

**APPENDIX C Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 1 – Objections concerning Weald Lane, Harrow Weald**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b> (Objector 1 – western end of Weald Lane)	<b>Officer Comments</b>
(a) Proposed double yellow line waiting restriction cover the front of my property and will prevent parking because of position of neighbour driveway.	Proposed restrictions are to facilitate access especially for larger vehicles at such junctions. They support Rule 217 of the Highway Code which states “DO NOT park ..... within 10 metres of a junction except in an authorised parking space ...” In this instance the proposed waiting restriction extend approximately 8.5 metres from the junction covering most but not all of the frontage of the property. So to sustain this length is reasonable. However the carriageway width at 7.2 metres is wider than many junction situations. Junction restrictions are necessary but their extent could be reduced by 1.5 metres, which would enable one vehicle parking space before the first driveway, without significantly compromising the purpose for the restrictions. On the opposite side of the road there is sufficient unrestricted length for one car space so no similar adjustment is needed.

<b>Grounds for Objection</b> (Objectors 2 – concerning eastern end of Weald Lane)	<b>Officer Comments</b>
(b) (Revised objection) Waiting restrictions by the “commercial properties” (shops) should only apply at the busiest times “7.30am to 9.30am and 3.30pm to 6.30pm” so that vendors can continue to trade without too much disruption. This makes it easy for local residents to use shops for groceries etc. Suggested that waiting might be restricted to 30 minutes.	The existing restrictions on this section of road, which the proposed double yellow line restrictions would replace, are no waiting Monday to Saturday 7am to 8pm were introduced in 1996 to address congestion caused by parking near the shops. The carriageway width of Weald Lane varies from 4.9 to 5.3 metres apart from around the junction with High Road, Harrow Weald and leaves barely 3 metres past parked vehicles. The objection is therefore really against present restrictions rather than the extension of these beyond 8pm, as proposed by this traffic order, when most businesses will be closed. The proposed extension of waiting restrictions is in line with those on High Road. Parking in this narrow section of road potentially would produce similar traffic congestion and impede the movement of larger vehicles including fire appliances at any time. The waiting restrictions do not affect loading / unloading which remains unrestricted. Blue badge holders could theoretically park outside the shops for up to 3 hours. There is unrestricted parking further along Weald Lane less than 20m away.

**APPENDIX C Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 2 – Objections from Stuart Road, Wealdstone**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b> (Objector 3)	<b>Officer Comments</b>
(a) Proposed double yellow line restrictions in Stuart Road will reduce the number of spaces available to park.	The double yellow lines proposed in Stuart Road are at junctions. These restrictions only enable council enforcement where drivers are not meant to be parking according to the Highway Code, see part 1 objection (a) above.
(b) Proposed bays in Ronart Street will again reduce available parking space as residents from Stuart Road will not be allowed to park in them.	These proposals were the subject of local consultation in July 2006. The majority view from this immediate area was not in favour of an extension of the controlled parking zone so no extension is proposed in Byron Road or Ronart Street. The parking bays are not part of the proposals contained in the traffic order.

**APPENDIX C Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 3 – Objection from resident of Graham Road**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b> (Objector 4)	<b>Officer Comments</b>
(a) Extension of the controlled parking zone is unnecessary.	The council has received complaints about parking problems in the roads where the current extension is proposed including from residents of Whitefriars Avenue and the western end of Graham Road. The proposals were the subject of local consultation in July 2006 when a clear majority of responses from occupiers supported extension. In the roads nearby the majorities were 10:4 for Graham Road (western end) and 14:7 for Whitefriars Avenue. (The eastern end of Graham Road is already within the CPZ). Only roads where a majority of responses favoured extension are included in the proposed scheme.
(b) School (presumably Whitefriars first and middle school) and Mosque nearby require daytime parking.	The operational hours of the CPZ (zone CA) are Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm so these proposals themselves are to address vehicles parked throughout the day and not parking at either end of the school day or people attending prayers at the mosque. They are intended to improve the parking opportunities of those with permits. The council is not obliged to provide large-scale on-street parking for non residential use. CPZs are partially there to restrain traffic growth whilst encouraging alternative more sustainable transport for appropriate journeys.
(c) Will affect Enderley Road doctors surgery visiting of patients and emergency calls.	GPs who are on call can use the medical emergency badge scheme to park within CPZ during their hours of operation. The reduced amount of parking usually makes it easier to park for those entitled to do so. This benefit is often experienced outside of the controlled hours although no permit or badge is needed to park.
(d) An extended CPZ will mean more street furniture (signs)	In the immediate proximity to this resident's house the proposals are likely to reduce the amount of signage as some zone entry signs will be relocated elsewhere and the proposed double yellow lines do not require signs. There will however be some increase in signs due to the permit holder only signs but these are kept to a minimum to enable enforcement.

**APPENDIX C Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 4 – Objections from a resident and a business in High Street, Wealdstone**  
**(section between Palmerston Road and Canning Road)**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b> (Objectors 5,6 and 7)	<b>Officer Comments</b>
Objectors 5 and 6 appear to come from different people at the same business raising similar points.	
(a) Objects to extension of CPZ as it benefits no one except the council and its revenue generation	The CPZ programme is entirely led by demand from the respective communities. The extent of any extension is determined by the response to local consultation, which for these proposals took place in July 2006. Only roads where the majority of responses from occupiers supported joining the CPZ are included within the scheme. See part 3 objection (a) above.
(b) I already have to walk for 10 minutes to find only free (on-street) parking.	The proposals for extension to the CPZ are to a number of roads on the northern and eastern edges of the existing zone, but this is where the residents have been experiencing parking problems and when consulted last year people confirmed they wanted to join the CPZ. The scheme proposals include changes to allow businesses to buy permits, for operational purposes, to park within the CPZ.
(c) The council is against small/new businesses and £300 per business permit is too high.	One of the key elements of the Wealdstone parking review was a request from local businesses for more on-street parking for their customers. Such increased provision is part of these proposals. The tariff for business permits was set some years ago and only represents approximately £1 per day for 6 days per week operation. The scheme proposals only make this option available to local businesses.
(d) Objector 7's exact objection is not entirely clear. It refers to "the time extension" and this being not "convenient for residents." Although the objection was received on the 23 August after the end of the statutory consultation period a letter requesting clarification was dispatched. No response has as yet been received.	The operational hours of the CPZ are set to remain unchanged at Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm. It is possible that the resident has mistakenly confused some local consultation, carried out in July, in Masons Avenue, Herga Road, The Bridge and the southern end of Byron Road on a possible extension to these roads' CPZ hours. The response to this consultation and the recommendations following from it are the subject of a separate report. In the event of changes being made there will be a separate order making process. The present zone CA hours were the most popular in an earlier consultation in 2002.