

## Appendix C

Source	Summary of Objections/Comments	Officers Response
<p><b><u>Petitions</u></b></p> <p>Winton Gardens Petition</p>	<p>The petitioners “would like to have the proposal for all day parking restrictions to the west side of Winton Gardens be amended to a one hour restriction between 2pm and 3pm Monday to Friday”. (See Appendix B).</p> <p>The petition contains 11 signatures representing 10 households out of 20 in Winton Gardens. The petition is accompanied by a letter from Winton Gardens Residents’ Association.</p>	<p>The proposed yellow line waiting restrictions are intended to improve access. However, the existing 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday waiting restrictions at the entrance to Winton Gardens deter obstructive parking. The cul-de-sac is short and the requested 2pm to 3pm, Monday to Friday restrictions (similar to that operating in Whitchurch Lane) would still deter commuter parking and would improve access further.</p> <p><b>It is therefore recommended that the advertised restrictions in Winton Gardens be amended to operate between 2pm and 3pm, Monday to Friday.</b></p>
<p>Powell Close petition</p>	<p>The petitioners are objecting to the scheme as “the proposals do not provide for sufficient car spaces in the road”. (See Appendix B)</p> <p>The petition is in the form of 7 identical letters representing six households in Powell Close (two of them without house numbers), and one from the corner property in Canons Drive. A further similar letter has also been received objecting to “lining and signage in a conservation area” as well.</p> <p>Two further letters have also been received from Powell Close in support of scheme but requesting additional</p>	<p>A review of the proposed parking spaces has been carried out. It would be feasible to provide two further parking spaces, thus increasing the total number of spaces from 9 to 11. All the properties in this road as well as the corner property have off-street parking for one or more cars. The consultation carried out in January 2004 showed a majority in favour of a scheme (7 for and 5 against). As the scheme operates for only one hour per weekday, the residents would be able to park where they wish outside the operational hour of 11 am to 12 noon. It is unlikely that more on-street spaces would be needed than the number now proposed during the operational hour of the scheme. Further spaces would be available in Canons Drive and elsewhere in the zone if required.</p> <p>It would not be possible to introduce the scheme without lining and signing. However, The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 permit the</p>

	<p>residents parking spaces, if possible.</p>	<p>use of smaller zone signs and narrower yellow lines in primrose in conservation areas and these would be used to reduce the environmental impact of the scheme.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that two further spaces be provided in Powell Close as shown at Appendix D.</b></p>
<p>Lake View petition</p>	<p>The petitioners are complaining that when they “were asked to vote on CPZ in Lake View they were not told that it might be restricted to only part of the road”. The petitioners are requesting that the CPZ should include the whole of Lake View. (See Appendix B).</p> <p>The petition is in the form of 24 identical letters representing as many households in Lake View. Three of these are already in the proposed zone. A three further similar letters have also been received requesting that the CPZ include Lake View up to Dukes Avenue.</p>	<p>There are 59 Lake View properties remaining outside the proposed zone, out of which 24 or 41% are requesting an extension of the zone. Such an undertaking would also affect the residents of Dukes Avenue who were overwhelmingly against inclusion of their road in the CPZ. There are no signatories from the residents of the 28 properties in this road amongst the petitioners. Whilst the petitioners do not represent the majority view, nevertheless, their request has arisen out of their realisation of the possible parking displacement that may result once the scheme is introduced. The consultation document does explain this possibility. The petitioners request will be considered as part of the stage 2 extension review which is not on the current Controlled Parking Zones and Residents’ Parking Schemes programmed or unprogrammed list. However, the list would be reviewed in March.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the petitioners request be considered at the next review and the objection to the traffic order be set aside.</b></p>
<p>Handel Close petition</p>	<p>See paragraph 7 of report.</p>	
<p>Montgomery Road, Gresham Road and Churchill Road petition</p>	<p>See paragraph 6.4 of report.</p>	

**Businesses**

Three letters (two from a firm on Barnet side)

Proposed parking restrictions will affect local employers and businesses.

Staff would leave and clients will be unwilling to visit our office.

The disadvantages, in terms of convenience for car users, need to be balanced against the congestion and safety problems that would ensue if on-street parking is not managed. The onus is not on the Council to provide on-street parking spaces for business employees or clients. However, provision has been made as part of the proposal for visitors to businesses and shops in the area. Shared use spaces would be provided in some residential roads near businesses together with 16 shared use spaces in the High Street, Edgware for visitors and operational vehicles belonging to businesses, although the business on Barnet side would not be entitled to such permits.

The proposal is in line with Government, Transport for London and Council policy of reducing dependence on the car, particularly for journeys to work. The proposed scheme seeks to give residents priority in the allocation of on-street spaces in residential streets for both policy and amenity reasons. Visitors to businesses are provided for at "pay and display" spaces and in shared use bays.

Implementation of the scheme will increase the incidence of crime in residential roads due to lack of movement of cars.

Commuter cars are typically left unattended from 8 am to 5 pm. By deterring commuter parking it is likely that there will be greater uptake by visitors parking in the spaces made available.

There are no traffic problems arising from parking in the area. Commuter parking does not cause a problem for residents.

Responses from the residents indicate that commuter parking is a problem in the Canons Park area causing obstruction and visibility problems.

Properties in Canons Drive area have ample parking and do not need to purchase permits to park on-street.

The Canons Park area scheme would operate only for one hour a day (11 am to 12 noon) which also assists visitors and shoppers as they will be able to park free of charge subject to the rules of The

		<p>Highway Code.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the objections raised by these businesses be set aside for the above reasons.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Commuters</u></b></p> <p>Six letters (three of them from outside the Borough)</p>	<p>Where are the commuters going to park their cars?</p> <p>I assume you will be making alternative arrangements for commuters. No free car parks.</p> <p>Poor/inadequate public transport services and as a result no alternative to travel to work by car and / or increased journey time.</p>	<p>In the light of parking congestion it is appropriate to manage and prioritise limited on-street parking space. Priority is given to residents in residential streets and to visitors and disabled parkers elsewhere. It is neither practicable, affordable, or sustainable to provide parking for all potential users, including long stay commuter parking. One of the aims of introducing controlled parking zones is to deter commuter parking and encourage more sustainable forms of transport such as walking or using public transport for those able to use it. In this respect commuters may consider leaving their cars at home.</p> <p>This would be against Government, Transport for London (TfL) and Council policy to reduce reliance on the private car. It could also be seen as a means of subsidising businesses by making car parking provision for them from Council taxpayer's money. This would be unfair, not only to the Council taxpayer, but also those businesses who have made proper provision at their own cost and/or have travel plans.</p> <p>The rail services provide good links to central London and from there to outer London rail services serving the home counties. The area is served by Edgware Station on the Northern line and four bus routes, link it to High Street, Edgware where several other bus routes operate. Clearly, there is room for improvement and the Council is actively promoting schemes with Transport for London that will provide a frequent and reliable bus service. A reduction in the use of cars for commuter travel will also help to reduce traffic congestion and</p>

	<p>Additional cost of travel by public transport / too expensive.</p>	<p>improve bus journey time.</p> <p>It is debatable what the true cost of motoring to the individual is and what the cost is to the community as a whole. Costs will also vary from person to person. In the long term, the cost of travel is a factor that individuals must take into account when choosing locations to live and work. In the short term, any additional costs to the individuals are a disadvantage of the scheme that must be weighed against the advantages.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the objections raised by commuters be set aside for the above reasons.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Residents</u></b></p> <p>Two letters from Montgomery Road</p>	<p>The majority of residents in Montgomery Road had requested to retain the existing operational hours, therefore, they should be considered separately from Gresham Road and Churchill Road. The notion that it would be too complicated or confusing for motorists is difficult to understand as there are other roads where restrictions vary in places.</p>	<p>The results of the consultation show that the Montgomery Road respondents voted 17 for shorter hours, 16 for the same hours and 2 for longer hours with a small majority favouring Monday to Friday operation. The respondents from Churchill Road and Gresham Road preferred shorter hours with Monday to Friday operation.</p> <p>Montgomery Road, Churchill Road and Gresham Road are further away from the shopping area than Mead Road and Handel Way. As they lead to one another, it would help to avoid confusion if they have the same parking controls. Taking these three roads together, there was a majority of more than 2 to 1 in favour of the one hour scheme operating Monday to Friday. Though there was a marginal preference for the existing/longer hours of operation in Montgomery Road, it would be problematic if it were to operate at differing times. Although technically possible to have different hours in different streets drivers would find it confusing and this may lead to complaints and appeals against fines.</p>

		<b>It is recommended that the objections be set aside for the above reasons.</b>
Letter from Cavendish Drive.	In support of the advertised scheme but requesting an additional residents' bay outside 20 Cavendish Drive.	<p>The property is located at the junction with Dorset Drive. It would not be possible to provide a parking space where requested without creating obstruction. However, an additional space adjacent to the property will be provided as shown at Appendix D. As the scheme operates for one hour, the inconvenience is minimised.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that an additional bay be provided as shown at Appendix D.</b></p>