

GREEN LANE CPZ STATUTORY CONSULTATION OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2021

REPOSSES

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>I am very concerned with regard to the proposals as the Lane I live in is occupied by 4 elderly pensioners 2 of whom don't possess a computer or mobile phone and the worry is if visitors want to visit how are they going to deal with the parking permits. People won't want to come if they are taking the risk of being issued with a ticket.</p> <p>In addition how are workmen going to be able to park.</p> <p>I appreciate that some residents are finding it difficult to park sometimes but the parking permits are going to have a devastating impact in this Lane.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing your comments.</p>	<p>The proposals have been generated by a residents' petition and have been the subject of previous informal consultation that showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close. The correspondent agreed with the proposal during the initial consultation.</p>
<p>Please can you be sure to include in your intended improvements, for which we are very grateful, the Uxbridge End of Green Lane.</p> <p>This is unfortunately highly used as a short cut and owing to the fact that there is permitted parking ON BOTH SIDES after 10 am,</p> <p>It only needs one thoughtless parker to make it impossible for Ambulances and Fire Engines (or large cars and vans) to access the road.</p> <p>My own husband's life was saved by an ambulance coming to our home in this road but it was very early in the morning. Later it would have been problematic. I don't want anyone else to suffer. Often it is jammed up until someone is persuaded to go up on a pavement or into a driveway to unjam the road.</p> <p>Schooltimes in particular but really all day.</p> <p>Thank you for all that you do,</p>	<p>The previous informal consultation did not show evidence of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane south of Culverlands Close.</p>
<p>I represent St Johns School in Green lane and last week we received the councils plans for the CPZ in Green lane and we wish to formally object to this and request an amendment so that parents can have a pick up and drop off time for the children which if the zone was implemented would cause serious traffic issues especially on Stanmore Hill.</p> <p>As the council is aware St Johns is a Church of England School and whilst we do have many parents who walk their children to the school , we also have a considerable number of parents who travel to the school from other parts of the</p>	<p>One of the problems previously reported relate to the obstructive parking at school entry and exit times.</p> <p>School travel is a persistent and wide ranging problem throughout the borough. Many schools take part in a number of initiatives that are aimed at encouraging parents to take their children to and from school using modes of transport other than the car.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>borough. By implementing this zone they will then have to stop on Stanmore Hill and many of the side roads north of Green lane and as you are aware Stanmore Hill is a bus route so the increased parking will not assist with the movement of the buses . I would estimate that Embry Way will also have increased traffic and parking. I am not sure in your correspondence why commuters are mentioned as the parking here is too far from Stanmore Station for people to walk. Could their not be a time allowed to park to drop children off and pick up ? School numbers are already under pressure and the implementation of this CPZ will decrease numbers further which is not what the school or Education department want and therefore there is a mixed message from Harrow in this respect.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p>	<p>At the moment St Johns School does not take part in any of these initiatives. Contact details will be forwarded to School Travel team so that the school can be made aware of the various initiatives.</p>
<p>I OBJECT to the proposal ----I live on green lane and have done so for nearly 4 decades .I would like to point out below the considerable bias to events north of culverlands close over past few years which has been hinted that either a councillor or a very close friend of a councillor or an ex councillor lives in that section and is very very active compared to the rest of green lane and roads off.</p> <p>1. when residents in that area of green lane started to receive fines for parking mostly on the pavement to the detriment of pedestrians and particularly people pushing prams in a complete and fast reverse not only were residents fines cancelled they were given the right to park half on the pavement and half on the road with expensive paving carried out but nothing to the awful tar paving of the rest of green lane----uuum wonder why?</p> <p>2. when the closure of green lane was proposed (see emails below with regard to that and the pictures attached) the residents north of culverlands close organised facebook campaigns etc to reverse the decision--I also received abusive messages as I wanted the closure to be given a chance-----the activists not only campaigned rigourously they were invited to speak at the council meeting when the decision was made to reverse the closure----no one who was in favour of closure was invited to the meeting or had a clue we could make representations---uum wonder why again?</p>	<p>Discussion of previous Council decisions is beyond the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>Although this correspondent was in favour of a CPZ in the whole of Green Lane, the majority of those respondents from Green Lane were not in favour of the proposal.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>3. now when this parking matter came up you dont have to have a degree in road engineering to know that if you put in place residents parking on only one small section of a road ALL the commuters and commercial shops/offices in the area will simply park in the rest of green lane--as per photos attached from last year you can see the frequent chaos that happens in green lane---the cpz or parking in just part of green lane should be extended to the whole of green lane and roads off green lane or not take place at all ---strange how the residents north of culverlands close used the school as a major factor in NOT going ahead with the closure of green lane but if this ridiculous scheme proceeds then dropping off and collecting from the school should ensure further chaos for the rest of green lane. Please consider the contents of this email carefully and refuse this ludicrous scheme or extend it to the whole of green lane and roads off</p>	
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
	The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p> <p>The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..</p>
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council’s final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p> <p>The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..</p>
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council’s final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
	<p>The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..</p>
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways.3. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council’s final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p> <p>The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..</p>
<p>We feel the proposed changes to Culverlands Close will negatively impact the street and we OBJECT for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on the road in front of all of the driveways which we think is unnecessary as no one parks in front of the driveways. 3. The hours of operation of the proposed resident permit zone North of Culverlands Close is Monday-Saturday which is excessive as there is no issue with commuter parking on this end of Green Lane and therefore it should be Monday – Friday. 	<p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council’s final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p> <p>The results of the previous informal consultation showed a large majority of support for the CPZ in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close with operational times as advertised..</p>
<p>I have the following comments to make about the planned changes to parking outlined in your proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an island in Culverlands Close and I feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. Your proposal suggests a proposal to place double yellow lines on both sides of the road in front of all of our driveways which I think is totally unnecessary. 3. I feel that your proposals do not actually address the issue of the dangerous commuter parking on the southern end of Green Lane, closest to Uxbridge Road. People routinely double park here causing issues for passing vehicles. 	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council’s final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>I am a resident in Culverlands Close.</p> <p>The double yellow lines proposed are needed but NOT to the extent that have been planned. Double yellow lines are needed at both pinch points on the round about to allow for the refuse trucks, emergency vehicles and my daughters transport bus to pass through easily.</p> <p>Parking for around 2 cars should be available on each side of the flat ends of the round about for visitors, deliveries and tradesman.</p> <p>With the parking permits happening near the cottages will then mean the people who cannot park there will park in culverlands close and other parts of Green Lane causing further congestion and restriction on safe passage of refuse trucks and emergency vehicles. The timings of the permits should be Monday to Friday and school hours.</p> <p>There is also a issue of poorly parked cars at the bottom end of Green Lane which makes it really tricky to go up and down the road easily and safely. At times some cars are parked so badly its almost near impossible for a car to pass let alone anything bigger. One suggestion would be for the single yellow line have restrictions 8-10am as already there and also add another hour or so later in the day. That way it will stop commuters from parking there.</p> <p>I have seen commuter cars going to sainsbury's to park for an hour or so and then repark their cars on Green Lane once the restrictions have ended. Hence adding an extra hour of restrictions in the afternoon would stop this.</p>	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p>
<p>I am a resident at X Culverlands close, Stanmore, HA7 3AG. I object to the proposed double yellow lines on Culverlands close.</p> <p>We have several guests who visit us often and require easy and convenient access to our home due to ill health / disability. This is always available for the around the roundabout and outside the front of our house.</p> <p>Double yellow lines around the area would make it very inconvenient for them to visit us with this ease.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
	consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.
<p>I regularly visit friends who live on Culverlands close and I understand there is a proposal to place double yellow lines on a large part of the street. This will remove areas that we use for visitor parking and make visiting our friends very difficult. We would therefore ask that you do not proceed with the proposed changes to parking arrangements on Culverlands Close and I therefore object to this proposal.</p>	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so.</p>
<p>I am a resident at x Culverlands Close, Stanmore, HA7 3AG. I object to the proposed yellow lines on Culverlands Close. The reasons for objection would be that we have lots of family and friends come to visit (some of those who are elderly and have limited mobility). Having double yellow lines would make it extremely inconvenient for them if they could not park near the house. Additionally, having lived here for over 15 years, there has not been a point where I have thought double yellow lines would be necessary.</p> <p>I hope this is clear.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
	to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.
<p>I am registering my formal OBJECTION to the proposed parking changes on Culverlands Close, Stanmore, HA7 3AG (REF - 21 - 23).</p> <p>I object to the proposal to introduce the double yellow lines on Culverlands Close as per the plan the council has sent us.</p> <p>This was not an option in the consultation that preceded this legal order that the council has now made.</p> <p>We are highly concerned that the implication of this will be to remove the limited visitor parking from Culverlands Close.</p> <p>As the council will be fully aware, there is a higher than average proportion of elderly residents on Culverlands Close. Many of them are dependent on carers and family support, and for them to be able to live independently in their homes there must be visitor parking available on the street.</p> <p>These proposals will remove that, and as a result will negatively impact on the quality of life of residents in Culverlands Close.</p> <p>As there are a significant number of residents with protected characteristics who would be negatively impacted by these changes, it seems unlikely that a full equality impact assessment has been completed with proper legal advice sought before making this order. Because the proposals as they stand are excessive and will negatively impact on residents as a result, I believe they are in breach of the equalities act.</p> <p>We have considered alternative options and I attach a plan which shows the only places on the road where the residents feel it would be appropriate for the introduction of a double yellow line on the street.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p> <p>The majority of properties in Culverlands lose have off street parking that can be used in preference to parking on street.</p>
<p>I regularly visit friends who live on Culverlands close and I understand there is a proposal to place double yellow lines on a large part of the street. This will remove areas that we use for visitor parking and make visiting our friends very difficult. We</p>	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>would therefore ask that you do not proceed with the proposed changes to parking arrangements on Culverlands Close and I therefore object to this proposal.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>However, officers have met with residents of Culverlands Close and have developed amendments that reduce the extent of the double yellow lines whilst maintaining access for vehicles.</p>
<p>As a resident of Culverlands Close, I will be negatively impacted by the proposal detailed within REF 21- 23 and as a result, I heavily object. For the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road. 2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on both sides of the road in front of all of our driveways which we think is unnecessary. 3. The hours of operation for the proposed resident permit zone on Green Lane north of Culverlands Close should be Monday - Friday and school drop off times only as there is no issue with commuter parking at this end of Green Lane. 4. We feel that the proposals do not actually address the issue with dangerous commuter parking on the southern end of Green Lane, closest to Uxbridge Road, as people routinely double park here causing issues for passing vehicles. 	
<p>I regularly visit my family who live on Culverlands Close and I understand there is a proposal to place double yellow lines on a large part of the street. This will remove areas that we use for visitor parking and make visiting our family very difficult. I therefore object to this proposal and ask that you do not proceed with the proposed changes to parking arrangements on Culverlands Close.</p>	<p>It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction. However, officers have met with residents of Culverlands Close and have developed amendments that reduce the extent of the double yellow lines whilst maintaining access for a majority of vehicles.</p>
<p>I object to the proposed changes to Culverlands Close ref 21-23 on the following basis;</p>	<p>The initial consultation indicated support for the introduction of a CPZ only in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road.</p> <p>2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on both sides of the road in front of all of our driveways which we think is unnecessary.</p> <p>3. The hours of operation for the proposed resident permit zone on Green Lane north of Culverlands Close should be Monday - Friday and school drop off times only as there is no issue with commuter parking at this end of Green Lane.</p> <p>4. We feel that the proposals do not actually address the issue with dangerous commuter parking on the southern end of Green Lane, closest to Uxbridge Road, as people routinely double park here causing issues for passing vehicles.</p>	<p>The proposals contained in the statutory consultation have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p>
<p>As a resident of Culverlands Close I wish to record my objection to the proposed waiting restrictions for the Close.</p> <p>I believe that they are excessive and that they will cause unnecessary disruption to both residents and visitors and suggest that these restrictions be limited to critical pinch points only.</p> <p>Residents met recently to discuss and we are in agreement with regard to what we believe is appropriate. One of the residents - Mr. Graham Lauder - has written to you separately outlining our suggestions.</p>	<p>The initial consultation indicated support for the introduction of a CPZ only in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close.</p> <p>The proposals contained in the statutory consultation have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations.</p> <p>However, officers have met with residents of Culverlands Close and have developed amendments that reduce the extent of the double yellow lines whilst maintaining access for essential vehicles</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
	<p>officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p>
<p>Dear sir/madam, my wife and I are over 80yrs, we strongly object to our street Having double yellow lines all the down our close. The main problem is the roundabout at the end of the close, this does cause problems On a Friday morning for the dustman, this can be solved by by having double yellow Lines at various points only on the roundabout. The driveway to the garages, needs to be kept clear at all times, this needs good Signage, to stop strange vehicles using our entrance to turn round. Please also note, we have 6 properties with residents over 80- 90 years, If double yellow bands were put in the length of Culverlands Close, 6 days a week, How are the family's be able to check on their Loved Ones?? Culverlands close need to see a planning officer in their close for a , so that the residents can explain their concerns.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. However, officers have met with residents of Culverlands Close and have developed amendments that reduce the extent of the double yellow lines whilst maintaining access for essential vehicles</p>
<p>I am writing on behalf of the residents of Culverlands Close # regarding the proposed Green Lane Area Parking Review - Legal Notification which you have sent to us. We have met as a group of residents from both the Houses and Flats on Culverlands Close, as we feel the proposed changes are excessive and will negatively impact our street. We have agreed that it would be best and most helpful if we can meet with and discuss these proposals with an officer of the council so we are able to demonstrate the following concerns on the road;</p>	<p>Officers have met with residents of Culverlands Close and have developed amendments that reduce the extent of the double yellow lines whilst maintaining access for a majority of vehicles. The proposals for a CPZ were the subject of initial consultation, the results of which indicated support only north of Culverlands Close, hence why this is the section where the CPZ and associated operational hours is proposed. Green Lane is wider closer to Uxbridge Road and as such obstructive parking may be considered less of an issue, as evidenced by residents responses to the initial consultation.</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>1. We have an island in the road and we feel that a double yellow line would only be beneficial here if it was restricted to the pinch points at the corners of the island, as opposed to double yellow lines around all of it. The straight sections in the centre on the longer sides are required to be retained for parking for visitors and trades and do not cause obstruction on the road.</p> <p>2. The council also proposes to place double yellow lines on both sides of the road in front of all of our driveways which we think is unnecessary.</p> <p>3. The hours of operation for the proposed resident permit zone on Green Lane north of Culverlands Close should be Monday - Friday and school drop off times only as there is no issue with commuter parking at this end of Green Lane.</p> <p>4. We feel that the proposals do not actually address the issue with dangerous commuter parking on the southern end of Green Lane, closest to Uxbridge Road, as people routinely double park here causing issues for passing vehicles. We would welcome a site visit where we can walk you through this in person.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you with proposed times for a meeting.</p>	
<p>I am writing with reference to Green Lane Area Parking Review 21-23. Thank you very much for your efforts to address the concerns of the local residents by removing commuter parking and freeing up road space for the local residents. However, I fully endorse the contents of the letter sent by email and posted on 5 November by Andrew Davis (reading us in copy) on behalf of all the residents in the Ben Hale Close (attached). In addition, double yellow lines outside or near my house will be a particular problem because space is limited outside my house. Double yellow lines will stop parking for servicer providers, thus impacting on resident's daily life, house maintenance and area amenity. I also understood that putting double yellow lines in front of houses, in particular, along dropped kerbs, may arouse controversy (see the previous case reported by Mirror on https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/couple-face-1000-fine-using-5764106). As stated in the objection letter from all the residents in the Close, additional times for single-yellow-line parking restriction such as 2 pm -3 pm in the Green Lane area has been suggested to achieve the objective of Green Lane Area Parking Review (to address the concerns of the local residents by removing commuter parking) as</p>	<p>The initial consultation indicated support for the introduction of a CPZ only in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close. The proposals contained in the statutory consultation have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where</p>

OBJECTION/COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>well as to minimize the new policy impact on all the residents living in the area. I believe this proposal is sensible and reasonable. "But whatever the final outcome needs to be the same for the area under review otherwise if there are lesser restrictions in some roads but not others, those with lesser restrictions will be a magnet to those who need parking spaces" (quoted from Mr Davis' email dated 5 November 2021).</p>	<p>there are strong material grounds to do so. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p>
<p>I am resident at Ben Hale Close along with my wife. I attach an objection letter signed by all residents in our Close. For the sake of completeness, I have also sent it by post. The letter should be self-explanatory. We have objected to the proposed measures for the reasons given. We have made sensible and reasonable proposals but whatever the final outcome needs to be the same for the area under review otherwise if there are lesser restrictions in some roads but not others, those with lesser restrictions will be a magnet to those who need parking spaces. Our proposals address this as well as set out the reasons for our objection. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and attachment. I will ensure any response is provided to each resident, but you must communicate with each one of us individually if you consider that to be appropriate.</p>	<p>The initial consultation indicated support for the introduction of a CPZ only in the section of Green Lane north of Culverlands Close.</p> <p>The proposals contained in the statutory consultation have been proposed to reduce the potential for vehicles to be parked in obstructive or hazardous locations. If reduced lengths of double yellow lines are introduced than it is possible that drivers will try to park in those sections that remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>The important thing to note is that this is statutory consultation and not a public consultation. There is a significant difference. Just because an objector may say that something is not desired it does not necessarily qualify as a substantive response as it is necessary to demonstrate a material impact. The officers reviewing all of the objections need to make a judgement as to whether an objection has a material impact or not. A lot of what has been provided as objections is speculative. It is not the purpose of the statutory consultation to have a second chance to amend the proposal. The purpose is to state what is the Council's final scheme and to only make changes where there are strong material grounds to do so. It is not the responsibility of the council to provide car parking, drivers must find suitable safe locations to park. No one has the right to park on street but practise allows drivers to park where it is safe and does not cause obstruction.</p>