

APPENDIX D

Extract from TARSAP report 25th November 2009

Proposed extension to Edgware Controlled Parking (CPZ) Zone TB –
Consideration of Statutory Objections to Traffic Order (Appendix F)

Objections received and officer's comments

Objection	Officers' Comments
<p>Chestnut Avenue 3 Objections received; 2 from residents and 1 from London Fire Brigade (LFB)</p> <p><i>(Ref 02)</i> There is no parking problem in Chestnut Avenue.</p>	<p>Because Chestnut Avenue is a relatively narrow road it can only accommodate parking on one side of the road. Residents have told us that in some cases cars are parked too tight to their driveways making it difficult to manoeuvre out of their driveways.</p> <p>Large service vehicles and emergency vehicles also experience difficulties in accessing this street due to vehicles parking too close to one another on opposite sides of the road. i.e. staggered parking.</p> <p>It is likely that parking in Chestnut Avenue would be made worse by displaced parking from the proposed extension to the CPZ in Canons Drive.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 03)</i> There is no overall support from residents for the introduction of a CPZ and therefore should not be included in the CPZ.</p>	<p>The result of the consultation carried out in September 2008, when residents were asked would the wish their road to be included in the CPZ if the adjacent road, voted 10 in favour and 10 against.</p> <p>This result was reported to the Traffic and Road Safety Panel (TARSAP).</p> <p>The recommendation of the Panel was that the extension of the CPZ should go forward to statutory consultation basis on two accounts:-</p> <p>firstly a road could be removed from the proposed extension if there is sufficient demonstration against the proposal at the statutory consultation stage, but in reverse the scheme could not be added if residents chose to voice their additional support; and</p> <p>secondly there could be displace parking resulting from</p>

	<p>the introduction of the double yellow lines and the proposed CPZ implementation in adjacent areas.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 04)</i> Permit charges are expensive and bureaucratic.</p>	<p>CPZs are funded from the council's highways budget which is separate to the Council's income from Council Tax. Each new CPZ that is created is allocated a budget from the council's purse, expenditure must then be recovered. The method of recovering the expenditure is through the sale of permits to those who will benefit from the scheme, i.e. the residents.</p> <p>The cost of the permits reflects the cost of implementing the scheme and includes administration costs of issuing the permits together with the ongoing cost of providing enforcement.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 05)</i> Scheme will inconvenience residents and visitors.</p>	<p>The CPZ is designed to address the issue of all-day commuter parking by individuals who do not live in the area. The removal of commuter parking will increase the number of parking spaces available to residents and their visitors.</p> <p>The control parking of 11am to 12 noon Monday to Friday is in effect for a very short period of the day and is designed to have minimal impact on people who have visitors (i.e. lunch times, evenings and week ends)</p> <p>Visitors may choose to adjust the time of arrival and/or departure to avoid the need to pay for permits. Nevertheless, the cost of a visitors permit is set as low as possible, but a charge is inevitable to cover the administration costs and providing enforcement.</p> <p>A 50% discount is available for senior citizens or for those receiving mobility benefits if discount is claimed.</p> <p>The inconvenience that accompanies having a CPZ has to be considered against the benefits of providing greater priority of parking spaces for residents.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 06)</i> Disfigurement of the conservation area.</p>	<p>The visual impact of the proposed CPZ scheme in conservation areas is kept to a minimum to be legally compliant and sufficient for the public to understand.</p>

	<p>Thus in conservation areas the yellow lines would be painted in primrose colour rather than the bright yellow and the lines would be 50mm wide instead of the normal 100mm wide for areas outside the conservation area.</p> <p>Existing street furniture, such as lamp columns, is used as much as possible to reduce the number of posts needed to erect the necessary signs for the proposed permit bays.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 07)</i> No guarantee to be able to park out side one's house.</p>	<p>There is no right in law to be able to park outside one's own property, however where the council will try to maximise the number of safe parking spaces where they do not cause an obstruction to other road users.</p> <p>A controlled parking zone cannot address all parking problems in an area, but is a useful tool where parking difficulties are made worse by commuter parking and non-resident parking.</p> <p>Being within a CPZ area will remove the all day nonresident and commuter parking, which will significantly improve residents' chances of parking near their property.</p> <p>No parking scheme on the public highway can guarantee a space for a specific user, as this would remove the flexibility that the scheme as currently designed offers.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>(Ref 08)</i> Scheme will encourage more people to pave over their front gardens,</p>	<p>The Council has a policy for residents wishing to apply for a vehicle crossover. This was revised about a year ago, which includes various conditions that specify minimum depth and width dimensions of the frontage available in order to construct a hard stand. This criteria also including measures that are necessary to be undertaken to address drainage concerns.</p> <p>For obvious reasons it is preferable to be able to park a vehicle off street where it is less likely to get damaged from passing vehicles. It would also benefit other road users in making the roads less congested with parked vehicles.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this objection is set aside for the reasons given.</p>

<p><i>(Ref 09)</i> Observation from the London Fire Brigade that the staggered permit bays outside No. 8 would appear to leave very little room for large vehicles to manoeuvre.</p>	<p>The proposed staggered parking bays adjacent to numbers 8 Chestnut Avenue on inspection was found not sufficient to give enough room for large vehicles to gain access without difficulty.</p> <p>The position and length between the staggered parking bays have been amended to give better access.</p> <p>This revision was submitted to LFB who subsequently withdrew their objection.</p> <p>Objection resolved.</p>
--	---