

APPENDIX B			
	Road of Address/ GC ref.	Objection/Comment	Officer response
1	Oakdene Close  14008	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposed changes to the Y zone CPZ as outlined in the document with ref DP 2016-13.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal would reduce the number of residents' bays available for permit users in the Westfield park area by more than half (with an additional space in the zone being removed) and</li> <li>2. To remove the afternoon restriction will mean that residents would pay the same amount of money for their permit on a much reduced offering and</li> <li>3. In addition will be likely to face a scenario where no parking spot is available at all. This is already the case especially on Friday nights and would be exacerbated by the fact that the other zones would have afternoon restrictions and I would no longer be able to attempt to find parking there.</li> <li>4. Furthermore as a local resident I observe that sadly the church on Westfield Park is hardly brimming with activity on weekday and Saturday afternoons. While this might be related to the unfortunate death of the vicar, it seems unreasonable to burden the neighbours throughout the year just to accommodate parking for guests for an occasional wedding. I assume that disabled parking permit holders are allowed to use the residents' bays (and if not this probably ought to be considered), which means that elderly disabled members of the church attending activities should be able to park anyway. For everyone else it surely is not too much hardship to have to</li> </ol>	<p>Resident of Oakdene Close (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduced bay length in Westfield Park and to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sole objection to the reduction of permit bay outside the church. Whilst the council tries to maximise available parking to permit holders within CPZs. This reduction of parking spaces was agreed by Traffic &amp; Road Safety Advisory Panel to address representations to facilitate wedding and funeral vehicles. Permit parking space remain in Westfield Park. The yellow line restriction would only be in operation during zone hours. It is recommended that this objection be set aside.</li> <li>2. Resident and resident visitor permits are set by Cabinet on a borough-wide basis and are the same irrespective of the operational period which varies from 5hours to 168hours per week. They should not be regarded as an hourly rate as periods selected to address parking issues present.</li> <li>3. Resident objects as believe the absence of afternoon waiting restriction will attract parking and will make it more difficult for permit holders to find parking. Being the only area near Hatch End station without restriction in afternoon, it is likely to attract more parking associated with station. Wholesale reduction in hours not recommended.</li> </ol>

		<p>park in the public car park.</p> <p>I had already outlined the above when responding to the consultation and therefore urge the council to actually follow the results of said consultation. Otherwise why have a consultation at all!</p>	<p>4. Comments on usage of church premise in comparison to number of residents this resident considers would be adversely affected. They observe that blue badge holders can park in any permit bay free of charge.</p>
2	<p>Sambrook Court, Westfield Park</p> <p>14012</p>	<p>Thank you for the recent background to the Hatch End Parking Review.</p> <p>1. Having read the information, I feel I must object to the new proposal, especially as the recommendation in the report was for "no change", from the respondees of the public consultation.</p> <p>2. If you remove the Monday - Saturday 3pm to 4pm parking restriction, Westfield Park will be open to unrestricted parking from 11am, making it available to all who want to go either to town, or Watford for their afternoon/evening visits. This will have the effect of overcrowded and dangerous parking, possibly, as it was before the restrictions were in place, leaving even less parking for the attendees to a Church Function.</p> <p>As most Church functions take place on either a Saturday afternoon, or weekday evenings, I would propose, as a compromise, that the restrictions could be as follows:</p> <p>Monday to Friday 10pm - 11pm and 3pm -4pm</p> <p>Saturday 10pm - 11pm</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>1. Resident observes proposal contrary to previous recommendation for status quo in report to TARSAP.</p> <p>2. Resident objects as believe the absence of afternoon waiting restriction will attract parking making the road less safe similar to situation prior to the CPZ. They argue afternoon rail users may leave less space even to church users. Being the only area near Hatch End station without restriction in afternoon, it is likely to attract more parking associated with station. Wholesale reduction in hours is not recommended.</p> <p>3. Suggests compromise in just removing Saturday afternoon restriction based on their belief that weekday afternoons are not as busy as Saturday for church. Whilst this would afford permit holders better protection on weekdays it would still require creation of a new zone. Such wholesale change is not recommended.</p>
3	<p>Elm Hatch</p> <p>14022</p>	<p>I am very unhappy that the majority of residents that responded to the first consultation requested the status quo i.e. no parking 10-11 am and 3-4 pm has been overturned. I strongly object to your proposals for the following reasons.</p>	<p>Resident of Elm Hatch (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p>

		<p>1. Westfield Park's proximity to the Train Station and Hatch End Broadway will be vulnerable to additional parking from shoppers, shift workers etc. Especially as it will be the only place to park for free, so close to transport and amenities, from one minute past eleven in the morning for the whole day.</p> <p>2. The residents on Westfield Park signed up to this parking scheme, incorporating both morning and afternoon restrictions, only to have our democratic choice over-turned by ward councillors, chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder. What was the point of a consultation in the first place? What a waste of our council tax!</p> <p>3. I agree with your proposal under 'other minor changes' reducing the size of the residents parking by 2 bays to facilitate wedding vehicles etc.</p>	<p>1. Resident objects as believe the absence of afternoon waiting restriction will attract parking to the detriment of residents who by majority responded wanting current hours. Being the only area near Hatch End station without restriction in afternoon, it is likely to attract more parking associated with station. Wholesale reduction in hours not recommended.</p> <p>2. Resident observes proposal contrary to previous consultation responses introducing a CPZ with both morning and afternoon hours and more recently for keeping for status quo. They question the point on asking residents about hours if council then choose to ignore majority view.</p> <p>3. Agrees with other proposed changes.</p>
4	<p>Sambrook Court, Westfield Park  14030</p>	<p>I live in Westfield Park and presently we have CPZ in our street with parking restrictions for Monday – Saturday for between 10 -11 am &amp; 3 - 4pm and I would like this to continue.</p> <p>I refer to the changes of removing the afternoon timings of 3 - 4pm and I strongly object to this change.</p> <p>1. Residents in our road campaigned to have the CPZ for a number of years and</p> <p>2. We certainly do not want to go back to how it was previously as we suffered from vehicles parked in our road all day as it is used for the nearby station by commuters as there is a station car park charge. We also suffer from once the restriction is finished of commercial vehicles (vans) parking in our road in order to go around the corner to the local pub and restaurants, apart from using the trains and if we did not have this restriction they would be parked there after the 11am</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>1. Resident observes it took some years to achieve a CPZ to address the parking problems in their roads which has been achieved by the current restrictions in both morning and afternoon.</p> <p>2. Resident objects as they fear the same parking problems they used to experience will return if the afternoon restriction is removed. Just removing the afternoon restriction will not return to the situation prior to the CPZ being introduced as the morning restriction will prevent all day parking by rail commuters and double yellow lines would remain. They do make the observation that a parking problem does still occur</p>

		<p>restriction had finished and remain there all day.</p> <p>3. I understand about the churchgoers, but these are mainly on a Sunday when the restrictions do not apply. There are the very occasional wedding on a Saturday, so if needs must the restriction of 3-4pm could be lifted, but this would be only on the Saturday, but certainly not for the whole week Monday-Friday.</p> <p>4. The road is very narrow in parts and to start having vehicles parked there for most of the day would be horrific once again.</p> <p>Please take my objection very seriously and I speak on behalf of a lot of residents and neighbours that live in this road.</p>	<p>after the 3-4pm restriction finishes and it is highly likely to be worse if such unrestricted parking can start from 11am as opposed to 4pm. Wholesale reduction in hours not recommended.</p> <p>3. Resident observes that main church activity on Sundays when restrictions other than double yellow lines do not apply. In practice for occasional events like Funerals and Weddings the church can apply for a dispensation for attendees to use permit bays even if they are in operation. Such a dispensation is not available for regular periodic visitors such as clubs using church premises.</p> <p>4. Resident objects as parking in permit bays and zone time yellow lines would cause similar access problems due to narrow carriageway width. This could potentially affect refuse collection and emergency vehicle access as well as residents. Wholesale reduction in hours not recommended.</p>
5	<p>Sambrook Court, Westfield Park</p> <p>14035</p>	<p>I object to the proposed changes to the current parking restrictions.</p> <p>Taking away the afternoon restrictions will mean people using the high street will use up all the parking spaces. As a resident i expect my visitors to be able to park outside my home. It is not acceptable to me that non-residents are able to park here instead of residents.</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>Resident objects as believe the absence of afternoon waiting restriction will attract parking making the road less safe similar to situation prior to the CPZ. They argue afternoon visitors to the High Street may leave less space. Being the only area near Hatch End station without restriction in afternoon, it is likely to attract more parking associated with station. Wholesale reduction in hours is not recommended.</p>

6	Westfield Park 14047	<p>Regarding the new proposals for Westfield Park, we <b>STRONGLY OBJECT</b> to this change.</p> <p>1. The alteration to the times will put us back two years. Cars will be parked in the street the whole weekend making access for ambulances and fire trucks very difficult as in the past. We will also have problems with getting out of our drive.</p> <p>2. From our observations it is clear the church has very few weddings and funerals and we are sure the two hours restriction can't be too difficult to work around. There are many religious buildings in main roads that t get round this problem.</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>1. Resident observes it took some years to achieve a CPZ to address the parking problems in their roads which has been achieved by the current restrictions in both morning and afternoon, they fear the same parking problems they used to experience will return if the afternoon restriction is removed.</p> <p>2. Resident observes that church actually has very few weddings and funerals. In practice for occasional events like Funerals and Weddings the church can apply for a dispensation for attendees to use permit bays even if they are in operation. Such a dispensation is not available for regular periodic visitors such as clubs using church premises.</p>
7	Sambrook Court, Westfield Park 14051	<p>I strongly object to any changes.</p> <p>1. I have lived in Westfield Park for over 10 years and when I first moved in I and my neighbours were suffering from constant parking of all types of vehicles parked in our narrow road on both sides especially when a charge was introduced at the station car park. I was thrilled when the CPZ came into operation as this really helped with the problem and wish it to continue.</p> <p>2. Although I understand the church wants these changes, but the churchgoers mostly visit the church on a Sunday when none of the restrictions are required. They have some weddings on a Saturday afternoon, but they are very few and</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>1. Resident observes it took some years to achieve a CPZ to address the parking problems in their roads which has been achieved by the current restrictions in both morning and afternoon, they fear the same parking problems they used to experience will return if the afternoon restriction is removed.</p> <p>2. Resident observes that main church activity on Sundays when restrictions other than double yellow lines do not apply. In practice for occasional events</p>

		<p>the church usually put out cones for the guests to park outside the church. I suppose the afternoon slot of restricted parking could be lifted for just the afternoon on a Saturday, but not the morning one, and during the week Monday- Friday certainly to be left as it is 10-am and 3-4pm.</p> <p>3. If we have these changes we will have all sorts of vehicles parking after 11am. They will be parked there for the rest of the day so they can use the station, shops, local pub, and restaurants.</p>	<p>like Funerals and Weddings the church can apply for a dispensation for attendees to use permit bays even if they are in operation. Such a dispensation is not available for regular periodic visitors such as clubs using church premises.</p> <p>3. Resident objects as believe the absence of afternoon waiting restriction will attract afternoon visitors to the High Street and may leave less space. Being the only area near Hatch End station without restriction in afternoon, it is likely to attract more parking associated with station. Wholesale reduction in hours is not recommended.</p>
8	Thorndyke Court 14101	<p>We are writing to make a formal objection against the parking review for Hatch End. We replied to the consultation on this planned change and indicated that we did not want any change to the existing parking scheme.</p> <p>1. We are shocked and dismayed that this change is now being pushed through despite the majority of replies from residents also being against the planned change. We feel that this change is unfair, unjust and discriminatory against the residents and council tax payers in this area for the benefit of a group the majority of whom do not live in the zone - and that it is actually for the benefit of a church business rather than for church Services as suggested in your document.</p> <p>2. Could you tell me why has it taken so long and cost so much money from the already limited Council budget to reach this decision? Surely the previous consultation when this zone was established just two years ago provided you with the information on what residents wanted.</p>	<p>Resident of Thorndyke Court (within area for proposed reduction of hours) objecting to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>1 – 3. The Hatch End controlled parking zone (CPZ) – Zone Y was introduced in roads surrounding Hatch End station and operates Monday to Saturday 10-11am and 3-4pm in 2014. Following the introduction of the zone the Council received a petition from St Anselm's Church requesting the removal of the afternoon restriction from the roads surrounding the church as the petitioners felt that the church was not fully represented in the original consultation and that its parishioners were unfairly affected by the implementation of the cpz. The Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) sanctioned a review of the Hatch End controlled parking zone to establish the level of support for the changes requested by the</p>

	<p>3. If you go ahead with this change further unnecessary costs will be involved to change the signage, permits and visitor passes.</p> <p>4. In addition, when it has taken seven months for the council to respond to the consultation with findings, why must residents reply within three weeks during the peak summer holiday period? Do you think this is fair?</p> <p>5. The area the council plans to change is made up of the closest roads to the train station. It was effectively a station car park before the zone was introduced.</p> <p>6. Most of the cars parked in the area during the day were from people who do not live in the zone and who were using the station. Have you investigated with Hatch End Station whether there has been an increase in the number of people using the station over the last few years? Surely this needs to be identified before a decision is made as we can see a significant increase in foot traffic.</p> <p>7. Changing the zone is going to increase driving and parking in our road - which is against Council / Government policy on increasing the use of public transport and exactly what this zone was established to prevent.</p> <p>8. In your document you claim that the change is to help the church. Over 95% and perhaps more of the church parishioners do not live in the zone you plan to change and so will not be affected by the increased parking in the area.</p> <p>9. Even the vicarage is not in this parking zone.</p> <p>10. Have you asked for a church census to identify how many local people use the church? Have you identified the number of</p>	<p>petitioners. The results of the public consultation carried out were reported to TARSAP February 2016. The report indicated that whilst the results of the consultation were generally inconclusive a small majority of those that responded to the public consultation from the Westfield Park area did not want any changes to the hours of control of the existing Y zone controlled parking zone (CPZ) operating Monday to Saturday 10-11am and 3-4pm. TARSAP resolved to defer a decision pending further discussions. It was agreed following discussions between ward councillors, the Chair of the Panel and the Portfolio Holder to recognise the needs of the petitioners and proceed to statutory consultation on the proposal to remove the current afternoon restriction which operates Monday to Saturday between 3-4pm. This statutory consultation also included (b) shortening a permit bay on the east side of Westfield Park opposite Linden Lea and its replacement by zone time single yellow line and (c) the extension of the junction double yellow line on the north side of Cedar Drive.</p> <p>4. The statutory consultation is part of a process that is set down by legislation (The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England) Regulations 2011), whereby the traffic order is advertised and people have a period of 21 days to object. It is unfortunate that this period coincided with the summer holiday period, but in order to ensure that any changes to the traffic orders could be implemented within the current financial year, the statutory consultation needed to be completed by September.</p> <p>5 – 7. Information regarding passenger numbers at</p>
--	---	--

	<p>parishioners who will benefit from the change and the times they will benefit and compared this to the number of residents affected and the periods they will suffer? As the zone does not operate on a Sunday these Services would not be included, so it would only be for irregular church services on other days of the week.</p> <p>11. We can understand that having the zone can affect wedding services, funerals and other church events, but these are rare, at most numbering one a month.</p> <p>12. Have you identified how many of these events there have been in the period since the zone was introduced and compared this to the number prior to this? Surely for a proper decision to be made these numbers should be identified and published?</p> <p>13, Also, for these events it is possible to suspend the parking zone, as was done for the church Christmas Fayre last year. Would that not solve the problem without changing the zone?</p> <p>14. It is our understanding that the church is concerned about hiring their facilities - the church hall - and not about church services for parishioners. Regular church services on a Sunday and throughout the week have always been outside of the restricted parking times. There is quite a distinction between the two.</p> <p>15. Hiring the hall is a business most often used by non-parishioners. Residents should not be inconvenienced in order for a church business to benefit. No other halls in the area - including churches in Pinner and Pinner village hall - have been given the benefit of free parking to the detriment of local residents.</p>	<p>stations is difficult to obtain as it is deemed commercially sensitive, and therefore unable to comment on any increase in passenger numbers at the station. Reiterate that the details of the objection will be reported to and considered by TARSAP and the Portfolio-holder when making any decision as to the way forward.</p> <p>8 – 12. Unable to offer any comment on the use of the church and can only state that the consultations were as a result of a petition received by the council and that the process has been subject to full discussion with and agreement of ward councillors, the Portfolio-holder and the Chair of TARSAP.</p> <p>13 – 19. The comments regarding the ability of the church to apply of a dispensation for parking at weddings and funerals and the nearby public transport access are noted and comments to this effect are included in the TARSAP report.</p> <p>20 – 21. Confirm that we have received a number of objections along lines similar to those that you raise. As mentioned earlier, these will all be reported to TARSAP who, as elected representatives, will decide whether or not the proposals are to be recommended to the Portfolio-holder to be taken forward.</p> <p>22. Parking permit charges are set centrally and are the same across the borough for all controlled parking zones irrespective of their operational hours. It is therefore unlikely that there will be any reduction in permit charges offered to residents if the zone times are altered, similarly if the zone times were extended</p>
--	--	--



	<p>16. If the people hiring the church facilities are local then they could walk, use the very good public transport links (both bus and rail) or park in the ample pay and display facilities on the Uxbridge Road within 100 yards of the church. We have monitored the pay and display bays close to the station in the last few weeks and there are usually 8 to 10 free spaces each time we have passed them. This does not indicate the need for more parking near the church.</p> <p>17. As you know, the Westfield Park population includes quite a number from vulnerable groups including the elderly - both in the large sheltered housing facility in the road and also in numerous flats and houses - and residents with young families.</p> <p>18. In addition to adding church hall hire parking, the planned change would turn the area into a station and restaurant car park. The zone is not just the closest area to the train station but also to many of the restaurants in Hatch End, and will be used by both staff and customers for free parking. This will make crossing the road and living in it more difficult. It will not help the residents nor the church.</p> <p>19. Have you considered the implications of street cleaning? It is poor currently, but the change will see more cars increasing litter and less cleaning due to cars being parked.</p> <p>20. We have spoken to a number of neighbours who replied to your last consultation but are not planning to reply to this as they feel they will not be listened to. That is not how democracy should work and is not a good reflection on Harrow Council.</p> <p>21. We do not understand how you would be prepared to turn our roads into a car park to benefit the church hall hire business and against the express wishes of the residents.</p>	<p>no increase in costs would be introduced.</p> <p>23. Confirm that the consultation leaflets were hand delivered by officers to all homes in the consultation area. Objector has been asked for details of addresses that did not receive a leaflet. Reiterate that the previous consultation has been fully discussed with ward councillors, the Portfolio-holder and the chair of TARSAP before undertaking the statutory consultation.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>There are far more people living in these roads than there are parishioners. Why would you hold a consultation and not listen to the results? Why would you want to prioritise a commercial business over the views of the residents when there are sufficient pay and display bays on the Uxbridge Road? Why are you making this decision without much of the information to make a proper cost / benefit analysis? It does stand scrutiny.</p> <p>22. If the council presses ahead with the change, whilst we will challenge it, will it also reduce the charges for car permits in the zone by 50% just as it will reduce the time residents would need them by 50%? It would not be fair and reasonable for residents to be charged the same as we will suffer more traffic.</p> <p>23. We will consider mounting a legal challenge to your proposals should they be implemented against the express wishes of the majority of the residents, and this will include that the council did not hand deliver the Hatch End Review document to all homes in the consultation area, despite being notified of this. We will also be contacting our Councillors and MP to raise objections to this plan.</p>	
9	<p>Sambrook Court, Westfield Park  14103</p>	<p>1. Just remove the 3-4 restriction on Saturdays, rather than Monday to Saturday. Most weddings take place on a Saturday afternoon and this would help St Anselm's. Removing the 3-4 restriction on weekdays may well lead to a lot of crowded parking as previously.</p> <p>If this is not possible then I would agree with your proposal of Monday to Saturday, 10-11 am only.</p>	<p>Resident of Westfield Park (within area for proposed reduction of hours) showing opposition to reduction of CPZ hours.</p> <p>Not a formal objection rather comments.</p> <p>Resident makes similar point as other objectors that busiest afternoon for church is Saturday when weddings occur. Expresses concern that removal of weekday restriction would return roads to congested parking situation as before. Weddings and funerals can be addressed by a dispensation on parking.</p>

10	Randolph Court, The Avenue  14024	As a resident of The Avenue, Hatch End I as a Disabled person (Deaf) feel an objection to a proposed extension of the double yellow lines at Cedar Drive junction as the area has been useful for parking whenever in case the driveway/rear garages at Randolph Court may have no space left for parking?	<p>Resident of The Avenue objecting to proposed extension to double yellow lines The proposed extension to the double yellow lines at the junction with Cedar Drive is intended to maintain clear visibility for traffic entering and leaving the junction.</p> <p>The highway is not provided as car park and as such drivers will have to find other safer areas to park.</p>