

**APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 1 – Objections primarily concerning proposed CPZ for Pinner Road Area**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<b>Objectors 1-4 – residents of Sussex Road within proposed CPZ</b>	
(1) Do not want address to be within CPZ as do not want to pay for permits and will not address parking in evenings.	The recommendation, due to opposition expressed in the petition and letters is that Sussex Road should be removed from the proposed CPZ area.
(2) Agree with proposals but object to single yellow line proposed outside garage access in Oxford Road.	The recommendation, due to opposition expressed in the petition and letters is that Oxford Road should be removed from the proposed CPZ area. There is no longer a single yellow line proposed.
(3) Object to extent of double yellow lines at the junction between Sussex and Oxford Roads as it reduces parking.	The restrictions proposed supports the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 “DO NOT stop or park ... opposite or within 10metres of a junction....” These have previously been reviewed following consultation feedback and reduced from the 10 metres specified in the Highway Code. No further reduction justified.
<b>Objector 5 resident of Oxford Road</b>	
(4) Object to CPZ as I do not want to pay to park in my road	See (2) above
<b>Objector 6 resident of Sussex Road outside CPZ</b>	
(5) Proposed CPZ will not address evening/night-time/weekend parking problem	It has been accepted the CPZ will have no direct impact on parking apart from the weekday daytime parking. There may be some indirect benefit in dissuading parking from garage businesses parking vehicles for long periods which has been the subject of complaints by residents. The CPZ was supported by residents where it is now proposed mainly in order to deal with the day-time parking problems. Any CPZ introduced will be subject to a review about 6 months after implementation. This review could include consultation on further hours as requested by some residents.
(6) Double yellow lines will reduce the amount of available parking. Restrictions too extensive and should only apply day-time	See (3) above. A review of the extent of the double yellow lines has taken place for all the junctions near objector’s address and reductions made where possible without prejudice to need to ensure access and visibility. The affects of obstructive parking apply at all times and especially when parking pressures are greatest. Access for a fire appliance could be needed at any time.
(7) Unclear whether people living over shops who perhaps currently park on forecourt areas would be able to buy permits to park in CPZ.	Residents who live on the section of Pinner Road within the CPZ would be eligible for permits. This would include the flats above the shops. Businesses could also apply for up to 2 business permits at £300/year each for business purposes only. It is considered unlikely that many of the vehicles currently parked on (private) forecourt areas (having presumably illegally crossed the pavement where there is no vehicle crossover) belong to residents. They are thought to belong to businesses or their customers. There is proposed provision in the first section of the side roads for short-term pay and display for customers.

(8) Council should create more parking by using land adjacent to Pinner Road (eg. former service station)	These parcels of land are privately owned not by the council. Even if they were publicly owned the council (as is the case elsewhere in the borough) it would not be justified in spending council tax payers money in preferentially creating parking for one area over another.
(9) Further restrictions (CPZ and on Pinner Road) will adversely affect businesses by reducing passing trade.	See (7) above re customer parking. Additionally the proposed CPZ would operate for one hour Monday to Friday. Apart from that period customers would be able to use permit bays.
(10) The CPZ only operates for one hour Monday to Friday so will only benefit residents who want to park during that period.	CPZ which only operate for one hour address the problem of non-residents trying to park throughout the day as these people usually cannot arrange to move their vehicle for the one hour. It provides this benefit to at the minimum inconvenience to residents and their visitors.
(11) Shared use bays will not be used outside of the one hour of the CPZ.	Customers and other visitors can use permit bays outside the one hour of CPZ operational period. If however there are no spaces conveniently close non-residents would be able to pay and display. Permit holders would also be able to use the shared use space if there is a shortage of permit only spaces.
<b>Objector 7 resident of an unspecified address in Bedford Road</b>	
(12) Majority of residents do not want CPZ so why is council taking proposals ahead	This issue was considered in the report on the consultation results to the Panel in November 2008. The CPZ is only being taken ahead where a majority of responses said they wished to be included. People are thus given a say on the restrictions near their address rather than in other roads. Most of the section of Bedford Road proposed for the CPZ in the draft traffic orders is now recommended to be removed from the proposals following opposition expressed in the petition.
(13) Should not have to pay to park especially as CPZ only operates for one hour	See (10) above regarding rationale for one hour operational period. The majority of residents within the area where the CPZ is now proposed who have responded have indicated there support for a scheme which involves purchasing permits. This was clearly explained in the consultation.
(14) Residents living outside of the proposed CPZ will suffer displaced parking.	Residents of the county roads were consulted. They were asked if they wanted a CPZ and separately if they would wish to be included in a CPZ if one was being introduced in a nearby road. It was explained that parking might displace to nearby roads. The respondents will have taken those issues into consideration in their response. Any CPZ which is introduced would be subject to a review about 6 months after implementation during which people will be given the option of being included in the CPZ if faced with changed parking patterns.
(15) Believe proposals are a soft tax – single yellow line on south side of Pinner Road specifically cited.	There is an existing single yellow line along this section of Pinner Road. The restrictions opposite the shops are currently peak time only to theoretically allow customer parking. In practice virtually no space is available without blocking access to driveways. The no waiting restriction is being upgraded to apply between 7am and 8pm. There is new provision for customer parking in the first section of the side roads which is a more suitable location avoiding the need of customers to cross the main road.

(16) Proposed restrictions including double yellow lines will damage struggling businesses	See (15) above regarding new provision for customer parking. Existing restriction on the north (shop's) side of Pinner Road are no waiting throughout working day.
(17) Should create more parking by for instance using former service station site.	It is not the responsibility of the council to provide parking, rather to maintain for reasonable access along the public highway and of safety. The council does not have powers to affect the use of private land for parking.
(18) This is "Gerrymandering" in the way the extent of the proposed CPZ has been determined	The extent of the CPZ proposed in the draft traffic orders and as recommended in this report represents the area where a majority of response have indicated they wished to be included within the CPZ. Those people who judge they have a parking problem to justify the costs of being part of a CPZ and permit scheme are being allowed to chose that whilst people who do not want to be part of a CPZ are similarly being allowed to remain outside.
<b>Objector 8 resident of Pinner View</b>	
(19) Introducing CPZ will just push commuter parking problem further up streets.	See (18). In Pinner View in particular the additional distance to walk is likely to dissuade commuter parking.
(20) A form of tax	CPZ is only introduced where it is wanted. Residents are choosing to pay some additional costs to address parking problems in their area. There are significant capital costs in introducing a CPZ which would only be paid back over something like a 10-15 year period. Any surpluses then generated are ring fenced to transport issues like funding senior citizen concessionary fares.
(21) Propose make county roads one way.	This is a separate issue. People were consulted on one way proposals for Pinner View and Bedford Road but there was overwhelming opposition
(22) My disabled friend will no longer be able to park outside of my house, and will have great difficulty in walking from outside of CPZ.	Blue badge holders are entitled to park in any permit bay or pay and display bay free of charge and can park for up to 3 hours on single yellow lines if there is no loading restriction. Therefore it is likely that friend will be able to find parking as near if not closer to resident's address than at present.
<b>Objector 9 resident of Bedford Road</b>	
(23) Objects to position of a proposed permit bay in Pinner View which he claims obstructs access to their garage.	The resident acknowledges that there is not a properly constructed vehicular crossing with a dropped kerb in the letter of objection. A response has been sent advising how they can apply for the crossing to be constructed to enable legal access and that should this occur the permit bay would be adjusted or removed from the scheme.
<b>Objectors 10 and 11 Businesses in the Pinner Road shopping parade</b>	
(24) CPZ will reduce the number of customers	New short term parking provision in the side roads, in particular in Oxford Road and Rutland Road for these businesses, should help customers to find legitimate parking close to the businesses. The CPZ controls will only apply for one hour weekdays so at other times customers can continue to park there. Removing the all day parking of non residents is likely to mean there is more space for customers.

(25) Suppliers will impose additional charges due to (proposed) waiting and loading restrictions	Suppliers will not normally be affected by waiting restrictions. There are already peak-time loading restrictions throughout Pinner Road. It is proposed that these restrictions should apply for longer periods, although there would remain an inter-peak period from 10am to 3pm weekdays free from loading restrictions. Following consultation feedback additional peak period loading provision has been added in the side roads. This will also be available for the period when the main road is currently restricted. More transparent waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) outside the shops should dissuade illegal parking which currently gets in the way of legitimate loading.
(26) The above two factors will make goods uncompetitive, make the remaining businesses less viable and increase difficulty in paying business rates	The scheme should have the opposite effect so should not itself be detrimental to businesses as suggested.
(27) The proposals seek to fix "something that is not broken"	The short term customer parking in the side roads follows requests including petitions from the businesses and their customers. The waiting and loading restriction proposals on Pinner Road are to address concerns raised over safety, illegal parking and congestion. The CPZ proposals came from residents complaints over day-time parking and following consultation.
<b>Objector 12 Business on Pinner Road roughly opposite Devonshire Road</b>	
(29) Whilst not objecting in principle to the CPZ, objecting to limitation on number of business permits available per business as this is inadequate for number of staff	Only 2 business permits are available per business for operational purposes only. These permits are not issued to enable staff to commute to work by car rather if goods or services need to be provided from the business address needing a car for say delivery or carrying equipment. The list of staff provided at least in part would suggest their vehicles are used for commuting. There are shared use bays proposed in Devonshire Road which would allow people to pay and display. The revised CPZ boundary due to other objections no longer includes Dorset Road which will remain unrestricted except for the junctions.
(30) Effect on clients who come for treatment	It is not clear from the objector exactly what the problem is but Pay and Display parking in the side roads off Pinner road will help
<b>(A) Petition containing objectors from Dorset and Oxford Roads and that part of Sussex Road where the CPZ was proposed</b>	70 signatures from 59 addresses
(i) Oppose the current proposals to introduce a CPZ on the county roads	The proposed boundary of the CPZ has been amended to remove the roads or parts of road covering these addresses. These objectors are now considered in (D) below
<b>(B) Petition containing objectors from Nos. 39-61 &amp; 44-74 Devonshire Road and 9-29 &amp; 10-30 Bedford Road</b>	17 signatures from 15 addresses
(i) Oppose the current proposals for a CPZ in the county roads	See (A) above

<b>(C) Petition objectors from Nos. 1-37 &amp; 2-42 Devonshire Road, 1-9 &amp; 2-8 Rutland Road and 1-7 &amp; 2-8 Bedford Road</b>	10 signatures from 8 addresses
(i) Oppose the current proposals to introduce a CPZ on the county roads	This expression of opposition has been added to the consultation responses and taken as current opinion if originally in support. The current expression from these sections of roads still shows majority support and it is recommended these sections of road along with the advertised section of Pinner View, Pinner Road and Neptune Road be implemented as a CPZ to reflect the view from these streets where there is permit parking. In most roads this will provide a buffer between the shared use parking available for short-term customer parking and largely unrestricted roads.
<b>(D) Petition signatures from outside of the area of the CPZ advertised. Plus signatures from areas recommended to be removed</b>	64 signatures from 60 addresses from outside advertised CPZ 87 signatures from 75 addresses from (A) and (B) above
(i) Oppose the current proposals to introduce a CPZ on the county roads	It is the council's policy only to go ahead with CPZs in areas where people want to be part of the scheme. This enables people to determine if there is a CPZ in their immediate vicinity. The people in these sections of road have indicated they do not want to be part of a CPZ and no CPZ is proposed there to respect this view. It is however not felt appropriate that people should be able to overturn the views of support for a CPZ in other streets or sections of road. Should a CPZ proceed a further consultation of people from nearby streets would be planned for 6 to 12 months after implementation.

**APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 2 – Objections concerning double yellow lines**  
**Part 2A In Edward Road (and surrounding roads)**

<b>Grounds for Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<b>Objector 1 - 7 – residents living in Edward Road or Headstone Gardens near Edward Road</b>	
(1) Double yellow lines on Edward Road will encourage people not to park near the junction displacing parking down the road which will make it more difficult for residents to park.	Implicit in this is that parking right up to the junction is satisfactory. This is against the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 “DO NOT stop or park ... within 10metres of a junction....” There are no specific rights to parking on the public highway only a responsibility on drivers to only park where it is legal, safe and not obstructive. The proposals aim to dissuade parking close to junctions and enables council enforcement against parking in unsuitable locations.
(2) Similar junction restrictions in Albert, Victor and Sidney Roads will displace parking into Edward Road.	Similar to (1). Whilst the council accepts parking close to one’s address is desirable this is not an argument to justify parking in unsuitable locations.
(3) Edward Road is wide enough to allow parking both sides up to the junction. Such parking discourages big vehicles from using Edward Road as a cut through.	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.
(4 ) Edward Road is not close to facilities (like supermarkets) so residents rely on their cars	Not seeking with these proposals to prevent anyone from owning a vehicle. It however remains the drivers responsibility to find a suitable place to park his/her vehicle.
(5) Scheme will cost money but provide no benefit to resident. No parking problems exist for residents at present that need to be fixed.	Junction restrictions are proposed on such an area-wide basis in order to make economies. These double yellow line proposals were never intended to improve parking amenity rather to ensure access and enhance visibility for all road users. It is not the authorities’ responsibility as the highway authority to provide for parking on the public highway.
<b>Objector 8 resident of Edward Road</b>	
Same objections plus (6) Proposal may also be a problem for disabled people in parking their cars	Exactly what this problem is, is not clear. Blue badge holders can park for up to 3 hours on even double yellow lines so the restrictions might actually assist disabled people. If the problem is more parking pressure away from junctions, mobility impaired disabled drivers who are residents could consider applying for a disabled bay.
(7) May lead to front gardens being converted for parking thereby reducing roadside greenness-Greener Harrow scheme	The council does not encourage parking in front gardens, this is a choice of residents, but as the highway authority we have greater duties for access and road safety.
<b>Objectors 9 and 10 residents of Victor Road</b>	
(8) The same pro-forma letter stating grounds (1) to (5) but applied to Victor Road rather than Edward Road	The same comments as (1) to (5) apply

<b>Objector 11 and 12 resident from Edward Road raising further objections</b>	
(9) Object to the lack of consultation on (double yellow line) proposals in Edward Road and nearby roads	Residents with addresses adjacent to the proposed restrictions and therefore directly affected were consulted in September 2008. The purpose for the statutory consultation, which this resident has responded to, is to allow those in the wider community to comment and object if they wish. The previous consultation is an optional stage which is often omitted for junction double yellow line proposals which are for safety.
(10) Reduction in the extent of double yellow lines at some junctions should have been applied to all.	The proposed restrictions are to support the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 "DO NOT stop or park ... within 10metres of a junction...." There are no specific rights to parking on the public highway only a responsibility on drivers to only park where it is legal, safe and not obstructive. Despite this, junctions where people asked for a reassessment have been individually reviewed. This will be applied to the junctions on Edward Road.
(11) There are worst locations with lesser restriction or applied to one side only	Lack of, or lesser restrictions elsewhere do not invalidate the need for restrictions here. These restrictions are being introduced on an area wide basis as part of a parking review. Parking controls at other locations are introduced on a prioritised basis under the Problem Streets programme.
(12) Traffic on Headstone Gardens moves too quickly already making it difficult to turn out of our road.	It is assumed the resident is arguing that the double yellow lines proposed on Headstone Gardens will cause traffic speeds to increase. Where similar restrictions have been introduced elsewhere (eg High Road, Harrow Weald) this has proved not to be the case. The junction restrictions proposed are specifically to address visibility problems and improve safety at junctions for all users.
<b>Objector 13 resident of Sidney Road</b>	
(13) Double yellow lines unnecessary as fire appliance have got through in the past	The narrow carriageway width (...metres) combined with junction and bend indicate that access for a large vehicle could not be assured when a computerised tracking system was used to test access. Fire appliances will sometimes mount the pavement to get past but this is not ensuring reasonable access. On the next occasion a larger (wider) vehicle might be parked at a critical point. The extent of the restrictions had already been reviewed and reduced after consultation feedback.
(14) Will no longer be able to park in my road which will prejudice the security of my vehicle	Whilst the security benefit of have a vehicle close to ones address is appreciated, there are no specific rights to parking on the public highway only a responsibility on drivers to only park where it is legal, safe and not obstructive. The proposed restrictions are to support the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 "DO NOT stop or park..." lists a number of instances of obstructive parking including junctions and bends.
(15) New housing developments in the area have made parking more difficult, restrictions in Downing Close will make it difficult for families	A further review of the extent of the restriction needed will be carried out but shortage of on-street parking space cannot be a reason for removing restrictions required for safety.

**APPENDIX B Grounds of Objection and Officer Comments**  
**Part 2 – Objections concerning double yellow lines**  
**Part 2B In Pinner View (and surrounding roads)**

<b>Objector 14 resident of Parkside Way near its junction with Pinner View</b>	
(16) Double yellow lines are unnecessary as majority of extent already covered by pedestrian crossing zig-zag markings	The double yellow line will not be marked within the controlled area of the crossing zig-zags as this is the greater no stopping restriction. The proposed double yellow lines do extend further west than the zigzags on the north side of Parkside Way as they ensure visibility on the approach to the Pinner View junction whereas the zig-zags protect the approach to the (zebra) crossing which is located to the east of the junction.
(17) Double yellow lines unnecessary as people cannot park there due to crossovers for driveways	This will stop people in general from parking but property owners theoretically could choose to park their blocking own driveway.
(18) Proposed double yellow lines beyond zig-zags would make it unlawful to reverse onto driveway	The presence of waiting restrictions does not affect the legality of any vehicle movements.
<b>Objector 15 resident of western end of Moat Drive</b>	
(19) Extent of double yellow lines on north side extend much further than comparable junctions with Pinner View or on south side of Moat Drive	The reason for this is that Moat Drive is narrower at ... metres width and in particular there is a bend in Moat Drive. Parking on the inside of this bend prejudices forward visibility. This issue was raised by a local resident and it was agreed these restrictions which would address it would be picked up by this parking review.
(20) The proposed extent are unnecessary and excessive and will adversely affect families and visitors	The combination of narrow road width and bend make this an unsuitable place to park, There should be adequate parking space on the opposite side and further down the road. The highway authority has no duties to provide parking but does have duties for access and road safety.
<b>Objectors 16 resident of Longley Road</b>	
(21) Parking restrictions (double yellow lines) will do nothing for traffic flow or safety but make it more difficult to find places to park.	The proposed restrictions are not in this situation to aid traffic flow but they are to dissuade parking close to the junctions where it may be obstructive especially to large vehicle like refuse collection and fire appliances. Parking close to junctions causes visibility problems for drivers and pedestrians. The proposed restrictions are to support the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 "DO NOT stop or park ... within 10metres of a junction...."
<b>Objectors 17 and 18 residents of Beresford Road near its junction with Chandos Road</b>	
(22) Object to the extent of double yellow lines proposed as small reductions in length will increase parking availability	A small reduction in the extent of the double yellow line restrictions in Beresford Road has already been made. The junction will be re-assessed to see if further reduction in particular on Chandos Road can practically be made.



<b>Objector 19 St George's Church</b>	
(23) Agree with the need for double yellow line restrictions at the junctions but question necessity between the junctions on the church frontage	The section of Pinner Road between Hide Road and Longley road is narrower than the rest of Pinner View so parking on both sides would cause difficulty for vehicles passing hence the proposed restriction on one side of the road. During the period when Pinner View was used as a diversionary route temporary double yellow lines were introduced both sides on this stretch of road,
(24) The restrictions will affect worshippers on Sundays when the road is much quieter. The church is also used for concerts	Traffic flow may well be less on Sundays but parking around churches can cause problems then. There are unrestricted on-street sections on the church frontage in both Longley and Hide Roads. Blue badge holders could park for up to 3 hours on the slightly wider sections of Pinner View.
(25) The restrictions will affect hearses. A social club for the elderly meets regularly	There are not any loading restrictions proposed here and hearses are normally provided reasonable latitude. Waiting restrictions even double yellow lines do not prevent dropping off or picking up people just parking.
(26) The opposite side of the road remains unrestricted.	There are some informal yellow zig-zags outside the church hall where a nursery runs during the week. We will explore with the church whether transferring some of the double yellow lines to the west side of the road where they could discourage parking for the nursery drop offs/pick ups.
<b>Objector 20 resident of Cornwall Road</b>	
(27) Objects to proposed double yellow lines as it will affect my ability to find a place to park.	Double yellow lines are proposed at the junctions at either end of Cornwall Road and other junctions in the area as part of the parking review. This supports the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 "DO NOT stop or park ... opposite or within 10metres of a junction...." There are no specific rights to parking on the public highway only a responsibility on drivers to only park where it is legal, safe and not obstructive. The proposals aim to dissuade parking close to junctions and enables council enforcement against parking in unsuitable locations.
(28) Would like to see extent of single (Monday – Saturday 8am-6.30pm) restriction reduced rather than extended and made double.	The extent of the proposed restrictions has been reduced at both ends of the road following consultation feedback. The extent now proposed near the junction with Pinner Road is less than the existing restrictions.
(29) Object to CPZ proposed in Pinner View as it will displace parking into Cornwall Road	These views of those opposed to the CPZ whose addresses are outside of the proposed boundary are considered in Appendix B Part 1 (i). If a CPZ proceeds it has been agreed those living in nearby streets will be consulted 6 to 12 months after implementation.
(30) If the double yellow lines and other restrictions are introduced so should a CPZ in Cornwall Road	If a CPZ is introduced, residents of Cornwall Road would be consulted about the possibility of joining the CPZ. If a majority of residents wanted a CPZ these proposals would be developed.
<b>Objector 21 residents of Gloucester Road, North Harrow</b>	
(31) Proposed (double) yellow lines in Gloucester Road and nearby County Roads will exacerbate current parking difficulties for residents finding	Double yellow lines are proposed at the junctions either end of Gloucester Road and other junctions in the area as part of the parking review. This supports the provisions of the Highway Code Rule 243 "DO NOT stop or park ... opposite or within 10metres of a junction...." There are no specific

space in Gloucester Road	rights to parking on the public highway only a responsibility on drivers to only park where it is legal, safe and not obstructive. The proposals aim to dissuade parking close to junctions and enables council enforcement against parking in unsuitable locations. In the case of the junction between Gloucester Road and Westmorland Road the road width are so narrow as to necessitate restrictions slightly further than 10 metres and opposite the junction to facilitate the passage of large vehicles like refuse collection or fire appliance.
(32) Objects to concept of having to pay to park on-street. Concerned that an extension of the proposed zone would include Gloucester Road.	Gloucester Road runs from near Station Road, North Harrow to Westmorland Road. The proposed CPZ is some 500 metres to the east along Pinner Road. Gloucester Road is much nearer North Harrow and the influence of parking from the shops etc there. It is quite possible that Gloucester Road might be considered for a permit parking scheme in the future but this is much more likely to be part of a North Harrow review due to its proximity, not as an extension to the proposed zone. Residents of those roads would be consulted at that stage on whether a CPZ was wanted.
(33) Introducing the permit bays (and CPZ) will displace parking making parking more difficult in Gloucester Road	The distance of the nearest part of the proposed zone makes displacement to Gloucester Road highly unlikely.
(34) Further parking restrictions in the area will affect trade in shops and restaurants.	Unclear exactly which restrictions or which businesses are being referred to here. Particular provision for customer parking is part of the scheme proposals for the businesses on Pinner Road within the proposed CPZ. The existing parking restrictions outside the shops there do not allow for parking. The businesses on Pinner Road approaching the junction with Station Road, North Harrow were consulted on changed waiting and loading restrictions but did not respond negatively.
<b>Objector 22 – business in shopping parade</b>	
(35) Objects to double yellow lines (on north side of Pinner Road) in front of shop and in surrounding roads as it bring an end to our business and our lives	Not exactly clear how the double yellow lines will have this affect. It may be they are placing reliance on people parking illegally on the single yellow lines that currently exist in front of the shop and apply Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm or perhaps parking after 6.30pm when the restrictions currently do not apply. If it is illegal parking the double yellow lines appear to provide more of a deterrent. The scheme does provide customer parking in the first sections of the side roads where drivers can pay and display during the day and not worry about collecting a penalty charge notice. Reference to double yellow lines in surrounding roads presumably is at junctions where perhaps customers and/or shop staff might now park obstructively.
(36) Council are saying parking space in side roads but at present there is no parking here anyway	Again not exactly clear what is meant but perhaps no available space as already heavily parked. The scheme will free up some space for customer parking via pay and display which will encourage turnover. Customers and other visitors will also be able to park within the CPZ apart for the one hour Monday to Friday. Space is more likely to be available as people without permits will no longer be able to park here throughout the day.