

APPENDIX C

Appendix C – Summary of Statutory Objections with officers’ responses

Objections from roads within proposed CPZ

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer’s response
S1	Bacon Lane (1 Objector)	The proposed CPZ control hours will adversely affect Bacon Lane surgery for its doctors, staff and its patients when it is at its busiest.	<p>The proposed control hours will not be supported by everyone, however, the times chosen were to reflect the wishes of the majority of people who participated in the consultation.</p> <p>The surgery has some off street parking available, which it is for them to manage to suit their individual staff needs.</p> <p>The scheme provides Pay and Display parking where patients have told us they have problems in finding a parking space near to the surgery.</p>
S2		The scheme should be split into a smaller zone with an operational hour of 1pm to 2pm when clinical staff undertakes home visits, and the non-clinical team are least likely to be undertaking reception and secretarial duties.	Whilst a lunch hour period may suit the staff of the surgery, it would do nothing to deter commuter parking by individuals who work morning or afternoon shifts, such as the staff who work at the nearby Edgware Community Hospital.
S3		The general practice provides a service and is not a business and should not be categorised as such for the purpose of any imposed CPZ.	<p>The council issue permits based on the type of property i.e. residential and non- residential.</p> <p>Permit for residential properties are issued as resident permit whilst non-residential properties can apply for business permits. It should be noted that central government classes doctor’s surgery as a businesses and is charged business rate.</p>
S4		Visiting clinicians and clinical staff attached to the surgery should be provided parking badges provided free of parking charges.	<p>The council has no provision to issue free parking permits for the staff who work at the surgery.</p> <p>The doctor’s surgery, as a non-residential property is entitled to purchase 2 business permits.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.</p>

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S5	Burnt Oak Broadway (2 Objectors)	Request to provide a pitch to re-instate a street trader's stall.	<p>A pitch to accommodate a street trader's stall will be provided in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road on completion of Barnet's A5 highway improvement works and the parking controls adjusted to accommodate this.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is upheld but that the proposed alteration overcomes the objection.</p>
S6	The proposed CPZ is being introduced to make money for the Council.	<p>Controlled parking zones are not lucrative for the council; in fact they take between 10 and 15 years to pay off the initial capital outlay. The money spent on implementing the scheme has to be borrowed, and without revenue from the people who benefit from the service, the cost of repayments would need to be made by cutting investment in other service areas.</p> <p>Once a controlled parking zone returns a surplus, by law this money is required to be re-invested in transport improvements, which includes subsidising the Freedom Pass for over-60s. Again, without generating revenue from parking controls, this money would have to be found from other council budgets.</p> <p>The cost of permits is comparable to other boroughs in outer north and west London, and is significantly cheaper in net present value terms than creating off-street parking, which is an option not available to many residents because of the insufficient size of their property.</p> <p>The costs of permits compares very favourably to the cost of renting a garage or other off-street parking.</p>	
S7	No parking problems in the roads where CPZ is proposed to be introduced.	The responses from the public consultation carried out in April 2009 showed that there is majority support of residents and businesses to introduce parking controls measures in the roads as listed in the published traffic order.	

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S8		Pay and display parking bays will adversely affect businesses.	<p>The provision of pay & display parking is two-fold: one to cover the cost of providing the service and secondly to ensure a healthy "turnover" of parking to maximise parking for customers.</p> <p>Free all-day parking would likely become full very early on in the day, and would still lead to motorists looking for parking elsewhere, with the obvious target being nearby streets.</p>
S9		Loading bays are not needed.	Designated loading bays are needed to enable vans and lorries to service business premises. The Loading Bays will secure a parking space for such deliveries and will help to deter double parking and/or parking on the footways in this area.
S10		One-way traffic in Park Way not needed since this is a quiet road. Cars parked in this road do not cause an obstruction.	<p>Park Way is a narrow road with insufficient width to support two-way traffic without vehicles mounting the footway to gain access and is often congested with parked vehicles.</p> <p>The single yellow line (waiting restrictions of 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive) proposed in front of the businesses on the south west side of Park Way is necessary to provide access for emergency vehicles and other large lorries but allow businesses to load and unload.</p>
S11		Why after all these years is it considered necessary to introduce double yellow lines?	<p>In recent years there has been a steady growth in vehicle ownership. This had caused an increase in the number of vehicles wishing to find on street parking. Unfortunately a minority of drivers park their vehicles where it is likely to cause an obstruction to other road users.</p> <p>Yellow lines at junctions, bends and pinch points are proposed in locations where parking would obstruct the highway, which is already an offence under Highway law. The introduction of waiting restrictions enables the council to carry out enforcement where previously only the police could prosecute for obstruction offences.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that these objections are set aside.</p>

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S12	Un-named access between Nos. 197 and 199 Burnt Oak Broadway (1 Objector)	Position of proposed Pay and display parking bays in access road will prevent large articulated lorry access to deliver goods to the industrial units in Cavendish Works.	<p>Officers have been informed of the larger vehicles that need to access this road. Having assessed the turning movement of this type of vehicle by computer simulation it is recommended that the proposed pay and display parking bay be removed and replaced by double yellow lines i.e. No waiting at any time.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is upheld but that the proposed alteration overcomes the objection.</p>
S13	Columbia Avenue (1 Objector)	Proposed yellow lines and pay and display 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday will adversely affect business for staff and visitors to find parking.	See response S8 above
S14		Consider proposals are more a source of revenue than providing what the area really needed.	See response S6 above
S15		The cost of business permits is too high.	Business permits are issued to those businesses who can demonstrate that their vehicle is required for operational purposes and do not have off-street parking facility. The cost of a business permit, which is the same across Harrow, is comparable with the annual cost of paying for a garage or off-street parking.
S16		Provision should be made for employees (to park) who work within the parking proposals.	<p>The purpose of a CPZ scheme is to prevent congestion and stop commuters from parking in residential streets making it easier for residents and visitors to park.</p> <p>The highway authority cannot guarantee the availability of on-street parking. It is unfair to expect the council to subsidised free parking for some businesses whilst other business provide off street parking for their staff and customers.</p> <p>Whilst the parking controls may affect some staff, they may consider the use of alternative forms of transport should they not wish to pay for parking, such as use of public transport, walking or cycling, which is part of the Mayor of London Transport Strategy.</p>

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S17		Most houses have off street parking therefore there is no need to introduce a CPZ.	<p>The responses from the public consultation carried out in April 2009 showed that there is support of residents and businesses to introduce parking controls measures in the roads as listed in the published traffic order.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.</p>
S18	Northolme Gardens (1 Objector)	There are no parking problems in my road; therefore there is no need for CPZ.	See response S7 above
S19		Can't afford parking permit.	<p>The controls are in operation for a very short period of the day, and the times chosen (i.e. away from lunchtime of the evening) are designed to have minimal impact on people who have visitors. Permits for residents and their visitors are only required if they need to park their vehicle in road during the controlled hours of the CPZ. Most residents will have off street parking and will not need to purchase permit.</p> <p>The area also is serviced by public transport. It is not unreasonable to suggest that public transport is a viable alternative to the private car for some people, particularly if the cost of visitor permits or pay and display parking is an issue.</p> <p>Visitors can also change the time of arrival and/or departure to avoid the need to pay for permits at all.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the cost of visitor permits is set as low as possible, but a charge is inevitable to cover the cost of producing them and verifying the eligibility of the purchaser.</p> <p>Although other authorities can afford to provide this, such a scheme is not part of Harrow council's charging model. Doing so now would require another service area losing funding.</p>
S20		Residents permit for first car should be free.	

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S21		Money making measures for council.	<p>See response S6 above</p> <p>Controlled parking zones are not lucrative for the council; in fact they take between 10 and 15 years to pay off the initial capital outlay. The money spent on implementing the scheme has to be borrowed, and without revenue from the people who benefit from the service, the cost of repayments would need to be made by cutting investment in other service areas. Once a controlled parking zone returns a surplus, by law this money is required to be re-invested in transport improvements, which includes subsidising the Freedom Pass for over-60s. Again, without generating revenue from parking controls, this money would have to be found from other council budgets.</p> <p>The cost of permits is comparable to other boroughs in outer north and west London, and is significantly cheaper in net present value terms than creating off-street parking, which is an option not available to many residents because of the insufficient size of their property. The costs of permits also compares very favourably to the cost of renting a garage or other off-street parking.</p>
S22		Pay Taxes should not have to pay for parking.	<p>Controlled Parking Zones are funded from the council's capital budget and is separate to the council's income from Council Tax. The expenditure for the implementation, administration costs and the cost of enforcement must be recovered in order to fund other highway schemes. Charges for are made for permits to those who benefit from the implementation of a CPZ.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.</p>
S23	Oakleigh Avenue Between Burnt Oak Broadway and The Chase (4 Objectors)	There are no parking problems in my road therefore there is no need for CPZ.	See response S7 above.

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S24		Object to single proposed single yellow line 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday in front of property since has drop kerb for off-street parking has been refused.	The proposed parking controls opposite the proposed shared use pay and display parking bays are necessary at this location. This is to prevent people parking in the space between driveways which is likely to be obstructed by vehicles since there is in sufficient room between the drop kerbs to safely park without obstructing the driveways.
S25		Proposals will leave me nowhere to park.	The CPZ is designed to address the issue of all-day commuter parking reducing parking availability in the area. Removal of commuter parking will dramatically increase the ease with which residents and their visitors can find spaces. The inconvenience that accompanies living a CPZ has to be considered against this benefit; clearly the majority of respondents in the area proposed to be within the CPZ considered the benefit of the scheme to outweigh the inconvenience associated with it.
S26		Residents should not have to pay for permits since parking problems are caused by businesses in the area.	The CPZ is being implemented where the majority of respondents want one. Inevitably, there will be people within the zone who do not support it but the council will always endeavour provide a CPZ in areas where the majority of directly affected residents support it, subject to funding. Where the majority of respondents are not in favour of parking controls, the council is not intending to impose a CPZ on these residents.
S27		Proposal will make it difficult to park and will inconvenience my family and friends by not being not able to park in front of property	See response S25 above
S28		There are no parking problems in my road therefore there is no need for CPZ.	See response S7 above.
S29		Parking proposals are just money making means for the council.	See response S6 above
S30		Pay Taxes should not have to pay for parking.	See response S22 above For the above reason it is recommended that these objections are set aside

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S31		Object to double yellow lines across frontage of garages denying facility to park in front of garages at night and at week end. Request parking restriction to be down graded to same as on opposite of the road i.e. single yellow line 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday.	<p>Double yellow lines were proposed at this location between two shared use pay and display bay in order to maintain free access to the garages. Having reviewed this request it is recommended that in this instance the waiting restriction is down graded to a single yellow line to be operational 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday as requested.</p> <p>For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is upheld but that the proposed alteration overcomes the objection.</p>
S32	Vancouver Road (3 Objectors)	Residents have said they do not want CPZ.	See response S7 above.
S33		Parking permits should be free.	See response S22
S34		Pay Taxes should not have to pay for parking.	See response S22
S35		Proposal will make it difficult to park.	See response S25 above
S36		Parking restriction will inconvenience my family and friends not being able to park in front of house.	See response S25 above
S37		Will encourage more gardens to be paved over adding to flooding problems.	<p>House holders have the right to apply to construct a hard stand on their property providing that they meet the council's criteria. The criteria specifies the minimum size required that the hard stand is to be of a porous material or provision s be made to direct any run off to an area that allows the water to drain away naturally within the boundaries of the property, e.g. a garden border.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is recommended that these objections is set aside.</p>

Objections from roads outside the CPZ but within the consultation area

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S38	Broomgrove Gardens (1 Objector)	There are no parking problems in my road therefore there is no need for CPZ.	The objector does not live within the proposed CPZ therefore this objection is not applicable.
S39		Displaced parking will make things worse.	The number of vehicles on our roads is continuing to rise, something which is beyond the direct control of local authorities. The council asked all residents in the area if they wanted to join the CPZ, and made it clear that displacement parking was likely to occur. For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.
S40	Oakleigh Avenue (2 Objectors)	There are no parking problems in my road therefore there is no need for CPZ.	See response S38 above
S41		Residents permit for first car should be free.	See response S38 above
S42		Money making measures for council.	See response S38 above
S43		Parking restriction will inconvenience my family and friends not being able to park in front of house.	See response S38 above
			For the above reason it is recommended that these objections are set aside.
S44	Orchard Grove (1 Objector)	There are no parking problems in my road therefore there is no need for CPZ.	See response S38 above
S45		Residents have said they do not want CPZ.	See response S38 above
S46		Residents permit for first car should be free.	See response S38 above
S47		Pay Taxes should not have to pay for parking.	See response S38 above
S48		Nowhere else to park.	See response S38 above
			For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.

Objections from roads outside the consultation area

Ref No.	Road of part road	Objection or summary of general points	Officer's response
S49	1 Objector - issues related to Bacon Lane surgery	Object two separate CPZ operational hours, one hour during the day should be sufficient. Proposals will have major impact on Bacon Lane surgery, especially for patients travelling by car with mobility problems.	See response S2 above Short and long term shared use pay and display parking bays have been provided near the surgery for its visitors albeit that they will have to pay for parking. Those individuals who have mobility problems and have been issued with a blue badge are able to park for free for an unlimited period in the pay and display parking bays or up to 3 hours on a yellow line provided the time clock is displayed and that their vehicle does not cause obstruction to other road users.
S50			See response S22 Above
S51		Charging for parking is another form of tax.	See response S3 Above
S52		Doctor's surgery is not a business but provides a service therefore doctors should not have to pay for parking permits at the business rate.	
S53		Proposals will adversely affect doctors in their ability to find parking spaces after making home visits to patients.	The surgery has some off street parking available which it is for them to manage to suit their individual staff needs. Approximately 40 shared use and pay and display parking spaces have been provided near to the surgery. These parking spaces will benefit patients and clinical staff who need to travel by car albeit that they will have to pay. For the above reason it is recommended that this objection is set aside.