

# APPENDIX B

25<sup>th</sup> June 2005

Mr S J Swain  
Transport Manager Urban Living  
HARROW COUNCIL  
P O BOX 38  
CIVIC CENTRE  
STATION ROAD  
HARROW  
HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
28 JUN 2005	
PASSED	MN
ACKNOWLEDGED	6/7

ON 6/7

Dear Mr Swain

RE Proposed Waiting and Loading Restrictions Stanmore Hill and Hilltop Way.

I refer you to my letter of 14<sup>th</sup> September 2004 a copy of which I have attached for your information, of which I have not to date received any reply or comment.

As set out in this letter I am strongly against any proposal that pushes the problem of parking from one area to another area, in my case Hilltop Way . **As my property is adjacent to Hilltop Way all the parked vehicles that are moved from Stanmore Hill will park in Hilltop Way, blocking my drive and Garage. The result will be that Hilltop Way will be come a parking road for people that do not reside there. The resulting difficulties could be overcome by extending the parking regulations up to my garage entrance so that this difficulty would not take place. I do not park in Hilltop Way I use my garage and drive to park my vehicles and incidentally pay rates for this privilege which none of the other vehicles parked do.**

**I would point out that I would like acknowledgment of this letter and your comments., failure to do so will leave me no alternative to seek further redress.**

14<sup>th</sup> September 2004

Mr Owen Northwood  
Traffic Manager - Transportation Section  
HARROW COUNCIL  
PO Box 38  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Harrow  
Middlesex HA1 2UZ

Dear Mr Northwood

**RE: Proposed Waiting and Loading Restrictions Stanmore Hill**

In principal I agree to your proposals however with some additions.

If a single yellow line is to be used this will only cure the problem of parking in day light hours. So far all the accidents that have occurred have been at night time when parking is still a massive problem. A double yellow line would solve this.

As my property, including my garage, borders onto Stanmore Hill and as I live with the consequence of the accidents daily, the only way forward would be to have the double yellow line be extended along Hill Top Way, both sides, to where my garage is situated. As you know from your experience if you stop parking in one area people will park where they can. If they park in Hill Top Way or indeed in any side turning off Stanmore Hill access to our own properties will be restricted and we will be living with the daily aggravation of inconsiderate people parking their cars anywhere.

A typical example happen on Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> September 2004 when a lady parked her car at such an angle that your Council vehicles were unable to gain access to Hill Top Way leaving all the bins un-emptied, yet again. The driver of the Council vehicle even commented on the fact that he was fed up with the way non-residents were parking totally inconsiderately and causing them stress. Now the Council will have to send a smaller vehicle adding to costs to the rate payer. If this caused your workers stress on one day you can see why we need double yellow lines as we have this stress everyday. When this lady parked I did ask her to park better because of the above reason but yet again I received abuse. I am sure she wouldn't put up with this situation outside her house! Every time this has happened it has never been a vehicle belonging to any local residents.

Cont'd.

If you are going to have parking restriction than surely the needs and requirements of the local residents should be taken into consideration, as we are the ones living with the problem daily. When we go to bed we live in fear of the consequence of the parked cars and of whose lives that might be lost!

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely

1 August 2005

Owen Northwood  
Project Engineer  
Traffic Management (East)  
Harrow Council  
Transportation Section  
P.O.Box 38  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Harrow HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
04 AUG 2005	
PASSED	
ACKNOWLEDGED	

Dear Owen

**Stanmore CPZ: Proposed Extension to Zones B & H**

Thank you for your very prompt response to my formal Objection dated 13 July 2005 to the above CPZ proposals.

In response, I wish to make the following comments &/or recommendations:-

**1.0 Impact of Wembley National Stadium**

- 1.1 It would clearly be a waste of public resources to consider the impact of Wembley Stadium (Event Days) as a separate issue. I recognise that it may or may not be the case that an Event Day scheme for Stanmore is justified. However, 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.
- 1.2 As I stated previously, when the former Wembley Stadium was in operation (pre-Oct 2000), the Stanmore Station area suffered significant parking problems on Major Event Days. The new National Stadium will have significantly less parking spaces available on site (note: I believe parking spaces will reduce from about 7,500 to less than 1,500 spaces), and a major CPZ is to be 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.

- 1.3 Therefore, in view of the forthcoming opening of the Stadium and the limited timescales now available, if a separate consultation for an Event day scheme is required (as you advise), then I suggest that this should be the Council's current priority rather than progressing a scheme that does not fully address Stanmore's short and long term parking issues.
- 1.4 I also object to the waste of public resources by carrying out these parking schemes (consultations, scheme designs, Traffic Orders and implementation) separately.
- 1.5 I therefore consider that 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. The Council can also use the opportunity of the supplementary consultation to address the flaws in the initial consultation outlined in section 2.0 below. The current CPZ proposals can then be reviewed and modified in light of the requirements of Event Days and the associated consultation.

## **2.0 Deficiencies in Consultation Process**

- 2.1 I note and welcome your undertaking to review the future presentation of the Council's consultation leaflets to avoid any misleading or incorrect information, and also to give respondents the opportunity to respond on all relevant issues (e.g. The consultation document did not specifically ask all respondents' views on the physical extension of the zone.)
- 2.2 However, you also need to ensure that the Council's representatives are properly briefed/informed/instructed, so they do not give out incorrect or misleading information biased towards the scheme. For example, as stated previously, during a discussion with the consultant regarding justification of expenditure, the consultant reassured me that any scheme implemented, including the scheme development costs, would not cost local residents anything, as a budget had been secured from TfL. However, this statement was both incorrect and misleading, as Harrow residents & taxpayers clearly contribute to TfL budgets.
- 2.3 Therefore, in addition to improving future consultation for other CPZ schemes, as recommended in para 1.5 above, a supplementary consultation on the Wembley Event day parking issues gives the Council the opportunity to address the flaws in the initial consultation for the Stanmore CPZ.

## **3.0 Loss of On-street Parking Capacity**

- 3.1 In respect of the "consultation draft" of the scheme, in many locations, the formalisation of on-street parking (both proposed & in the existing zone) actually reduced the amount of available parking space for residents & their visitors. The consultants had no evidence that the current residents parking demand had been assessed. Indeed, the consultant hadn't even undertaken a simple "night-time" parking survey to help ascertain levels of residents' parking demand.

3.2 In many locations within the existing zone, including the section of Sandymount Avenue just to the north of No.45, there was scope, on the “consultation draft” of the scheme, to increase the number of residents parking bays without prejudicing access for emergency & service vehicles. This will also help address the issue of safety caused by excessive vehicle speeds encouraged by “opening up” the carriageway.

3.3 You state that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the possible disadvantages of speed. However, any increased vehicle speeds will certainly prejudice safety and are a definite (not a possible) disadvantage for residents. Therefore, as suggested in para 3.2, the number of residents parking bays could be increased without prejudicing access, whilst also helping address the issue of safety.

#### **4.0 Value for Money**

4.1 You state that “TfL no doubt appraised the value for money before awarding the funds”. However, this does not remove the Council or its officers from any responsibility in respect of this scheme for ensuring the efficient and effective use of public expenditure.

4.2 I have received no proper explanation as to how the “cost v benefit” of the proposed changes have been assessed, or how any decision whether or not to implement a proposal have or will be made. The Council’s Consultants indicated that the scheme implemented would be based purely on what the local frontagers wanted, and money was available to do this. However, 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”.

4.3 As stated in para 1.4, I particularly object to the waste of public resources by carrying out the “normal day” and “Wembley Stadium Event day” parking schemes (consultations, scheme designs, Traffic Orders and implementation) separately.

#### **5.0 Summary**

In summary, I consider that the Council needs to:-

5.1 Put the current CPZ proposals on hold;

5.2 Carry out an urgent consultation on Wembley Event day parking issues;

5.3 Use the opportunity of the supplementary consultation to address the flaws in the initial consultation;

5.4 Review and modify the current CPZ proposals in light of the requirements of Event Days and the associated consultation;

5.5 Ensure that the level of residents’ parking is maximised and that projected vehicle speeds are minimised, whilst maintaining provision for essential access;

5.6 Provide evidence that the expenditure on the final scheme proposals provides sound value for money.

Finally, can you please confirm the time & date of the formal Council meeting that will consider the Stanmore CPZ proposals, and also please provide me with a copy of the Committee report being presented to members. Can you also please pass on a request to the Chair &/or the Committee Clerk that, if possible, I would wish to make a personal representation to the meeting.

Yours Sincerely

21 September 2004

Harrow Council (c/o Project Centre Ltd)

Dear Sir/Madam

**Stanmore CPZ: Response to Consultation**

I wish to make the following comments &/or objections:-

**Flawed &/or Poor Quality Consultation Document**

The consultation leaflet mentions that "we are also consulting with residents outside of the two existing zones, to identify if there is a need to extend the CPZs into their areas". This sounded like a bit of "tweaking at the edges", and no proposed extension was shown (or indeed indicated) on the map that was included. Furthermore, I nearly didn't even visit the exhibition feeling that the hours of operation was apparently the main point of the review. However, as I found out when visiting the exhibition, the extent of the potential extension is enormous. Therefore, since a large number of people are likely to have responded without visiting the exhibition, and not fully appreciating the extent of the potential enlargement, I feel that the consultation exercise is flawed as the leaflet does not give them an adequately full picture on which to make a judgement; i.e. the massive potential zone extension is not at all apparent from the leaflet.

**No Extension of Zone in Sandymount Avenue**

The consultation document does not specifically ask respondents' views on the physical extension of the zone. However, being the last property at the edge of the zone, this is a very relevant issue to me and a large number of other local residents. I would like zone boundary to remain as at present.

**No Change to Hours of Operation in Sandymount Avenue**

There is little evidence of commuters parking & then leaving before 3pm, so no additional morning restriction is required, and a full day &/or weekend restriction would be totally "over the top" and unjustified. I would the hours of operation of the zone to remain as at present in Sandymount Avenue.

**Loss of On-street Parking Capacity**

In many locations, the formalisation of on-street parking (both proposed & in the existing zone) actually reduces the amount of available parking space for residents & their visitors. The consultants had no evidence that the current residents parking demand has been assessed. Indeed, the consultant hadn't even undertaken a simple "night-time" parking survey to help ascertain levels of residents parking demand.



**Crossover outside No.70**

A crossover opposite my house, outside No.70 Sandymount Avenue, was not shown on the proposal map & should be added.

**Future Consultation (before Traffic Orders)**

Once the scheme proposals have been developed & clarified, residents should be consulted again or at least properly notified that the Traffic Orders are being formally advertised. By this, I mean more than just the Statutory minimum of posting an advert in the London Gazette (or whatever the relevant TRO publication is) and “slipping it” (hopefully unnoticed) into the local press.

Mr S Swain  
Transportation Manager  
PO Box 38  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Harrow  
HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING  
TRANSPORTATION SECTION

03 AUG 2005

PASSED	MAN 5/8	ONS 5/8
ACKNOWLEDGED		

1 August 2005

Cc Owen Northwood  
Project Engineer, Traffic Management (East)

Dear Mr Swain

Further to our e-mail correspondence with and telephone calls to both you and Mr Northwood, we would like to confirm in writing our objections to your proposals for controlled parking in Laurimel Close.

Laurimel Close is a very small road, with the appearance of a driveway, with already limited parking space. Yellow lines, or controlled time zones, would be likely to make it almost impossible for us to park outside our own homes, as we already find it difficult to fit into our own driveways with our own cars. We do appreciate that there are problems with parking and access in September Way, but to date have never had any problems with the public using our road for extra parking.

Bearing the above points in mind, it would seem to us to be unnecessary to add controlled parking to Laurimel Close and very much hope that you will give serious consideration to our objections.

Yours sincerely

4. REF DP 200: 0/92 705  
T Mr Swan 0 7

I and my wife most strongly object to your Department making our lives become a yellow line zone. We live a peaceful & law abiding existence & will have to pay for the privilege of parking in our own road.

If this becomes law we will want to be allowed to park with the permit not be left to the mercies of traffic warden

Yours Sincerely

27 July 2005

Mr Owen Northwood Project Engineer  
Traffic Management (East)  
Harrow Council  
Transportation Section  
PO Box 38  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Harrow, HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
28 JUL 2005	
PASSED	
ACKNOWLEDGED	

Dear Mr Northwood

Further to my letter of 11 July 2005 and subsequent conversation with both myself and my husband, could you please take my letter as confirmation that we would like some restrictions put in Court Drive, as when controlled parking starts to take bite both in Snaresbrook Drive and London Road, all these commuter's cars will find their way into Court Drive and The Spinney (The residents in these two roads I gather voted against any extension of the Yellow lines etc.

In view of this, could you take our concerns into consideration when you, as Project Manager make decisions regarding parking especially in Court Drive. It is bad enough already with proliferation of 4 x 4 's coming into the shops, school coaches dropping off school children at the top end of Court Drive, parents waiting to pick them up in their cars from 4 to 4.30p.m and it all happens in our bit of Court Drive.

Also enclosed, is a letter which has been dropped through our letterbox which is self explanatory. Could you please pass it on to the relevant department?

Thank you for all your help in this matter.

Yours sincerely

13 July 2005

Mr Steve Swain  
Transportation Manager  
London Borough of Harrow  
Civic Centre  
PO Box 38  
Harrow  
Middlesex  
HA1 2BR

Dear Mr Swain

I write to express my opposition to the proposed plan for double yellow lines to be placed outside my house, no. 4 Court Drive, and the other three corners making up the intersection of Court Drive, The Spinney and Snaresbrook Drive.

I have been advised that this is for safety reasons, but would reasonably argue that by restricting parking at these points at any time, you are allowing and encouraging the use of this intersection as a turning circle for the numerous lorries which hurtle down Court Drive to turn and in doing so present a greater hazard. In particular, I refer to a juggernaut which delivers to the butcher's shop on London Road each Wednesday and when no cars are parked outside aforesaid houses, he deliberately mounts the kerb to restrict his manoeuvres. The same thing has happened with Harrow Council refuse lorries which have on numerous occasions mounted the pavement outside my house and caused damage to the paving stones and have knocked my wall over for which I was able to make a claim against the council for repair. It may also be worth pointing out that my house is often subjected to shaking when these large lorries pass which may well be having a detrimental affect on my foundations. By not restricting the size of vehicles allowed to access the street and, indeed, by giving them further space for turning, you are in turn creating a greater hazard for residents in cars accessing their homes and pedestrians crossing the road at this point.

Whilst I try to understand the safety implications and necessity to restrict parking during working hours, I do not understand the need to restrict parking at all times and, as such, would accept a single yellow line if restrictions have to be enforced at all. The double yellow lines you propose extend across the front of my house to my driveway which will present me with huge difficulties when I have visitors such as friends and family and, particularly, tradesmen. The problem with safety only arises from cars parking directly onto the corners, particularly of The Spinney, for which myself, my family and visitors are not culprits. I would happily accept the lines starting on Court Drive, with enough room to accommodate a car between my driveway and the start of the line, and then extending around the corner well into The Spinney.

I further wish to take issue with the fact that the single yellow line currently at the entrance to Court Drive is not being considered for change. All residents entering Court Drive to access their homes find this to be the major issue of safety. I feel it is highly irresponsible of you not to enforce major parking restrictions in this area and strongly suggest that this needs to have red lines. It is at this point that emergency services would be unable to gain access to the area which makes a mockery of your proposal to give them greater access further down the street which they wouldn't even be able to reach. The congestion and subsequent pandemonium caused in this area is an accident waiting to happen. Instead, for some absurd reason you believe the safety issue is further down the road where there is plenty of room and full paying council tax residents will be highly inconvenienced and deprived of their freedom to park outside their own home in what is essentially a designated residential area.

Whilst we do not currently feel the effect of commuters, your proposals will force cars to park on any available space in Court Drive and The Spinney causing a problem that does not at present exist. As such, I do not agree with your proposal to extend parking restrictions in this area.

To summarise, it is my express wish that we be excluded from the scheme and that the double yellow lines proposed for outside my house be scrapped, the implications being that this will encourage this area to be used as a highly dangerous, noisy and damaging turning circle for which you would be culpable should this plan come into force and the consequences realised.

Yours sincerely

5

STANMORE OBSECTIONS

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Date:**  
**Subject:**

We have very recently learnt about the above as a neighbour gave us a photocopy of a letter she received from Steve Swain. In addition, the sign on the lamp post in The Spinney is hardly noticeable. However, now that we are aware of the proposals, we are writing to voice our objections.

1 There is a serious problem at the top end of Court Drive by the shops. With cars parking on both sides of the road, dreadful congestion and blockage is caused frequently. On many occasions, we have not been able to get onto the London Road because of this. Severe measures need to be taken to stop this parking - possibly clamping or red lines or large fines - whatever it takes to deal with this. Generally with up to five cars on each side of the road, chaos is caused.

2 Where we live - at number 5 Court Drive (by The Spinney) there is no problem at all with parking - presumably because it is too far from the shops - and certainly much too far from Stanmore Station. There is certainly no need to introduce restricted parking here. As for football events at Wembley, again our part of the road is usually not affected - and these events are not frequent.

3 We would be extremely angry if we could not park at liberty outside our own house. We totally object to having to pay for parking rights, especially as there is no problem here. Secondly, my friends and family would have difficulties when visiting us. Come and observe this road and see where the problems lie.

We will be in contact again shortly about this matter.

---

Winks & nudges are here - download MSN Messenger 7.0 today!  
<http://messenger.msn.co.uk>

1<sup>st</sup> July 2005

Att: Mr S J Swain  
Transportation Manager  
Urban Living  
PO Box 38, Civic Centre  
Station Road, Harrow  
HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
04 JUL 2005	
PASSED	ON 4/7
ACKNOWLEDGED	

Dear Mr Swain

**Ref: DP/2005.03/92.05/37**

I cannot see why you are proposing new parking restrictions in this area. In my opinion, and that of others, all you are doing is raising your revenue and causing a lot of inconvenience and additional costs to the residents left in this area.

If you were so concerned about the parking arrangements and congestion in this area you wouldn't have granted permission for all the massive developments which have been carried out in this area over recent years. Clearly little thought has been given to this situation as congestion will indeed increase again once the further development of a bigger school and flats are completed in the Spur Road and Stonegrove area. Parking is the last thing we need to worry about. Your department should be more concerned with the gridlock situation which will inevitably occur.

Might I suggest that you leave well alone with the proposed parking restrictions? It seems that everytime you think you carry out improvements to the parking situation you fail to improve it at all. Your supposed improvements cause added inconvenience and distress to the residents that are affected.

Yours faithfully



**BY EMAIL**

**URGENT**

Mr Northwood  
Transportation Section  
Harrow Council

23<sup>rd</sup> August 2005

Dear Mr Northwood,

**Re: Extension of Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – London Rd/Snaresbrook Drive**

Apologies for emailing you on the deadline date for the revised consultation papers to be received, but I have been away.

At the time of the first consultation papers in June 2005, my family and I objected to the proposed parking restriction of single yellow lines outside our house (23 Court Drive). The reason for this was that we felt that the Council were only putting these restrictions for their own financial gain.

We wrote to our local MP, Mr Tony McNulty and then we received a reply from him with a letter from Mr Steve Swain, Harrow Council's Transportation Manager, which said that new papers will be sent out as an error was made.

We received the new consultation papers and have the following queries to them

) **“Possible double yellow line waiting restrictions”**

We're not happy with the word **“possible”**, as if we agreed to the double yellow lines, which we think is much better than the single yellow lines, then the council could change their mind and put single yellow lines in the end.

Also, the green questionnaire doesn't really relate to us, as it says which days/times would we want the parking restrictions. But if there were to be double yellow lines outside our house then this doesn't relate to us.

The only thing we would consent to is DOUBLE YELLOW LINES

2) **Parking over our own driveway**

A while ago I heard on Capital Radio the DJ, Johnny Vaughan, saying that he parked over his own driveway, blocking his wife's car, and was given a parking ticket even though he explained to the parking attendant that his wife wouldn't mind him blocking her in and he could go and ask his wife who was indoors.

Is it the law that you're not allowed to park on the road, blocking your own driveway? As, if we were to have double yellow lines outside our house and would have a visitor and they blocked our driveway (after the yellow line finished) does that mean they would get a ticket?

### 3) Widening our Driveway

Instead of yellow lines, would the council consider widening our driveway up until near to the corner of Snaresbrook Drive, so that no cars would then be able to park outside our house anyway. Therefore the corner would be kept clear so that big lorries delivering material/removal lorries/dustcarts will not be able to drive over the pavement and crack them, as they do frequently.

- 4) In our letter to the MP and in the July questionnaire, we mentioned the dangerous parking at the corner of London Road/Court Drive and also on the London Road Slip Road/Court Drive. I don't think I made it very clear, as in the reply letter from Mr Swain he says that there are "already existing yellow line waiting restrictions here, which should deter obstructive parking at the busiest times of the day". This may be the case, but if the Council come down on Thursday and Friday mid-morning and Sunday's (the busiest days for the corner shops or the few days leading up to Jewish holidays), they will see the traffic/parking at the corner of London Road (slip road) and Court Drive is horrific. Even in the mornings when we go to work and go down the slip road, we have problems seeing cars coming the other way, as cars always park on the corner of the London Road Slip Road (even though there is a small piece of single yellow line) and we often have to reverse back into Court Drive to let the cars coming the other way through. As London Road has become so congested lately (mainly during school terms), more and more cars are using this slip road to avoid the main road congestion. You can ask your Dustcart drivers of the problems they have down here (when they come late) on a Friday.

I have taken some photos of the way people park on the corner of London Rd Slip Rd/Court Drive, which I can forward to you if you want. A suggestion would be to put either red lines or double yellow lines here as the small amount of single yellow lines is not working.

I would appreciate your response to the above, especially point 1, about the "possible" double yellow lines outside our house

Yours sincerely,

Record of Telephone conversation

Date  
Between  
And

**Stanmore CPZ, additional waiting restrictions – Court Drive**

Mrs Harding wishes to object to double yellow lines being placed out side her house as advertised 23 June 2005.

She states she is 90 years old, broken her wrist and therefore unable to write her objection.

stated that I would record her objection and write to her noting her objection

Her objection is that she does not want the yellow lines to be painted out side her house in Court Drive because relations and visitors will be unable to park out side her house.

Owen Northwood

6

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
14 JUL 2005	
PASSED	
ACKNOWLEDGED	

Mr O Northwood  
Harrow Council  
Traffic Division  
Harrow  
Middlesex

12 July 2005

Dear Mr Northwood

**Re: DP/2005-03/92.05/37**

We live at 27 Court Drive. Please note our strong objection to the introduction of any parking restrictions or residents' parking permits and bays in any section of Court Drive, other than at the corners with The Spinney or Snaresbrook Drive for sightline purposes.

In time, if events at Wembley justify it, we would prefer residents' parking rather than yellow line restrictions. Any alterations to traffic restrictions will materially affect customers using the parade of shops at Canons Corner.

Yours sincerely

GD/IF/cou27-1.jul

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
15 JUL 2005	
PASSED	
ACKNOWLEDGED	

13<sup>th</sup> July 2005

Dear Sir,

am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions for Stanmore

I am a resident of Canons Corner which it has been decided, despite numerous requests, will not be included in the proposed parking restrictions. My concern is that if the parking restrictions are implemented, as proposed, the residents and the shop owners on Canons Corner will be severely affected.

Canons Corner has an area which allows free parking for approximately 6 cars. At the current time, the residents and shop owners maintain a balance of parking, i.e. the residents require the parking spaces in the evening and the shops during the day. However, if restrictions are enforced along London Road, the commuters that currently use London Road to park will begin to use Canons Corner.

This will result in no parking for the shoppers that frequent the shops on Canons Corner and no parking in the evenings for the residents until the commuters have moved their vehicles. At the present time we are aware that this area is being used for free parking for the entire duration of the day by employees of the Tesco petrol station situated across the road from Canons Corner.

I am therefore objecting to the current parking restrictions on the basis that this will have a very detrimental impact on both the residents and shop owners of Canons Corner, and either the restrictions should not be applied or Canons Corner must be included in the proposals.

If Canons Corner is to be included, this should be with Pay and Display/Residents Permit restrictions from Monday to Friday, 8.30am – 18.30pm. This will ensure a balance between the needs of the residents and the shop owners.

I appreciate that the Council have a view that even with restrictions there will still not be enough parking for all residents and shoppers, as London House also has a Canons Corner address, but the fact is that London House residents have garages which allow them parking. This means that they never use the parking and are therefore not concerned with what actually occurs at Canons Corner.

In addition I feel that by implementing some proper parking restrictions, we can ensure a turnaround of users of this area, and also prevent serious risks to the public when car

owners search for parking. In the last month, I have seen several examples of cars being parked badly or half on the pavement, just to get parking in this area.

I therefore enclose several letters from residents lodging their objection to the proposed parking restrictions and a copy of the original petition that was put forward to Harrow Council on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2005.

I hope that you will take our concerns seriously as the implementation could result in shops losing a great deal of shoppers and the residents being unable to park anywhere near the vicinity of their homes.

Yours Sincerely

Saturday, 09 July 2005

To whom it may concern,

I as a resident of Canons Corner would like to raise my objection to the current proposed Traffic Order as to the fact that it does not include Canons Corner and in doing so will force people to park in our very limited parking that is currently available and wish to see both Resident's parking and pay and display parking.

Respectfully yours

## TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

WE HAVED LIVED AT 4<sup>A</sup> CANNONS CORNER FOR 35 YEARS AND HAVE NEVER HAD ANY PROBLEM PARKING OUR CAR OUTSIDE OUR FLAT, THAT IS UNTIL YELLOW LINES WERE PUT IN LONDON ROAD AND COURT DRIVE, THEN WE HAD COMMUTERS FOR STANMORE STATION PARKING ALL DAY, AND SINCE TESCO EXPRESS HAVE OPENED ACROSS THE ROAD THEIR STAFF ALSO PARK THERE CARS FROM 5.30 AM THE MORNING.

IT DOES SEEM THE ONLY SOLUTION IS FOR PAY AND DISPLAY FOR 20 MINUTES AT A TIME AND RESIDENTS PARKING PERMITS (WHICH WE WILL CERTAINLY HAVE TO PAY FOR)



# parking permits

Clear parking bay in the lounge to best use

A assume that the question of who goes for a parking permit is a 'reset stage' issue

✓ the r

Free Haysit

6.7.05

We agree that

Concess Comm must be made in the proposed parking restriction plan looking at the options the proposal that seems to make the most sense would be

Restricted parking between 10-11am & 3-4pm to those who have not got

S J Swain  
Transportation Manager  
Urban Living  
P.O. Box 38  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Harrow HA1 2UZ

URBAN LIVING TRANSPORTATION SECTION	
07 JUL 2005	
PASSED	ANN ON 8/6
ACKNOWLEDGED	

5th July 2005

We believe in a controlled parking zone, however, we object to the proposal on the extension to the Stanmore Station controlled parking zone (CPZ) as it stands. It would appear that the existence of the parade of shops at Canons Corner has been given little or no forethought.

No consideration of this project has been given to the retailers, and the trade that will certainly be lost due to the arrangement proposed.

You have seen fit to put forward a no parking zone along The Spinney, Snaresbrook Drive and Court Drive at certain times of the day. Those hours and all day from approximately 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. are shopping hours for our businesses.

We propose that a 'pay and display' be put in place in front of the shops and in Court Drive and Snaresbrook Drive.

May we point out that if your proposal goes through, it will have a devastating effect on the retailers on Canons Corner and our customer base. It will then force these businesses to close. There is at this time two premises already empty in the parade. Needless to say, this will have a knock on effect in the coffers of the borough.

We would be grateful if a new proposal was put forward regarding the above matters.

Yours faithfully,

Ivor Silverman Ltd





URBAN LIVING  
TRANSPORTATION SECTION

03 SEP 2005

Mr. Steve Swain.  
Transportation Manager.  
Harrow Council.  
Transportation Section.  
PO Box 38.  
Civic Centre.  
Station Road.  
Harrow. HA1 2UZ.

30th. August. 05

Your Ref: SS/ON/92.05/3/4.

Dear Mr. Swain,  
RE: Stanmore Hill Conservation Area.  
Green Lane: Request For Parking Controls.  
-----

Thank you for your letter dated 10th. August. 05.

I must point out that the consultation carried out in September 2004 was not clear in so far as many residents thought that parking meters and traffic wardens would be outside of their houses if parking controls were brought in.

I am enclosing a petition from over 50 houses and these residents want parking controls in Green Lane.

If the problem is the cottages at the top of Green Lane then these could be excluded from the scheme and controls could be from the bottom of Green Lane up to Culverlands Close.

There is a major accident waiting to happen as traffic is mounting the pavement in order to drive up Green Lane.

Would you please put this letter and the petition at the meeting on 21st. September.

Yours Sincerely