

APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments
Part 1 – Objections concerning extension of CPZ (zone C)

Grounds for Objection (Objector 1 – resident of Walton Road)	Officer Comments
(a) Cost to residents of buying permits.	The cost of permits was explained to residents in the consultation in July 2007. The responses received supported the extension of the CPZ presumably as the improved parking opportunities offered by proposals outweighed the cost to residents of purchasing permit. There were majorities from each of roads where bays are proposed and nearly a 2:1 majority over the scheme area. Residents only need to purchase permits if they wish to park in the permit bays during the zone hour (Monday – Friday 10am-11am).
(b) Extending the CPZ and permit parking scheme to Walton Road will reduce the number of cars parked and lead to increased traffic speeds which are already too high.	Walton Road and Walton Drive are used as a cut through to avoid the right turn ban at the junction between Harrow View and Headstone Drive. Traffic speeds can be higher on such roads. The most recent traffic survey, in 2003 shows traffic speeds typical for this type of road with an 85%ile speed just below 30mph. This does indicate that some drivers are exceeding the 30mph speed limit, but numbers are comparatively small. There are permit parking bays proposed on both sides of the road but there will inevitably be fewer spaces than the theoretical maximum at present. In particular the double yellow lines at junctions will reduce the parking capacity. Parking within controlled parking zones is less congested than that which occurred in the same road prior to the CPZ. The distribution of permit bays makes it unlikely that speeding vehicles would get a clearer run down one side of the road even within the restricted time period. The restriction on the bays and the single yellow lines only applies for one hour each weekday. Experience with traffic condition in similar roads suggests that traffic speeds may increase marginally but is offset in terms road safety by better visibility.
(Objector 2 – Marlborough School)	
(c.) Decision on extending the CPZ has already been made without consulting Marlborough School.	The consideration of whether to extend the controlled parking zone was the subject of local consultation in July 2007 when an officer visited the school to discuss the issues; it has recently been the subject of statutory consultation which is reported here. The decision will be made by the council's executive following consideration of the results of consultation.
(d) No consideration of detrimental impact on school community. Placing single yellow lines behind the school keep clear zig-zags will limit our parking further.	Views of the school were sought and considered in the July 2007 consultation. It is recognised that school staff parking has been a difficulty for the school for some time and the proposals would make that more difficult. Travel plan advice and assistance has been on offer to the school. Government, London Mayoral and council policy is to encourage consideration of alternatives to use of private cars. Clearly schools help to inform and influence young people and the transport choices of tomorrow. The school has forwarded a petition from parents concerned

	about inter alia parking close to the school causing hazard to children.
(e) School will be restricted to visitor permits and involved in extra costs.	The council reviewed its policy on the issue of parking permits and allows schools within CPZs, who have developed a school travel plan, to purchase two permits for their operational purposes at the same cost as a resident's permit ie £41 per vehicle per annum. Such qualifying schools can be considered for a limited supply of visitor permits for genuine visitors. Businesses can purchase up to 2 permits but at a cost of £300 each.
(f) School staff and visitors will be forced to buy visitor permits via residents at £1 a day, providing they can find an empty resident's bay.	Residents should only be purchasing visitor permits for their own visitors. People without a permit can park outside the zone which ends part way down Walton Drive or in permit bays after 11am. The restriction between 10am and 11am is likely to result in more parking opportunities for all including school staff after 11am.
(g) School staff will be forced to park outside the zone much further away from the school involving wasted time walking	The western end of Walton Drive remains unrestricted. This can be accessed via a street-lit alleyway adjacent to the school. The zone ends some 200 metres from the school front entrance.
(h) Support staff provide early morning reading. They would be forced to park at considerable distance.	The nearest unrestricted street is some 200 metres from the front gate. If the duties are finished before 10am they could park in the permit bays until then.
(i) Visiting professionals need to visit during hour when CPZ operates.	Visitors can also arrange their visit times to avoid the 10-11am period or park outside the zone.
(j) Volunteers would not be able to park outside the school until after 11am	If the volunteers come before 11am they would need to park in unrestricted streets outside the zone.
(k) The council has sold off part of the land attached to the school in the past. This could have provided more off street parking.	The council is not obligated to provide parking for school staff or other people who come there. Government, London Mayoral and council policy is to encourage consideration of more sustainable means of transport.
(l) Although many of the staff are local they need their cars to pick up their children. Walking to get their cars will cost them money.	The end of the zone is relatively close. If they are local perhaps they could walk or cycle their journeys and reduce car costs.
(m) Prospective parents may not choose Marlborough School if they cannot park locally to pick up their children	The restrictions are likely to make it easier for people to park after 11am. The council would encourage parents to walk to collect their children.
(n) In general this will make parking for school staff more difficult and/or more expensive	CPZ and permit parking schemes have the general objective of improving the parking amenity of the community at large. Priority in parking guidance places the needs of residents and visitors to the area above those who use their vehicles to travel to work. The school is part of that community and is treated preferentially to other organisation like businesses. CPZ have an aim of encouraging a modal shift away from single occupancy private car use. For those people who do not have flexibility and have to use their cars the distance to the nearest unrestricted road is only about 200 metres. The proposals may also improve parking opportunities for some who come to the school particularly those who arrive after 11am.

APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments
Part 2 – Objections concerning double yellow lines in Dobbin Close

Grounds for Objection (Objector 3 – resident living in Dobbin Close)	Officer Comments
(o) Double yellow lines are unnecessary.	The proposals were in response to complaints that obstructive parking especially near the entrance to car parking areas were causing difficulties to residents, refuse collection and potentially access for emergency services vehicles.
(p) The consultation on the double yellow lines took place before restrictions introduced in off-street car parks to which many residents no longer have access.	The need for reasonable access along the public highway and to properties along it has not changed. This is a legal responsibility of the council as the highway authority and is the reason for the double yellow line proposals. The three car parking areas off Dobbins Close although council owned are not part of the public highway and any changes there cannot affect the highway authority's legal responsibilities.
(q) Many of the parking problems are created by parents bring or collecting children from St Joseph's School	Parking problems may be at their worst at either end of the school day. Significant problems occur at other times as observed at various times including in the middle of the school holidays.
(r) The extent of the double yellow lines proposed outside 35 and 36 Dobbin Close is excessive	The extent of the proposed restrictions was amended in consideration of the responses from the July 2007 consultation and site inspection. The yellow lines in the turning head were removed as turning could be achieved elsewhere within Dobbin Close. The restrictions were proposed across the frontage of 35 and 36 as there is a continuous dropped kerb present. Stopping the restriction short, part the way across the access, might be mis-interpreted by parents as a short term parking opportunity. On re-examination, the highway objectives of maintaining access to the car parking area can just be achieved by stopping the restriction just short of the dropped crossing. It is recommended that the draft traffic order be modified accordingly to reduce the extent of the restriction introduced.
(Objector 4 – resident living near junction between Kenmore Avenue and Beaufort Avenue	
(s) Support double yellow lines in principle but ask for review of extent.	The location has been revisited. The general guidance given in the highway code is that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction as it is likely to be obstructive. To address parking pressures the length down the side roads can sometimes be reduced dependent on road geometry and in particular width. In this instance, Beaufort Road is comparatively narrow at approximately 5.5 metres width. The two roads are also far from at right-angles to one another introducing increased difficulty for larger vehicles attempting to enter Beaufort Avenue if approaching from the north. The extent of the double yellow lines proposed in Beaufort Avenue at approximately 10 metres is considered necessary to maintain reasonable access. The extent of proposed restrictions in Kenmore Avenue either side of the junction with Beaufort Avenue at approximately 10 metres is considered necessary to ensure reasonable visibility. No change is recommended.

APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments
Part 3 – Objections concerning restriction changes in Masons Avenue

Grounds for Objection	Officer Comments
<p>Objectors 5, 6 and 7 who all reside in Masons Avenue</p> <p>(t) Proposal to reduce the space available for permit parking and replace by parking meters will cost resident money and is unfair.</p>	<p>The actual proposals in the draft traffic order have one more permit holder only space provided. There are also four spaces where permits can be displayed or the driver can pay and display. The additional spaces replace what is currently no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm. The wording of the street notice has been reviewed but appears clear and it not easily seen how the misunderstanding arose. The objectors have been sent plans by way of clarification and one has subsequently advised he does not object to what is proposed.</p>