

APPENDIX C

Analysis and comment on response to statutory consultation

The representations, objections and comments received from individuals during the statutory consultation period are tabulated along with officer comments in the table at the end of this appendix. Responses have been grouped geographically. Some responses were essentially identical except the name and address of the respondent. The responses are analysed and the officer recommendations made on whether the scheme proposals should be changed by each significant issue.

1) Whether the CPZ should proceed and if so to what geographical limits?

The responses from residents on support or objection to a CPZ in principle varied. In Whitmore Road (east of Porlock/Treve Avenue) and Bessborough Road north of Whitmore Road 22 responses offered support whilst 7 objected.

In Treve & Porlock Avenue two are in explicit support and two further implicit support or wanting stronger restrictions with only one in objection.

In Whitmore Road (west of Porlock/Treve Avenue) there are only two in support whilst 12 objected.

On this basis **the area recommended for CPZ implementation includes Whitmore Road (east of Porlock/Treve Avenue), Treve and Porlock Avenues within the consultation area.**

2) Period of operation of the CPZ?

There were relatively few representations directly about the proposed CPZ times of Monday – Friday 10am-1pm. Implicitly those who completed the form letters welcoming the CPZ proposals and raising two specific objections are accepting the CPZ hours. Similar would apply to the other supportive responses although two from Treve Avenue request additional hours on Saturday. Perhaps unsurprisingly those who objected to the CPZ also believed the hours of control to be too long. The majority of the responses/representations from where the CPZ is recommended above accept the proposed CPZ hours so these hours are recommended for implementation.

3) Proposed Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm waiting restriction on north side of Whitmore Road between Treve Avenue and Bessborough Road

It is **recommended this be reduced to operate Monday to Friday 10am-1pm** as the CPZ operational hours following representations by residents.

4) Eligibility area for permits in Bessborough Road

Whitmore Road is a public highway available for the use of the public in general and the local community in particular. It is appropriate that local residents on more major roads like Bessborough Road and Treve Avenue should be able to access parking in quieter side roads like Whitmore Road. The residents of Whitmore Road do not have exclusive parking rights in Whitmore Road. Despite the widespread objection to Bessborough Road residents being eligible for parking permits no change in the area of eligibility is recommended.

5) Proposed Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm waiting restriction on east side of Bessborough Road

It is recommended that this proposed restriction is abandoned

6) Proposed Monday to Friday 8am – 6.30pm waiting restriction on the north side of Whitmore Road between Treve Avenue and Drury Road

It is **recommended this be reduced to operate Monday to Friday 8-10am and 4-6.30pm** as the CPZ operational hours following representations by residents.

7) Request for additional permit parking spaces on south side of Whitmore Road towards junction with Porlock Avenue

It is recommended that two further permit be introduced, also minor adjustments to starting points of proposed permit bays in Whitmore Road and Treve Avenue.

8) Section of Whitmore Road between Drury Road and Treve Avenue

Various options considered based on some support and some objection to CPZ also opposition to the proposed waiting restriction on north side. Recommended no CPZ at this stage but monitoring post implementing of current scheme to determine need for possible further consultation.

9) Access to shared use parking spaces in Whitmore Road for all day use

Objections from people working locally who use Whitmore Road (and perhaps Treve Avenue) for parking but claim cheapest all day parking £4.20 per day. The parking spaces in Whitmore had a proposed maximum stay period of 4 hours. It is recommended to remove the maximum stay period which would allow all day parking for c£2.50-£3 as a means of addressing these objections.

Representations regarding proposals in Whitmore Road or adjacent streets

	Source	Objections or other representations	How addressed and/or officer comment
1.	Resident of eastern section Whitmore Road 12331	1. I support and am in agreement with the proposed CPZ scheme but have a couple of objections I would like to make: 2. Eastern section of Whitmore Road - In my view the proposed no waiting zone time, single yellow line (SYL) Monday to Friday from 8am- 6.30pm, proposed along the northern side of the road, would materially	1. This and the 15 essentially identical text and 5 further representations offer explicit support for the controlled parking zone (CPZ). Several others offer implicit support. 2. The arrangement with a single yellow line on the north side and parking bays on the south side came from previous consultations and was to protect visibility for residents emerging from their driveways also to obviate a post a sign by each parking

		<p>affect my current parking rights and those of my family, friends and visitors. The parking congestion, safety, access and visibility issues caused by non resident parkers, which has prompted the Review, could be addressed by merely reducing this time slot to the Zone Time of 10am-1pm.</p> <p>3. With the exception of 128 Bessborough Road, whose front door and drive is in Whitmore Road, I am also objecting to the inclusion of 32 properties (includes 23 flats) in Bessborough Road within the proposed CPZ scheme. This will materially affect my current parking rights and those of my family, friends and visitors as it will reduce the parking spaces available.</p>	<p>bay between driveways. It was proposed all day to match the operational period of the shared use bays and prevent afternoon parking by non-residents. Residents and their visitors would still be able to park in permit bays after 1pm. This approach has attracted universal objection from those residents otherwise supportive of the parking controls in their road. It is therefore recommended to reduce the operational period of the single yellow line to Monday to Friday 10am-1pm to match the CPZ time.</p> <p>3. Observations in evenings, weekends and school holidays show relatively little parking in Whitmore Road. This suggests few residents from Whitmore Road or Bessborough Road actually park in Whitmore Road. It seems highly improbable that significant numbers of Bessborough Road residents would start parking in Whitmore Road if they would now need to purchase permits. The introduction of restrictions as proposed would deny access for parking to these Bessborough Road residents who already have waiting restrictions outside their properties. Whitmore Road is a public highway so residents of that road are not entitled to exclusive parking rights. It is therefore recommended to leave the CPZ boundary in Bessborough Road unchanged. Even had the suggestion of residents been accepted it would have necessitated further consultation of those Bessborough Road residents who would be potentially excluded from the scheme.</p>
2. to 16	<p>Representations from same section of Whitmore Road using identical or near identical wording as 1. above.</p> <p>12332 12333</p>	See 1 above	See comments to 1 above.

	12334 12335 12336 12343 12354 12368 12373 12392 12394 12395 12396 12416 12417		
17.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road making exactly the same representation as 1 above but with additional comments as noted 12393	Additional two paragraphs emphasising support for CPZ and wanting it introduced as soon as possible plus offering contact if clarification required	See comments to 1 above.
18.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road making exactly the same representation as 1 above but with additional comments as shown 12355	Essentially same as 1 but additional para: The current plan proposes a no-waiting time zone of 10 to 1pm Monday to Friday outside our back garden gate. As discussed with officer, we understand that there has to be some form of marking across this driveway, so accept that the proposal is the best available. I was reassured to learn that, if someone did park across our drive outside of this time zone, then the Highway Code would apply and Harrow Council would be willing to issue a parking ticket.	See comments on objections to 1 above. The resident's comments are correct.
19.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road on south side near junction with	We live on Whitmore Road, which is on the Eastern Arm of the road between Treve Avenue and Bessborough Road. We have the following objections to the current proposal:	1. Adequate parking for residents and non-residents provided however addition of two permit bays not detrimental to scheme objectives and is recommended.

	<p>Porlock Avenue</p> <p>12329</p>	<p>1. No waiting between 10am-1pm outside numbers 71-79, would materially affect our current parking rights and those of our family, friends and visitors. The parking congestion, safety, access and visibility issues caused by non-resident parkers, which has prompted the review, could be addressed by implementing residential parking along this strip within the restricted time.</p> <p>2. No waiting between 8am-6:30pm on the northern side of the road (eastern arm). This reduces the parking on this end of the road by 50% during the day. We believe that the restrictions on the northern side should allow for permit holders to park between 10am-1pm.</p> <p>3. The southern side of the road, where there are no houses, this section is not outside any property, and therefore we would like to see this as free parking at all times. This would not directly impact on any residents on the road.</p>	<p>2. To introduce permit parking on north side would necessitate numerous parking bays each with its post and sign. These would be more detrimental for visibility for residents emerging from driveways..</p> <p>3. All space within CPZ is meant to be controlled. This would leave chaotic parking which scheme is designed to address.</p>
20.	<p>Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road 12346</p>	<p>Parking in Whitmore Road is undoubtedly a nuisance but I have some reservations.</p> <p>1. I wonder if the hours on the laybys might be changed to 10 a. m to 12 p.m.? I have 9 or 10 friends to lunch quite often and the cost of the parking tickets for these occasions would be prohibitive for me, as a pensioner.</p> <p>2. I also wonder whether the 'No Waiting' on the residents' side of the road might do as well between these times as it would interfere with those using the</p>	<p>1. Not a formal objection rather comments /request. Resident wants CPZ times amended so finishes at 12 noon rather than 1pm for convenience of resident's lunch visitors. The 10am to 1pm period agreed by officers and councillors to enable effective enforcement. The CPZ with this time has been supported by almost all the other residents in their representations. No change recommended.</p> <p>2. Yellow line proposed for north side to be reduced to CPZ time see 1 above.</p>

		street for the station and also the school while causing less trouble for some of my neighbours.	
21.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road 12358	<p>As 1 above with the following in addition</p> <p>The sub-division of parking zones on the south side of the eastern arm of Whitmore Road into at least 10 separate zones will lead to increased signage materially impacting the visual amenity of existing residents. In looking for ways to reduce and/or consolidate the number of separate zones, and thus related signage, we note:</p> <p>1. The proposed scheme provides for pay and display parking to allow opportunity for parking associated with the playing fields and Whitmore High School. This we understand, however, it is unclear how the shared use provision opposite 12-24 Whitmore provides such amenity whereas it does contribute to the number of zones and materially affect both our current parking rights and those of our family, friends and visitors;</p> <p>2. The notification provides no basis for the proposed double yellow line opposite No. 24-28 Whitmore Road. If this is to provide a passing place, for example for emergency vehicles, there is no evidence that this is required even when vehicles are parked along both sides of the eastern end of Whitmore Road, because of the availability of driveways (e.g. for each pair of houses and the Pavilion) whereas it will add unnecessarily to the number of zones and related signage. We note there is no such provision on the western arm of Whitmore Road whereas</p>	<p>1. Parking is subdivided in order to provide mix of permit parking and shared use which also allows for pay and display. Residents may find pay and display cheaper for their visitors. Shared use also allows non-residents to park by paying and display. Whitmore Road is a public highway the CPZ offers residents preferential parking opportunities but not exclusive parking rights. Permit parking and shared use each need signing at quite frequent intervals c30metres apart so a fair amount of signing would be inevitable even if the number of subdivisions reduced.</p> <p>2. The double yellow lines opposite No. 24-28 provide a safe place to allow vehicles to pass. Without this, issues may arise especially for larger vehicles when other restriction do not apply and parking potentially on both sides of road. The western section has different parking provision as there are houses on both sides along the full length.</p>

		the notification has identified the difficulties that buses experience when parking occurs on both sides.	
22.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road 12344	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed CPZ on our road for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) We are fortunate enough to live on one of the most beautiful streets in Harrow. We have a gorgeous view of the hill. The CPZ road markings will deface our road, with either white boxes or yellow lines and unsightly signs and meters along the whole street. What a shame to have to look at such things when the view is so lovely.</p> <p>2) From what we have observed, one of the busiest times in terms of cars parked on our road is during school drop-off and pick-up hours. The suggested times of 10-1 during the working week will not address this nor will it deter cricket game attendees, church goers or McDonalds drive-thru customers who park outside these hours.</p> <p>3) We moved from another part of London in order to escape the misery of paid parking. From firsthand experience we know that creating a CPZ simply creates a parking problem in neighbouring roads. And there is evidence to suggest that introducing CPZ to residential areas puts people off wanting to move to the area, reducing desirability and therefore house prices.</p> <p>4) A relative comes to our home on a weekly basis to look after</p>	<p>The resident is one of seven objections from residents of this part of Whitmore Road. There are however over twenty representations showing explicit or implicit support for the introduction of a CPZ scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The road markings and pay-and-display meters have a negligible effect on the aesthetics of the area. The markings and signing is part of national legislation but some adjustments can be made in conservation areas. 2. The CPZ is designed to deter longer term parking by non-residents. The CPZ does not consider school drop-off and pick-up hours etc nor was other short term parking the issue of concern of residents. 3. No evidence that introducing CPZs reduces property values indeed parking problems as raised by residents often deters potential purchasers and has a negative impact on prices. 4. How useable a resident's driveway is not an issue for the council. Visitor permits are available and the P&D element of the shared use bays may prove more economic. 5. Residents have been made aware of permit charges and by clear majority support a CPZ <p>This opinion is in the minority in the road.</p>

		<p>the children during the working week. The CPZ will mean that every visit by family will be a paid one as we do not have a useable driveway here (and visitors' permits are usually limited in number). What residents who are in favour of the CPZ do not seem to realize is that, during hours of operation, all visits by family members, friends and tradespeople, or where a resident may be using a replacement vehicle for a short time e.g. due to breakdown, will require a visitor's permit which is far from ideal. This may be acceptable to those who have a driveway but we do not.</p> <p>5) And most importantly, we will have to pay the annual fee for our two vehicles, which is an added expense when budgets are very tight. We calculated that we would be paying approximately £300 annually (2 cars plus mother visiting weekly plus random extra permits) which we simply do not have. And this cost will only go up as the years go on. This is causing us significant worry.</p> <p>In conclusion we feel it is a real shame to introduce a CPZ to a road which has cricket fields down almost one whole side, where we have never, in the two years that we have been here, had a problem parking outside our house. And because the majority of homes on this road have a driveway (for a minimum of 2 cars), we find it difficult to understand why there is such a pressure to introduce CPZ.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The practicality of a driveway access at this property is a separate issue to the CPZ. The off street parking provision is issue which people would make when choosing where to live. 2. Whitmore Road is public highway and the location of signs or pay and display machines will be decided by the council for traffic management reasons. Whenever possible signage is located as to be unobtrusive. 3. The hours of restriction of the CPZ
--	--	--	--

		<p>Objection to CPZ proposals Described</p> <p>Should the CPZ go ahead we would kindly request the following:</p> <p>1) Permission to build a driveway at the front of our house so that our parking situation is the same as everyone else's (so that we are not the only household paying for a permit)- I have been liaising with officer at the council about this</p> <p>2) Please do not position any parking meters outside our front gate. They are unsightly and will compromise our security because members of the public will be loitering outside our house, which is currently very private</p> <p>3) Please only enforce the restricted parking from 10-11am. This way you deter daily commuters but those parking once in a while are only paying a very small fee. This will be consistent with the restrictions on roads leading to West Harrow tube, which is fair</p> <p>4) Please allow for residents parking along both sides of the street (instead of having a yellow line down one whole side). We have two very small children and it would not be safe for me to carry both children half way down the street because there is no available parking close to our house. For the same reason we would appreciate it if you could have residents parking in front of numbers 71-77 (instead of the proposed yellow line).</p> <p>In conclusion, please do not</p>	<p>and any other restrictions will enable effective enforcement. They have either been accepted by the majority or adjustments have been made where strong community view expressed. Whilst all objections and representations are considered and where practical adjustments made, it is not possible to make adjustments to satisfy every individual.</p> <p>4. Allowing residents to park on north side of road would require far more posts and signs and be more visually intrusive. The restriction here has however been reduced to CPZ time.</p>
--	--	--	--

		implement CPZ in our road. There is plenty of parking and all residents except us have a driveway in front of their house. This is a selfish campaign by some residents to prevent having cars parked on our street at all which is just ridiculous.	
23.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road 12356	<p>As 1. Plus Eastern section, south side - whilst we welcome the proposed provision of permit bays along most of the southern side, we object to the siting of a permit bay immediately abutting our gateway at No. 71. This will materially affect our safety, as it will increase the risk of obstruction of the sight lines to the eastward (ie, up the road) when exiting our driveway. We request that a no-waiting region of at least a car's length be provided to the eastward of our gateway at No 71.</p> <p>2 The SYL outside Nos 71 - 77 with a proposed no-waiting period of 10am - 1pm would be inconvenient for residents, and would not increase safety significantly as the main danger when exiting these driveways is from westbound traffic coming down the road. We object to this proposed SYL as it would thus materially affect our parking rights by reducing the available parking spaces. We request that it be replaced by permit bays with a 10am - 1pm Zone Time, similar to the rest of the south side.</p>	<p>See comments from 1 above</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resident raises an issue regarding the close proximity of the proposed permit parking bay, which restricts the visibility when leaving the driveway. The standard practice is for a single yellow line to be placed across all driveway accesses and extend 1.5 metres either side to provide more visibility than with the current unrestricted kerb-space where vehicles can be parked right up to driveway. Giving the at least one car length clearance would reduce the amount of on street parking and is not justified. In fact this might be more detrimental when the restrictions do not apply and an additional car may seek to squeeze into the space. Notwithstanding this a small adjustment to increase the clearance will not lose an on street space. 2. Adequate parking for residents and non-residents provided however addition of two permit bays not detrimental to scheme objectives and is recommended.
24.	Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road	Essentially identical to 23 above who is a near neighbour	As 23 above
25.	Resident of	Similar to 1 above.	Similar comments to 1 above.

	<p>eastern section of Whitmore Road</p> <p>12371</p>	<p>Exact text included: I refer to the Whitmore Road Area Parking Review which you have recently compiled at the request of residents.</p> <p>Whilst we are in general agreement with the proposed CPZ scheme we have the following objections to the current proposal.</p> <p>1. <u>Eastern section of Whitmore Road, north side</u></p> <p>Our original objective in seeking the CPZ was to prevent the use of the road as a long-term car park by commuters which was preventing parking for all other purposes during the day time by everyone else, principally the residents and those coming to see them or conducting business with them. It was not the intention of the residents in requesting a scheme to reduce the availability of parking in the road to such an extent that no parking would be possible on one side of the road from Monday to Friday between 8 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. That's worse than the existing situation! The objective we seek is simply that employed commonly in other CPZs in the borough and elsewhere i.e. the restriction of parking by non-permit holders for a <u>short</u> period during the day, usually one hour is sufficient and that would be preferred. The three hour period between 10 a.m. and 1 p.m. which I have heard as a compromise suggestion is barely acceptable.</p> <p>2. <u>Inclusion of properties in Bessborough Road</u></p> <p>We also object to the inclusion of the properties in Bessborough Road (32 properties in all) being included within the proposed</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>scheme as this would once again reduce the availability of parking in the road for residents, their families, friends and all other visitors.</p>	
26.	<p>Resident of eastern section of Whitmore Road</p> <p>12410</p>	<p>With reference to the proposed parking scheme, and in particular the Eastern end of Whitmore Road.</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>I am in favour of a form of parking in Whitmore Road, but the 0800 - 1800 to the North side of the road is far too restrictive to myself and family.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>The excessive daytime parking is caused by non residents who park for the day and continue their commute to the centre of Harrow or by train to London.</p> <p>This could be simply remedied by introducing a shorter parking restriction time, which has been successfully implemented in other roads in Harrow. This normally takes the form of two periods: between 1000 - 1100 and 1400 - 1500. These periods would allow for the school runs and also other non resident road users would have the benefit of parking for shorter periods, but the all day commuter parking would disappear immediately.</p> <p>The no waiting time of 1000-1300, which has been proposed on the south side of the road would also deter commuter parking successfully if introduced to the north side of the road.</p> <p>The proposals for the south side appear to be extensive over complicated with nine separate changes along the length of the</p>	<p>Comments to objection see 1 above.</p> <p>In relation to comment: The 10am to 1pm CPZ and now waiting restriction on north side allows for more effective enforcement. Different periods of enforcement are necessary to enable efficient enforcement. The mixture of permit bays and shared use bays provides preferential parking opportunity for residents.</p>

		<p>road. Many posts and signs will be required which will be very confusing as well as unattractive and obtrusive.</p> <p>The extent of the South side proposals have been developed using a 0800-----1800. restriction on the North side. If the North side has shorter restrictions. say 1000-1300. then consideration should be given to reducing the number of changes on the South.</p> <p>The pay and display will be little used for the Harrow School PRIVATE playing fields. The only noticeable parking generated by the fields is on alternate Saturday afternoons during the football season, at a time which is outside the restricted period. The 2010 planning application for the new pavilions submitted by the school stated that the gate was for deliveries only and a pedestrian gate would not be included so as to deter parking in Whitmore Road.</p>	
27.	<p>Resident of Bessborough Rd address</p> <p>12420</p>	<p>I would like to put forward my objections to the CPZ proposal in Whitmore Road.</p> <p>1. We have lived on the corner of Whitmore and Bessborough Road now for 29 years. We haven't had serious problems with parking. We are grandparents and babysit every week day for our daughter, to enable her to go to work. At the moment she is able to arrive with her child and leave the car while she goes to work. The new proposals will make this difficult, as people from neighbouring roads will have permits which will enable them to park here, instead of wherever they park at the moment. Even if we buy</p>	<p>1&3. The observation by these residents seems at odds with the majority of Whitmore Road residents who have petitioned for a CPZ. A single yellow line across the resident's driveway is necessary as all road space in the CPZ must be controlled in some way or form.</p> <p>2. See comments to 1 above</p> <p>3. See above</p> <p>4. The 10am to 1pm period was to allow more effective enforcement.</p> <p>5. Residents permits are the same cost for residents of all ages however resident's visitor permits are available at a 50% discount to those in receipt of an old age pension.</p> <p>This representation is one of only seven objections to the CPZ in principle. The majority of representations from this section of Whitmore Road are in favour.</p>

		<p>permits, which we will find very expensive, more than likely we won't be able to park here anymore.</p> <p>2. My objection is that residents in Bessborough Road and perhaps Treve and Lasselles Avenues will have the same permits which allow them to park here. They should not be included in the scheme. There will not be enough room for all that parking. The situation will be worse for us. <u>Please reconsider this.</u></p> <p>3. Also, I object to having a line across my drive. I would like you to make an exception and leave it as it is, so that we can use it in emergency if, as I suspect, my daughter will have nowhere to park when arriving with our grandchild. <u>We should be trying to make things easier for each other, not more difficult. Please reconsider this.</u></p> <p>4. Originally, when this scheme was proposed, the time of restriction was from 10.00am -11.00am. This was to stop commuters parking all day. In my view, this is sufficient for the purpose. Lengthening the time, will only make it more difficult for residents here and surely, this is not the aim. Please reconsider reinstating the hour slot from 10.00 - 11.00 am at least outside the houses at this end of Whitmore Road. This would be of great help to us. We would actually be quite happy if our corner of the road was left as it is and not included in the scheme. We would be delighted with this as it would be the easiest option for us. We don't want life to be made more difficult than necessary.</p>	<p>Second part of representation from same residents</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>5. Please could you tell me if the cost of parking permits reduced for senior citizens as this would be of help?</p> <p>.</p> <p>This, I am sure, will push permit holders into the bays along the length of Whitmore, making the road, as I said, a parking lot all day and night.</p> <p>Compounding the problem, as you pointed out in your objection no.2 in your letter to the service manager, is the fact that Bessborough Road residents will also park in the permit holders bays. Where else can they go? That is a shame, as beautiful Whitmore will change for ever.</p> <p>I looked out this evening and apart from our two cars and two for Roxeth Farm the road was clear, as is usually the case at evenings and week ends.</p> <p>My view is that the 32 Bessborough Road properties should certainly not be included in the CPZ . There is not enough room in Whitmore Road to accommodate them.</p> <p>As soon as the CPZ comes in, our end of the road will constantly be filled with permit holders cars from other roads, outside our two houses.</p>	
28.	<p>Resident of Whitmore Road living close to junction with Treve Avenue</p> <p>12408</p>	<p>I have enjoyed living at this address for many years. I live at this address with my family and there are three cars in this household and four when my daughter is home.</p> <p>I wish to make FORMAL OBJECTIONS to the proposed scheme as I believe that myself, other members of my family and my neighbours are materially affected by these proposals. From my understanding the main reasons outlined for these</p>	<p>The rational of the parking proposals was described in the documents sent to residents and is based on complaints from residents and observation of the parking situation by officers. The views expressed by the resident in objecting are at odds with the majority view of representations in the eastern section of Whitmore Road.</p>

		<p>proposals is to address the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety in relation to access in and out of resident driveways on the northern side of Whitmore Road. 2. Long term parking by non residents, possibly commuters or people working in Harrow along unrestricted parts of Treve Avenue and Whitmore Road. 3. The need to provide parking for all road users including use associated with the playing fields. <p>As a resident I have first -hand experience, and I am also well positioned to make observations on the parking associated with Whitmore Road/Treve Avenue on a daily basis. I believe that the council should seek to understand more fully the nature and degree of the concerns before entering into a CPZ scheme that actually constrains residents more than it benefits them.</p> <p>I would firstly like to address the proposals in relation to Bessborough Road/ Whitmore Road arm. (Eastern arm) The proposal to place no stopping restrictions on the north side of Whitmore Road Mon – Fri between 8 am – 6.30 pm</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduces the available number of parking places on Whitmore Road by 50% during these hours. b. Does not afford residents any parking outside their homes during the restricted hours of the day. c. Forces residents to purchase resident permits or parking time for themselves and visitors within the restricted hours and for them to park on 	<p>The resident refers to no stopping restrictions. There are no such restrictions proposed. There is a no waiting restriction which allows loading/unloading and drop off / pick up of passengers.</p> <p>Residents do not have a large need for on street parking during the day. The majority of the parking appears to be from non-residents who would be deterred by these proposals.</p> <p>Parking on the north side would require multiple bays and signs. It also makes visibility coming out of driveway difficult.</p> <p>No resident is forced to purchase a permit although one is required to park in a permit/shared used bay during the operational period.</p> <p>The council cannot control the number of cars a resident chooses to own however the council wishes to discourage multiple car ownership so has escalating charges for 2nd and subsequent vehicles.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>the south side of the road.</p> <p>d. Forces residents to compete for fewer parking spaces on the south side with other road users.</p> <p>e. Negatively impacts residents with charges that offer less rather than more access to parking. In total my household will pay an additional £472.50 + visitor parking charges per annum to compete for less parking places on the road where I live. It is not clear in your circular whether this charge is an annual one. I would be most grateful if this could be clarified to all concerned in order that accurate and informed comments can be made. The proposal is one of many ways that may be employed to deter long stay parking by those who have no connection with the immediate area. However it is not the only one. Unfortunately, I find it is too restrictive. It restricts all parking, impacting the very people who should be permitted to use the road as they live on it and pay council tax to do so. This part of the proposal is not closely aligned to the needs of the residents. I believe the compromise here is unacceptable.</p> <p>Possible alternatives/amendments to the proposals could be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to the restricted hours given for the northern side, an exception could be to allow parking for up to 30 minutes with no return within the hour. This allows residents to drop off shopping to their homes, or for the delivery of services. 2. Allocate parking bays on the north side of Whitmore Road to residents only during agreed hours of the day possibly 10- 11 	<p>The suggested alternatives or similar have been proposed here and elsewhere in the borough. None of them are practical.</p> <p>National legislation requires councils to make its parking schemes self financing so free permits are not an option in Harrow. The actual charges for permits are agreed by councillors.</p> <p>Other local authorities have differing funding streams which affects the costs of permits. The charges for permits are the same across the borough.</p> <p>Parking a Harrow Leisure Centre is not on the public highway.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>am and / or 3 -4 pm Mon - Fri</p> <p>3. Amend proposals for the north side and continue with the proposed scheme on the south side of Whitmore road thereby allowing parking for other road users and bringing in a revenue to cover the cost of the proposals.</p> <p>4. Allocate up to two free parking permits to households on the eastern arm of Whitmore Road. These need not be renewed each year, cutting down on administration and processing time.</p> <p>5. By offering free permits to residents and charging non residents the CPZ does not financially impact residents. If this is the case I would have no objections to its implementation. Similar schemes are currently being run in Brent where residents are charged a one off minimal fee of £10 or no fee at all for resident parking permits. The charge for parking is applied to other road users. Similarly at Harrow Leisure Centre, users are not impacted by parking charges and get three hours parking free. Am I mistaken to have expectations that the council would seek to offer cost efficient schemes, which have the interest of their council tax payers as a priority. I do not believe that you should be introducing a CPZ scheme that financially impacts residents in this way for the foreseeable future. The scheme is far too expensive and I think that you have a duty to seek an alternative means of regularising parking that does not materially impact your residents in this way. Whist the long stay parkers move on, residents are left paying to park outside their homes for years to come. Who benefits most? The council I</p>	<p>The proposed permit parking bay in Treve Avenue is to replace what is currently unrestricted parking and is often full of parked vehicles. A permit bay is less likely to be fully parked especially as it is thought to be no-resident parking which would not continue as they would not have permits. There are no plans to inset the parking bays on this straight section of Treve Avenue.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>think as you have now safeguarded an income from residents parking for years to come.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed introduction of parking bays onto Treve Avenue. I am amazed that you would consider placing a no stopping restriction on the north side of Whitmore Road for reasons of 'safety', and not do so on this dangerous junction of Whitmore Road and Treve Avenue. Unless you intend to indent the parking bays into the green grass verges as has been done on both sides of Treve Avenue, then I object to them being placed here.</p> <p>My OBJECTION is that I feel cars that park here cause a dangerous obstruction to traffic in both directions. This is a major road servicing 3 main bus routes. The proposed bays would lay on the bend of the road just before a main junction. They obstruct visibility to oncoming traffic and hamper residents safe access across their drives. They also present extreme safety concerns for people entering and leaving their vehicles. I ask that you review this proposal.</p> <p>There is one thing that I am truly thankful for is that all proposals are limited to Mon – Fri only. I do hope my comments may be useful it helping you to determine the best way forward for residents and the local community.</p>	
29.	<p>Resident of Whitmore Road living close to junction with Treve Avenue</p> <p>12407</p>	<p>I have lived on Whitmore Road for many years. I own one vehicle which is parked on the north side of Whitmore Road daily. I wish to make OBJECTIONS to the proposed CPZ parking scheme for this</p>	<p>Resident from the same address as 28 above raises similar objections. The comments are to new issues raised:</p> <p>Residents in other nearby roads are entitled to have their parking issues addressed by the introduction of parking</p>

		<p>area.</p> <p>Prior to the introduction of the councils current CPZ scheme in 2012/13 residents of Whitmore Road did not experience any of the present difficulties we now face. With restrictions placed on parking in central Harrow, commuters travel further afield to secure parking. Hence the ramifications of the first scheme, has a knock on affect further down the chain. Similarly any further CPZ schemes introduced on Whitmore Road will create problems further down. The free parking spaces at Shaftesbury Circle shopping area will possibly be the next place to be used by commuters and then the CPZ will have to be imposed there. Ultimately the charge and inconvenience is passed on to residents in our community. I would like to outline my objections to the proposed CPZ as I believe that I and members of my family will be materially affected by its introduction. Whilst I accept that introducing resident parking bays may be useful in addressing safety and access issues. I do not believe that it is the only way, nor the most cost effective way to address the issues.</p> <p>The proposed no waiting zone Monday – Friday 8am – 6 .30 pm on the north side of Whitmore Road (eastern arm) restricts the use for commuters which is what we want, but, is also extremely restrictive to residents. It reduces the number of potential parking places available for residents during the day by 50%, imposes financial expense for residents of Whitmore Road and their visitors, and impedes the delivery of services.</p> <p>Presently 19 cars are parked overnight each night by residents on the north side of Whitmore</p>	<p>controls / CPZ. Parking does tend to displace but there is a limit to the distance people are prepared to walk or use other means to finish their journey to work.</p> <p>The waiting restriction on the north side of Whitmore Road has been reduced to Monday to Friday 10am to 1pm i.e. CPZ time.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Road. These cars do not cause safety issues to other residents accessing their homes. Why would you implement a single yellow line waiting restriction operating Monday to Friday 8 am – 6.30 pm thereby placing constraints and limitations on residents when the intention is to deter long term parking by commuters who are the ones which impede access in and out of resident driveways. This could be achieved by having resident parking only on the north side of Whitmore Road.</p> <p>An alternative to the above could be the implementation of a no waiting zone Mon- Fri 10 am – 11 am on the north side of Whitmore Road, (eastern arm). This would facilitate residents of Whitmore Road and act as a deterrent for long stay parking. The south side could be used in a number of ways including pay and display parking. This option is more flexible as it could facilitate access to a free parking between 11 -4 pm for residents and other community users and services. It makes provision for parking associated with the playing fields and local schools. An option which has been available to the playing field and local schools in the 30 years that I have lived in this area.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>The fee structure for administering the proposed scheme is not cost effective, nor does it appear to be in the best interest of the residents and their families. Whilst it may be the same one adhered to throughout the Borough, that does not guarantee that it is the most cost effective method nor that it should not be open to review and scrutiny by the residents you are asking to pay it.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>It would seem that this proposal aims to deter approximately 30 long stay car parkers on Whitmore Road by imposing undue financial burdens and penalties on residents and other community users. Whilst the scheme does not cater for long term parking these persons will simply seek alternative parking elsewhere and we shall be left paying to park outside our homes for years to come. The proposed CPZ ultimately imposes fees for parking to residents, reduces the number of parking places by 50% to all users in order to deter some 30 long stay parkers and coincidentally in the long term manages to secure a revenue stream from parking for the council. So, in addition to paying council tax, brown bin collection charge, we are now being asked to pay to park outside our homes. For my household that charge is an additional £472.50 + the cost of visitor parking per year. Consider this charge applied to each and every other home in Whitmore Road, each and every year. I make the assumption that the charges will be applied each and every year. It is NOT CLEARLY outlined in the consultation letter whether this is a yearly charge. Please can you advise all residents in writing in order that they may accurately consider all the financial implications of this proposed scheme before a decision is made and if necessary extend the consultation period. The OAP reduction is no consolation to having to pay this charge as I am in my thirties.</p> <p>I would very much like you to consider and comment on a scheme which is run in London Borough of Brent to preserve</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>parking facilities for residents near and around Wembley Stadium. In Preston Road area, residents have parking bays marked outside their homes with restrictions. Parking is restricted to residents only during event days at Wembley Stadium. This ensures residents can park outside their homes on these days. The cost to residents is a ONE- OFF charge of £10 per badge with up to 3 badges per household. This scheme regularises the use of parking, placing the needs of the residents as a priority and is run at a cost which is kept to an absolute minimum to residents. Residents are issued with permits which they can transfer to their cars or that of any visitor to their home on match days in order to avoid parking penalty. Similarly the new parking system in place at Harrow Leisure centre allows 3 hours free parking to centre users and accommodates other users, including all day parking for commuters. The point I am trying to make here is that this system was devised to meet specific needs. Centre users are not penalised by having to pay for parking in any way. Other users are charged presumably sufficient to cover and recuperate the running costs of the car park. In the same way centre users are not asked to pay, I do not feel residents should have to pay to park outside their homes in this case. Is it possible to consider and employ similar cost efficient schemes specifically tailored for residents of Whitmore Road and indeed residents of our entire Borough?</p> <p>There is one other objection I would like to make and that is in relation to the proposed parking bays on Treve Avenue. I make</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>this objection as I believe that unless the parking bays are indented into the grass verges as they are further up Treve Avenue, then this is unsafe planning.</p> <p>Cars that are currently being parked at this location cause such an obstruction that in order to proceed you have to cross the mid-point of Whitmore road, thereby being forced to drive on the side of oncoming traffic. The width of the road does not allow for vehicles to pass safely on both sides if cars are parked on the road at this point. That this situation exists on what is a main bus route for several buses, in an area less than 100 metres from a major junction, and on a bend, causes a nightmare for buses and large vehicles, and is a danger to people entering and leaving their cars. Having lived here for 30 years I know that it has also been the point of several road accidents.</p> <p>My objection here is not necessarily about having parking bays, but that the parking bays should be only placed where it is safe to do so and that they do not impede and cause obstructions to what is a very busy road.</p> <p>In conclusion I feel that there are several options available to the council to control the safety, traffic and parking concerns in this area. I object to the proposed scheme as it only seems to include options that force residents to pay an annual charge to park. It this way I and my family are negatively materially affected.</p> <p>I thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the proposals and hope that these comments will be given some consideration and that they may be used to review the proposed</p>	
--	--	---	--

		scheme.	
30.	Resident of Whitmore Road living close to junction with Treve Avenue 12406	<p>I would like to make objections to the proposed CPZ scheme for Whitmore Road.</p> <p>I object to the no stopping restrictions on the north side of Whitmore Road. (eastern arm) This restricts free access to my home. There should be provision for residents to park for at least 30 minutes to drop off things at their homes. I think the restriction from 8 am – 6.30 could be reduced to possible 8 am – 4.30 pm</p> <p>I object to having to use a resident permit scheme that is so expensive. Given that there are other low cost schemes working around other neighbouring Boroughs I believe that the Council has a duty to seek an alternative more cost efficient proposal. The current proposal places a heavy financial burden on residents to park their vehicles. What justification is there to impose this charge annually?</p> <p>My objections are made on the grounds that the proposed CPZ has a material impact on my well being and my finances. I imagine it will also impact the resale value of my home.</p>	<p>Resident from the same address as those making objections 28 & 29 above. They raise similar objections and the comments to them from 28 & 29 apply. The following also applies.</p> <p>Like 28 above the resident refers mistakenly to a no stopping restriction. The actual no waiting restriction allows loading and unloading. The period for this restriction has been reduced to CPZ time.</p>
31.	Resident of Whitmore Road living close to junction with Treve Avenue 12432	<p>I live on Whitmore Road. I would like to make the following OBJECTIONS to the proposed CPZ scheme on Whitmore Road and Treve Avenue.</p> <p>I feel that the proposals commit residents and other users to long term financial charges which could be avoided if we are more creative and conservative with the expenditure. I would like for</p>	<p>Resident from the same address as those making objections 28 & 29 above. They raise similar objections and the comments to them from 28 & 29 apply. The following also applies.</p>

		<p>the Council to come up with a low cost /budget scheme and let us see what that may look like. It may be that any compromise may be well worth not having to enter into long term parking charges for residents.</p> <p>The main problem residents on Whitmore Road (eastern arm) experience is the effects that long stay parking has on access in and out of resident homes.</p> <p>If the north side of Whitmore road has restricted use to residents only then the problem of long stay parking by others not associated with the area should resolve the issue of safe access on this side. Currently parking on the unrestricted areas of Treve Avenue is very minimal, particularly in front of the playing field. Providing pay and display bays here can take up the shortfall of parking spaces for those currently using Whitmore Road, thereby providing parking to other road users.</p> <p>There are various options and more flexibility for the south side of Whitmore Road, particular, in front of the playing field. This side could also be left as is, offering some free parking, and reviewed later with the view of installing pay and display bays here if necessary. I do not believe that FREE short term parking should be excluded from the options available.</p> <p>I feel that the proposed CPZ as set out, may suit some, especially if money is no object. But unfortunately I cannot afford to support this costly scheme and I believe the Borough too should be mindful of how it is spending tax payer's money. It is unnecessarily restrictive for the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		level and degree of gains to residents. I will be materially affected by these proposals and greatly inconvenienced should they proceed.	
32.	Resident of Bessborough Road 12322	<p>My comment is that while I am supportive of the objectives of the plan which do address quite pressing parking issues I am surprised that you have not included the provision of some parking restriction, preferably double yellow lines, between the South end of the Bus Stop Bay on the West side of Bessborough Road adjacent to the junction with Whitmore Road and the limit of the pedestrian crossing restrictions at the junction of West Street and Lower Road.</p> <p>I hope you are able to consider adding this extension as the current proposals can only make the use of this section of road for parking even more common. This stretch of road has been the site of serious accidents in the past.</p>	Resident in addition to stating support for proposals is requesting a no waiting restriction on the West side of Bessborough Road south of its junction with Whitmore Road. Regrettably this is beyond the remit of the current scheme. There is probably a good case for such restrictions on a narrower section of Bessborough Road but such proposals cannot be added to the scheme without the need to re-advertise the proposals. The council has a separate programme for assessing and potentially introducing such restrictions called the local safety parking scheme (LSPS) programme to which this request will be referred.
33.	Resident of Bessborough Road 12345	<p>With reference to the Legal Notification Parking Control Scheme relating to the above review, I wish to raise an OBJECTION to the proposal to introduce restricted parking Monday to Saturday, 8am - 6.30pm on Bessborough Road, opposite Whitmore Road.</p> <p>1. This is a relatively wide section of road, with no houses on that side, and it is difficult to understand why there is a need to make it restricted when actually parked vehicles cause no obstruction whatsoever. The real problems occur further along Bessborough Road on the opposite side, and on Lower Road beyond West Street.</p>	<p>1. The reason the CPZ extends quite far along Bessborough Road is due to the displaced parking that will most likely occur when the CPZ is implemented.</p>

		<p>I think if an actual inspection was made during these proposed hours the facts would become very clear.</p> <p>My impression is that the previous proposal has been rolled again without an actual review, as I recall making a similar objection at that time.</p> <p>I live on Bessborough Road, and this particular stretch, from the junction of Lascelles Avenue to Kingsfield Road, has no restrictions in accordance with the preference of the majority of residents when we were last consulted (2010?) However, these increased restrictions in surrounding roads will have an adverse effect and impact on my stretch of the road, as people in the many surrounding offices and flats vie for fewer and fewer parking places. Nowadays it is rare for our own visitors or trades people to be able park at all, and obstructive parking across dropped kerbs is becoming more common.</p> <p>Lastly, I do object to not being included in this recent consultation and notification. As can be seen from a map, we are most certainly involved and affected, and I feel we should have been included in both the consultation and decision making.</p>	
34.	Resident of Treve Avenue 12278	<p>1. The close proximity of the parking bay to the west of my driveway promotes a major hazard to those leaving my driveway, and those travelling east on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>When a car is parked in the bay my vision is obstructed of any east going traffic when leaving</p>	<p>1. Resident raises an issue regarding the close proximity of the west parking bay, which restricts the visibility when leaving the driveway.</p>

		<p>my driveway.</p> <p>Similarly the parked car in the bay obstructs the vision of east going drivers of my driveway.</p> <p>This has resulted in near misses when seeing too late a car emerging from my driveway, coupled with, perhaps, the drivers main distraction being a bus at the bus stop opposite number 23 Treve Avenue.</p>	
35.	<p>Resident of Porlock Avenue 12323</p>	<p>As a resident in Porlock Avenue I wish to point out that since the introduction of an area of permissible free parking in Porlock Avenue adjacent to the Cricket Field & on the opposite side of Porlock Avenue to the front of Whitmore High School, between the hours of 15:00 & 18:00 Traffic Jams have become a common feature from Roxborough Avenue, across Shaftsbury Circle, along Porlock Avenue and into Treve Avenue. Traffic is also held up entering and exiting Whitmore Road. This congestion is primarily caused by vehicles parked-up in this free area of parking along Porlock Avenue. Buses coming towards each other along Porlock Avenue are more often than not having to give way to each other especially around the traffic island beside 'Bramber' bungalow.</p> <p>The only way to alleviate this congestion is, I respectfully suggest, by cutting defined parking bays into the adjoining grass verge running along Porlock Avenue – the grass verge on the opposite side of Porlock Avenue to Whitmore High School, the area where free parking is allowed at present. I do not think that when this area of free parking was introduced, it was imagined that there would</p>	<p>The council as highway authority has not created (unrestricted) free parking in this section of Porlock Avenue as this resident suggests.</p> <p>Observations of traffic in Porlock Avenue</p>

		<p>be traffic jams of this magnitude in Porlock Avenue and surrounding roads 2 to 3 years later. The traffic in this area requires closer monitoring before the situation worsens and becomes uncontrollable. It requires visual monitoring by staff from the council's Traffic, Highway and Asset Department. This should be done with some urgency; Harrow Traffic & Highways Department are, by allowing parking in its present format along Porlock Avenue, turning a blind eye to the congestion and pollution created by their own short sightedness and planning directives.</p>	
36.	<p>Resident of Treve Avenue</p> <p>12311</p>	<p>I live on Treve Avenue and write to you as a resident of the area and as a user of the amenities of the area. Availability of convenient parking – though seen by many in very NIMBY terms – is vital for the progress and development of the community.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. I object to the proposal to remove the unrestricted parking section at the Porlock Avenue end of Treve Avenue and replace this with Permit parking bay/s.</p> <p>If this proposal is approved it reduces to zero the amenity (of accessible parking) presently available to Treve Avenue residents (and others). The fact that this amenity <u>may</u> be utilised by others not resident in this area is insufficient reason to take it away completely.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>I view with considerable disquiet that proposals are made to</p>	<p>1. Resident objects to a CPZ at the Porlock Avenue end of Treve Avenue. The reason this is part of the CPZ is due to the displaced parking that will most likely occur after implementation.</p>

		<p>reduce to zero the amenity of unrestricted parking on the section of Whitmore Road between Bessborough Road and Porlock Avenue. I would suggest that the proposed double yellow lines is a gross over reaction and you could consider a no waiting 10 am to 1.00 pm on this side and the other side of the road be left as un restricted parking area.</p>	
37.	<p>Resident of Treve Avenue</p> <p>12338</p>	<p>With regards to our telephone conversation of Friday I am in agreement with having permit holder bays on the south eastern side of Treve Avenue.</p> <p>I was wondering whether this could be extended to include Saturday. Given the current flow of traffic on Saturday is the same as any other week day and with other parts of Harrow becoming permit bays, double yellow lines; I feel commuters are taking the liberty of free parking. In order to control the free flow of traffic I believe I am being reasonable in proposing the Saturday. This will help the elderly neighbours to drive in and out of their driveways without having to stress about cars being parked on the south eastern side of Treve Avenue.</p>	
38.	<p>Resident of Treve Avenue</p> <p>12433</p>	<p>I am generally supportive of the proposed permit parking bays along Treve Avenue. The area does tend to be affected by commuter parking during the working week and the proposal hopefully will alleviate this problem.</p> <p>I would also support extending this to include Saturday morning for AM period along Treve Ave.</p>	
39	Eight worker from businesses	1. I would like to register my objection to the proposed	1. Part of the reason for this review is local residents complaining about

	on Bessborough Road	<p>parking restrictions on Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road on the grounds that there is already limited parking in the area.</p> <p>2. My office is based in, Bessborough Road. There is not enough parking to accommodate all staff members which means some need to park locally. I currently park on the East side of Whitmore Road, the non-residential side which I do not think should be restricted.</p>	<p>commuters parking in their road – a commuter is anyone that travels to another road to park whether they work locally or then use other modes of transport such as train or tube</p> <p>2. It should not be expected that the council provide any on-street parking for any resident or worker particularly if their work does not have adequate on-site parking for its entire staff. In this instance it is recognised there is some demand for non-resident parking hence why the shared use bays have been proposed with a low P&D tariff if workers want to use them</p>
<p>Due to the level of objections and petition from western section of Whitmore Road, it is proposed that a CPZ NOT be installed in this section of the road at this time.</p> <p>Below is a summary of objections received from residents and officer response.</p>			
1		CPZ unnecessary as no problem with parking in this section of road	Representations and petition for controls mainly concentrated in eastern section of road but western section was consulted to give residents the opportunity to have controls and consider any possible displaced parking from eastern section
2		Street furniture and road markings will make road unsightly	For the scheme to be enforceable signs, lines and P&D machine where appropriate are required to be installed on the public highway and there is no evidence to suggest they have a detrimental effect on the 'feel' of a road.
3		Monday to Friday 8am-630pm on north side of Whitmore Rd between Porlock and Drury as parking is mainly school traffic not commuters and is unnecessary	Representation from bus operator indicated congestion at this location. Some traffic congestion has been witnessed by officers. In light of objections it is proposed to reduce the hours of operation of this single yellow line to morning and afternoon peak times ie: 8-10am and 4-630pm
4		Proposed layout will result in long lines of vehicles possibly increasing vehicle speeds as random parking acts as traffic calming	Current parking habits exacerbate this with parking on both sides of road in eastern section thus creating a tunnel effect. Parking should not be relied on to calm traffic as it is not always there
5		With multiple cars there is need for residents to park on road	The council cannot control the number of vehicles residents own and it should not be expected that the council should provide parking on the public highway when residents do not have sufficient off street parking space for the vehicles associated with the property

6		CPZ will force residents to pave over their front gardens and will reduce beauty and appeal of road and increase flooding	There are more natural ways of providing parking on a property than concreting over the current area. It could be argued that excessive cars parked on the road also reduces the beauty and appeal of a road
7		Not enough permit bays for the number of residents to park and too far from some houses	As 5 above
8		CPZ affects property prices	No substantive evidence to support this
9		Care workers and other trades cannot park in cpz	Registered carers are covered by special permits that may be available. Residents would be responsible for trade and could offer own drive for them to park in
10		High cost of permits particularly for properties of 4 or 5 bedroom	As 5 above
11		Road slightly busier during peak times but never grid locked but mini roundabout may help. Speeding traffic can be a problem so wants 20mph signs	Comments noted but outside remit of parking review
12		Restrict visitors and will be cost to residents	Visitor permits only required during control times outside of these times anyone can park in road for free
13		Residents with multiple vehicles have to bear cost of permits and will greatly affect them	As 5 above plus all cpz have to be self-financing and should not be a burden on general council taxation
14		CPZ will make residents park in other uncontrolled roads	This can happen and why western section were consulted so they can make a decision on whether or not they feel there will be displaced parking in cpz installed in eastern section
15		Generally agrees with idea of cpz but believes will not improve environment for road users and pedestrians but may improve congestion	CPZ can reduce parking at inappropriate places but cannot deal with driver behavioural matters
16		Traffic calming and speed cameras to control speed	As 11 above
17		Zebra crossing required	As 11 above
18		Yellow line deprive residents of on street parking and restrict loading/unloading	A CPZ or other yellow lines are only operational at certain times any vehicle can park on a single yellow line outside of these times. Vehicles can park on single yellow lines during control times to load and unload providing it is seen to be a continuous process.
19		CPZ time excessive when other areas only have 1 hour to deter commuters	There are a significant number of 1 hour cpz areas in the borough. A slightly longer control better allows better enforcement of non-compliant vehicles which residents would expect to happen

20		Loss of grass verge for parking would be detrimental to environment and resident does not give consent for this to happen	None of the public grass verges were proposed to be removed. All parking bays would be on the current road surface
21		Cars likely to park all day outside house which is unacceptable and security risk particularly if yellow line goes in	Cars can currently park outside house all day if they so wish as area is unrestricted and no evidence to support security claim
22		Location of permit bays will cause problems getting in and out of property	When CPZ installed council will try to maximise number of parking spaces where it is safe to do so, unfortunately these may be near or opposite some driveways
23		CPZ is extra tax on residents	All cpz have to be self-financing by national legislation and should not be a burden on general council taxation
24		Runs business from home and requires loading outside or nearby and location of permit bays will not allow this	The council should not be expected to provide on street parking in a residential area for a business that operates out of a private house in a residential area.
25		Existing bus stops restrict parking outside property already, CPZ will make it worse	Bus stops need to be positioned where they best fit the requirements of the service and its passengers. It is likely that wherever bus stop is located someone will be affected