event Days scheme is agreed. Though there would be a cost saving if the two schemes were combined, as most of the review work has already been completed, the savings would not be</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Zone boundary in Sandymount Avenue should remain as existing.</p> <p>“The consultation document did not specifically ask all respondents’ views on the physical extension of the zone”.</p>	<p>considerable. It would not be reasonable at this stage to delay the current proposals until an Event Days scheme can be agreed.</p> <p>The majority of the respondents from Sandymount Avenue outside the existing zone voted to be included (9 for and 3 against). Therefore it is proposed to extend the scheme to include the whole of Sandymount Avenue.</p> <p>A plan showing the possible extension of the zones B and H accompanied the consultation documents delivered outside the existing zones. A comment box was also included where any comments including the proposed extension boundary of the zone could be entered. The questionnaires also included the following two questions among others: “Q3. Are you in favour of parking controls being introduced in your road” And “Q4. If you answered no or don’t know to question 3, if parking controls were introduced in the road next to yours, would you then want your road to be included”. The residents/businesses within the zone were informed about the consultation outside the zone and its possible extension. Although a plan of the proposed extension was not provided a similar comment box was provided.</p> <p>Residents’ parking scheme areas are normally considered only in those areas where there is support. Therefore, it is for the residents of the roads/areas concerned to decide if they want the scheme to be extended into their roads/areas or not. It would not seem reasonable for residents of one road to decide the fate of another road. However, the presentation of this</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The Council’s representatives gave “misleading information biased towards the scheme”. “the consultant reassured me” that the scheme “would not cost local residents anything, as a budget had been secured from TfL. However, “Harrow residents & taxpayers clearly contribute to TfL budgets.”</p> <p>The proposal reduces “the amount of available parking space”. A “night-time” parking survey to help ascertain levels of residents’ parking demand” has not been carried out.</p> <p>There is scope “to increase the number of residents parking bays”.</p> <p>Vehicle speeds will increase “by “opening up” the carriageway” and this “will certainly prejudice safety”.</p>	<p>issue, particularly for those who live near the edge of existing zone, in future cases will be reviewed.</p> <p>This appears to have been about making a distinction between Council funding and Transport for London funding in relation to which the consultant had been briefed. The misleading comments are regrettable, but unlikely to have reached the wider audience to a degree that would affect the outcome of the consultation.</p> <p>The consultant’s brief was to maximise the number of bays wherever possible. There is little point in carrying out evening surveys if we are providing the maximum number of spaces possible without creating obstruction or danger. Surveys carried out during the hour of operation of the scheme in Sandymount Avenue indicate that the existing arrangement is adequate. Additionally, the consultation has not shown that there is a need for more parking spaces in Sandymount Avenue. Therefore, there are no plans to alter the section in the existing zone. Part of the objective is to improve access and local amenity by better management of parking. The layout in the proposed extension creates a chicane effect which has road safety benefits. As the road is about 6 metres wide with parking creating single file traffic, safety would not be compromised. The existing scheme operates for one hour a day, Monday to Friday and the proposed zone, if agreed, would operate similarly. It</p>
--	---	--

<p>Letter containing 4 signatures representing all 4 properties in</p>	<p>No proper explanation as to how the “cost v benefit” has been provided. A “poor quality & ill-conceived scheme should surely not be progressed solely on the basis of a local majority, particularly if it conflicts with professional advice and does not constitute “Best Value”.”</p> <p>“Yellow lines or controlled time zones, would be likely to almost make it impossible to park outside our own homes”. We confirm “our objections to your</p>	<p>must be remembered that outside zone times parking is not controlled and as a result parking is not restricted to the marked spaces. Additional spaces in the existing and proposed sections would create access difficulties for the emergency services.</p> <p>Parking schemes are demand led. They are introduced only in areas where there have been requested and where consultation shows there is majority support. The ability of residents to park near their homes where there is extraneous parking demand is obviously a benefit to those residents. The aim of the Council is to be responsive to the needs of the local community. Draft proposals were formulated for consultation in liaison with local key stakeholders because parts of the local community lobbied hard for review of the scheme. The proposals were modified in certain areas in response to the feedback and those areas where consultation showed that it is generally not wanted were dropped. Event Days proposals would have to be consulted upon separately for clarity and in light of evidence that they are necessary in a shape and form that it is justified. The benefits of the scheme are improved residential amenity, improved vitality, improved safety and improved access.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the objection be set aside.</p> <p>Laurimel Close is at the bottom of September Way and it is too narrow to accommodate residents’ parking spaces. There are only 4 properties in this road. As the road is narrow it is unlikely that displaced parking could affect Laurimel Close. In view of this</p>
--	--	---

<p>Laurimel Close</p> <p>Total of 6 letters from residents of Court Drive and a further objector</p>	<p>proposals for controlled parking in Laurimel Close”.</p> <p>One corner property is in favour of the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions at the junction of Snaresbrook Drive/Court Drive/The Spinney. A second is opposed. Another corner property resident has made an objection by telephone explaining that she is unable to write. The remaining four letters contain objection to residents’ parking scheme in Court Drive.</p>	<p>and the unanimous support for the request it is recommended that the objection be upheld and Laurimel Close be excluded from the proposed extension of the CPZ.</p> <p>Court Drive was excluded from the extension of the zone as the majority of respondents to the September 2004 consultation opposed it. However, in order to improve access double yellow line waiting restrictions were proposed at the Snaresbrook junction to improve access. The objectors maintain that obstructive parking is not a problem. Further investigation has shown this to be the case. The objection to a CPZ appears to be a misunderstanding arising from the street notices about the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions in Court Drive and possibly CPZ proposal notices in Snaresbrook Drive. However, The Highway Code indicates that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. It is normal practice in controlled parking zones to cover the junctions of the roads within the zones and at entrances to them with zone time yellow line waiting restrictions. It is therefore recommended that the double yellow line objections be upheld and the proposals be dropped and zone time yellow line waiting restrictions be provided at the Snaresbrook Drive entrance only, leaving the entrance to The Spinney without restrictions in accordance with the details shown at Appendix D.</p>
--	--	--

Summary of re-consultation responses not in favour of scheme and officers response

	Source	Summary of Objections/Comments	Officers Response
1	Laburnam Court 6 responses not in favour	Proposals do not provide enough parking spaces.	proposed parking spaces have been maximised. One of the scheme's objectives is to improve access and local amenity by better management of parking. Only those areas which cause a safety hazard or obstruction will be lost. However, the scheme operates for one hour a day, Monday to Friday, therefore, its impact is minimised.
2		No current parking problems.	Responses from this road indicate that commuter parking is a problem.
3		Penalised for parking outside my own home.	Legislation requires CPZ schemes to be self financing. This means that it is not possible to enforce the CPZ without making a charge for a resident permit. The charge will need to cover the scheme's administration and enforcement costs. Most properties have adequate off-street parking. As the residents benefit from residents' parking schemes it would not be unreasonable for them to pay towards their costs. The cost of visitor permits is set at a level to minimise abuse.
4		Would agree to proposals if there was an additional hour of control in the morning.	The public consultation carried out in September 2004 showed that the majority of respondents within the existing scheme were in favour of retaining the existing hours of operation of the zone. It would be confusing for drivers if there are different time zones for individual streets.
5		Request that waiting restrictions in a section of Dennis Lane be changed to allow parking after	The Dennis Lane restrictions were introduced to deal with hazardous parking. It would not be conducive to road safety to allow such parking after

		6.30pm.	6.30 pm. It is recommended that the objections be set aside for the above reasons.
6	Marsh Lane 3 responses not in favour	Inconvenience to visitors.	Residents' parking schemes do have some disadvantages, such as having to purchase residents and visitors permits. However, deterring extraneous parking would help residents and their visitors find parking spaces near their homes.
7		Penalised for parking outside my own home.	See 3 above.
8		Proposals do not provide enough parking spaces.	See 1 above. It is recommended that the objections be set aside for the above reasons.
9	Merryfield Gardens 4 responses not in favour	Proposals would not bring any benefits.	A petition and deputation by residents representatives was received by the Council's Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel in March 2005 indicating that commuter parking in Merryfield Gardens is an increasing problem. The scheme would deter commuter parking which makes it easier for residents to find parking spaces near their homes.
11		Do not wish to have parking attendants patrolling Merryfield Gardens.	Parking attendants are necessary to patrol the streets in order to enforce the parking regulations. See also 9 above.
12		No current parking problems.	Responses from this road indicate that commuter parking is a problem.
13		Parking permits are too expensive.	See 3 above

14		Request that CPZ is not extended beyond the service road.	The proposal was drawn up in accordance with the wishes of the petitioners and verified by consultation which shows majority support amongst the respondents to include the whole of Merryfield Gardens.
15		Do not want parking restrictions in Merryfield Gardens.	See 9 and 14 above. It is recommended that the objections be set aside for the above reasons.
16	Snaresbrook Drive 7 responses not in favour	Proposals would create parking problems for visitors.	See 6 above.
17		Proposals have no provision for the disabled.	Blue badge holders may park in residents' parking spaces free without a permit, provided their blue badge is displayed. As commuter parking is deterred, parking spaces would be much easier to find and the disabled residents would be able to find spaces near their homes.
18		Proposals would create problems for workmen.	Workmen have the option of obtaining a parking dispensation at a cost of £10.50 per two weeks, per vehicle. The scheme here operates from 3 pm to 4 pm, Monday to Friday. Outside these times parking is permitted in residents' parking spaces and on the yellow lines provided the parking does not create danger or obstruction. Alternatively visitor permits could be used.
19		Position of parking bays would make it difficult for large vehicles to reverse.	The purpose of the scheme is to control parking. The proposed location of parking spaces are such that access is maintained.
20		Not necessary to extend scheme for occasional	The scheme proposals are designed to deal with the current daily parking

		Wembley events.	<p>problems. The impact of Wembley stadium (Event Days) on residents' parking will be considered as a separate issue. An Event Days scheme will require a separate consultation.</p> <p>The September 2004 consultation showed support for a residents' parking scheme in Snaresbrook Drive. The recent re-consultation sought views on the preferred days of operation of the scheme as this element of the previous consultation was inconclusive. The recent consultation has shown that 80% of the Snaresbrook Drive respondents are in favour of the proposed Monday to Saturday scheme.</p>
21		Commuter parking is not a problem.	Responses from this road indicate that commuter parking is a problem.
22		Proposals do not provide enough parking spaces.	See 1 above.
23		Parking in Stanmore is a problem. Council should invest in providing multi-storey car parks at the Station and repair multi-storey car park.	<p>It is Government and Council policy to reduce reliance on the private car. Various initiatives are being pursued by the Council to achieve this aim. Among these are, various schemes to improve public transport, cycle schemes, Safe Routes to School schemes and other initiatives aimed at improving pedestrian facilities to encourage walking. The Borough's Controlled Parking Zones, mainly around railway stations, are designed to discourage commuters coming by car to continue their journeys to Central London or elsewhere.</p> <p>The upper floors of the multi-storey car park are structurally unsafe and it would not be cost effective to embark upon repairs.</p>

24		Scheme proposals would put businesses in Canons Corner at risk.	<p>Provision of “pay and display”/residents’ parking in front of the shops would not resolve the parking problems here. There are competing demands for parking from shoppers, businesses, residents and visitors. There is room for only 6 parking spaces in front of the shops and this would not be adequate to meet demand.</p> <p>The consultation carried out in September 2004 included proposals for shared use “pay and display”/business parking in Canons Corner and shared use “pay and display”/residents/business parking in Court Drive. The majority of respondents from both these roads did not support the scheme. Only one trader responded to the consultation. Therefore, these roads together with The Spinney were dropped from the proposed extension. As the Court Drive respondents are against parking controls, it would not be possible to impose a scheme as suggested.</p> <p>London Road, The Spinney and Court Drive will not be included in the scheme. Given the zone will be some distance from the parade of shops and that it operates for two hours per day, Monday to Saturday, the impact would be minimal. Residents of Canons Corner and shoppers would be able to continue to park (as they do now) in London Road, Court Drive and The Spinney, all of which would be outside the proposed CPZ.</p>
25		Yellow lines in front of drives would not allow me to park across my	The yellow lines are operational only during the controlled hours. Parking spaces are not provided across

		driveway.	driveways since any vehicle displaying a parking permit for this zone would be able to legally park across any such driveway obstructing access to it. For this reason residents' parking spaces are not proposed across driveways.
26		Without incorporating The Spinney and Court Drive in scheme the problem will shift to these roads	The majority of respondents from The Spinney and Court Drive were not in favour for these roads to be included in the scheme. Controlled Parking Zones are only considered in roads/areas where there is majority support.
27		Scheme is piecemeal either all roads in the area should be included or none.	Proposal includes the roads where the majority of respondents are supportive. It would not be plausible to impose a scheme on those who do not want it. It is recommended that the objections are set aside for the above reasons.