

APPENDIX F

Total Results Analysis for Rayners Lane on road basis (individual road analysis on following sheets)

Data											
Road Name	Count of Resident	Count of Business	Count of Both	Count of Q2 Yes	Count of Q2 No	Count of Q3 Yes	Count of Q3 No	Count of Q4 Yes	Count of Q4 No	Count of Q5 Yes	Count of Q5 No
Alfriston Avenue	33			24	9	23	10	4	9	21	12
Brunswick Close	6			1	4	1	5		5	1	5
Capthorne Avenue	35			16	19	18	17	6	16	19	15
Central Avenue	27			11	16	12	14	2	14	11	16
Church Avenue	50		1	11	40	9	41	7	37	15	36
Clitheroe Avenue	40			24	16	18	20	5	19	21	18
Dewsbury Close	7				7		7		7		7
Downs Avenue	32			16	16	19	13	7	12	16	15
Drake Road	50		1	17	33	16	34	3	33	15	35
Exchange Walk	1			1		1				1	
Fernbrook Drive	51			6	45	19	32	21	20	21	29
High Worples	6				6		6		4		6
Hillcroft Avenue	10			5	5	5	5	1	4	2	8
Kings Road	13		1	9	5	9	5	3	5	8	6
Lucas Avenue	41			20	21	15	26	4	24	15	25
Newlyn Gardens	9			3	6	4	5	1	5	1	8
no address	1			1		1				1	
Ovesdon Avenue	6			4	2	4	2	1	2	4	2
Raynton Close	9			2	7	3	6	1	5	1	8
Romney Drive	3		1	2	2	2	2		2	2	2
South Close	8			5	3	5	3		3	2	6
Southbourne Close	13			2	10	6	7	1	7	3	10
Spinnells Road	5			3	2	2	3	1	2	1	4
The Avenue	40			30	10	31	9	4	6	31	8
The Close	4			2	2	3	1		1	2	2
The Glen	23			4	19	6	17	4	15	5	18
The Ridgeway	33			8	25	7	27	3	27	8	26
Torbay Road	44			8	35	9	34	5	31	7	36
Trescoe Gardens	13		1		14		14		14		14
Village Way	62			45	17	46	12	3	11	35	20
Warden Avenue	29			18	11	16	12	5	10	19	10
Waverly Road	11			5	6	5	6		6	5	6
West Avenue	40			23	16	26	10	6	8	24	12
(blank)	1			1		1		1		1	
Grand Total	756		5	327	429	342	405	99	364	318	425

 Roads in support of CPZ

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
69	Alfriston Avenue	04 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
92	Alfriston Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		My family give you full support in putting parking restrictions in your plan as shown.We consider the present parking in AA to be a hazard & a H&S issue.Aa an additional comment,could the 'rat run' through AA to be stopped.We have lived in AA 39yrs and find the present situation with traffic very unreasonable
126	Alfriston Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
149	Alfriston Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1	1			1	1	there should become a one way system from imperial drive instead
152	Alfriston Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
161	Alfriston Avenue	03 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	No comments
182	Alfriston Avenue	03 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	No comments
183	Alfriston Avenue	04 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	No comments
195	Alfriston Avenue	04 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	There are other traffic problems
196	Alfriston Avenue	02 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	There should be a one way system
216	Alfriston Avenue	03 06 10	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	cannot see the need of cpz therefore does not support it
235	Alfriston Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		Would like the restricted times to be10am-12pm and 4:30pm-6:30pm Monday to Friday
238	Alfriston Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
271	Alfriston Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
273	Alfriston Avenue	19 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		Would like the restricted times to be10am-12pm and 4pm-6pm
514	Alfriston Avenue	13 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
582	Alfriston Avenue	10 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		Imperial Dr/Alfriston Ave would encourage dyl extended into Alfriston Ave;dyl in front of 8 Romney Dr should be syl as this would not restrict traffic flow;parkg prob overall is not station users but Ladbrokes staff who also park across drives;AA suffers through traffic which reduces ped and cyclist safety
597	Alfriston Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1		1		1	1	Too many car of people working in Rayners Ln, recent accident, whole heartedly support for safety reason; due to number of cars in adjacent properties suggest additional bay 61-63 AA
640	Alfriston Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
642	Alfriston Avenue	07 06 10	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	No comments
660	Alfriston Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
661	Alfriston Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1		1		1	1	Don't own car so little difference to me, doesn't want lines and signs outside property would be eyesore; alternative would be just 1hr control; certainly would not be paying for visitor permits
698	Alfriston Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
848	Alfriston Avenue	21 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		no comments
860	Alfriston Avenue	22 06 10	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	No comments
861	Alfriston Avenue	20 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
872	Alfriston Avenue	12 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		CPZ should have been intro in AA number of years ago; petition submitted to council few years back with 65% resi agreeing to intro cpz; as usual council kept ignoring resi points of view; rather than wasting time look at petition figures and implement cpz; whats stopping you making right decision; next excuse council has no funding; could have told you that before you started this money wasting consultation process
885	Alfriston Avenue	22 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
892	Alfriston Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
896	Alfriston Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
922	Alfriston Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
927	Alfriston Avenue	13 06 10	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	No objection to parkg outside as long as drive is kept clear; everyone has drive; there are enough yellow lines without adding more
930	Alfriston Avenue	19 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
75	Brunswick Close	01 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
84	Brunswick Close	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
476	Brunswick Close	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Where are visitors/tradesman going to park;BC to narrow to park so why waste public money painting lines where no necessary spoiling look of road
619	Brunswick Close	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	BC does not have parkg prob,any regulation or lines waste of public money
658	Brunswick Close	01 06 10	1				1		1		1	1	1	Seems odd no proposal for The Glen as closer to station than BC
800	Brunswick Close	05 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	You would be isolating the elderly by putting in cpz or dyl;never been parkg issue in BC

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
59	Capthorne Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1					1	The plan looks as tho there is a parking bay outside my home I don't own a car and I'm always getting vans parked outside
113	Capthorne Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1					1	Parking from commuters ever increasing prob in Rayners Ln.If cpz is not extended,many residents will be forced to pave over their front gardens increasing problems with drainage and increasing local flooding problems
157	Capthorne Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
242	Capthorne Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
252	Capthorne Avenue	09 06 10	1				1		1				1	There are no parking problems
266	Capthorne Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1					1	There are generally problems with vehicles blocking the drive so yellow lines should help this
450	Capthorne Avenue	04 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
467	Capthorne Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
474	Capthorne Avenue	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
521	Capthorne Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
549	Capthorne Avenue	14 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1					1	glad it's getting done,happy with this,so people can't park and then go to work
559	Capthorne Avenue	10 06 10	1			1		1					1	obvious hadn't read accompanying booklets at time of writing;if discount for drive then more than 100% support proposal
570	Capthorne Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1					1	no comments
592	Capthorne Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	don't have parkg prob in street therefore extra costs for permits seem unnecessary and expensive
593	Capthorne Avenue	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
631	Capthorne Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	live on public highway and pay enough road tax & c tax,no prob with parkg in CA,isn;t it already decided to do this to bring in some more revenue for the council
635	Capthorne Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1					1	registered disabled driver has previously applied for disabled bay and told no money to do.previously had tax disc stolen,is there a sticker can leave in car so don't have to go out to car all the time
645	Capthorne Avenue	04 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
647	Capthorne Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1					1	1)suggest restricted parkg next to 8 Capthorne Ave.2)suggest parkg at end of Capthorne Ave made unrestricted next to flats,3)suggest syl extended to cnr 15-1730 or longer,probs-parkg across drives,across service rd exits,restrict views from service rd;l have no objections to proposals
702	Capthorne Avenue	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	why resi penalised for parkg prob if there are nay;resi should not pay
705	Capthorne Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1				1	blue badge holder and would appreciate the first bay in CA to be disabled bay
709	Capthorne Avenue	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
737	Capthorne Avenue	02 07 10	1				1		1				1	parkg not prob in Capthorne Ave
765	Capthorne Avenue	27 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
780	Capthorne Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
781	Capthorne Avenue	25 06 10	1				1		1				1	these schemes cost money and don't work,prob pushed to another rd,no need for full clour leaflets and brochures,against scheme proposed for Capthorne Ave as consider it waste of money and ineffectual
790	Capthorne Avenue	25 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
791	Capthorne Avenue	27 06 10	1				1		1				1	parkg is fine,there are no problems
796	Capthorne Avenue	21 06 10	1				1		1				1	appalled at time of budgets Harrow spending money on expensive literature for a scheme no one in my area wants;suspend this ridiculous scheme immediately.cpz should be withdrawn from neighbouring areas;like idea of moving around in my town without worry about additional motoring/parkg expenses;pay c tax;feel human rights being violated by introducing these parkg restric;another way of Harrow C to generate more money from its citizens;devalue price of property;do not support scheme and demand it be withdrawn;booklets too biased;you are not being impartial;do not know anyone who has spoken favourably
835	Capthorne Avenue	20 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
902	Capthorne Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1					1	no comments
904	Capthorne Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
920	Capthorne Avenue	17 06 10	1				1		1				1	as have off street parkg don't find comm parkg a prob;having to get visitor permits for visitors and workmen would be added inconvenience
932	Capthorne Avenue	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	like to see extn at stn car park to park mopre cars and maybe cheap fees
933	Capthorne Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	what impact of me parkg outside own hse to drop off shopping?would refuse to pay fine imposed on me;main reason object to yellow line or bay o/s my drive

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
659	Central Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Not willing to pay for parkg bay as I have garage and drive.is this one way of raising money?
733	Central Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Main objections related to parkg,secondary lines and signs change character of road
769	Central Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Strongly opposes extension and has several strong and potential liablis comments on separate sheets from residents
801	Central Avenue	23 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
803	Central Avenue	20 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
883	Central Avenue	30 05 10	1				1	1	1		1		1	Thank you for opportunity to air views;my opinion and most of neighbourhood proposal waste of public money and council time;area around extn does not suffer from parkg prob;most resi have off street parkg;clearly this is money making scheme in order to fund other transport related initiatives!;proposal does not provide any value for community;hope this does not get approval and will take to local MP
910	Central Avenue	15 06 10	1			1		1				1		Council finding yet another system of taxing residents (may be some confusion of yes/no ticks on form as ticked yes but doesn't want it)
917	Central Avenue	16 06 10	1			1							1	Object to syl commencing o/s 98 CA and bay opposite;long term large removal lorry parks in area;therefore propose syl be placed on opposite side of 96&98 CA and bay on near side of 96&98 CA;this new proposed layout will not affect neighbours as there are no houses facing

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments
2	Church Avenue	30 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	thinks proposals should not go ahead
6	Church Avenue	31 05 10				1				1		1		No comments
8	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
17	Church Avenue	31 05 10	1				1	1				1		Exiting CA to rbt a problem with parked cars near post box.Coming off rbt into CA can be prob if cars parked there,dyl would be helpful on that side of road
29	Church Avenue	31 05 10	1				1						1	cannot understant the need for parking restrictions
30	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
32	Church Avenue	31 05 10	1				1			1			1	these roads are rat runs would favour speed humps instead
36	Church Avenue	30 05 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
38	Church Avenue	30 05 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
44	Church Avenue	30 05 10	1				1			1			1	lived in CA 16yrs I don't think or want CPZ outside my house when I suggested block off the entry from rbt at the jct of RL and CA because of all the minor accs and near misses nothing has been done.Now you want to waste money putting in CPZ Why? I've never had trouble parking outside my house.
49	Church Avenue	31 05 10	1				1			1			1	no comments
61	Church Avenue	04 06 10	1				1			1			1	we do not have any parking problems, keep the road markings to a minimum, keep choichif possible
64	Church Avenue	02 06 10	1			1				1			1	there are no parking problems
72	Church Avenue	29 05 10	1				1			1			1	residents do not want to pay for parking on their own road feels there is no need for this
80	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
89	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1			1			1	there are no problems with parking in our road and I don't want so many markings on any of the surrounding roads or mine.I don't want to tell visitors to not come between a certain time.If people choose to park sensibly,this far from the station and choose to walk then I'd say they are using their brains, wouldn't you?I'd do the same.It saves people thousands a year in parking.I would like my road and surrounding roads to stay the way they are!
128	Church Avenue	03 06 10	1				1			1			1	no comments
200	Church Avenue	04 06 10			1		1			1			1	does not consider there to be any parking problems
203	Church Avenue	no date	1				1			1			1	No comments
217	Church Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
431	Church Avenue	28 06 10	1				1			1			1	no comments
434	Church Avenue	14 06 10	1				1			1			1	1)make use of large area of land on the allotment site between CA and Yeading Brook relatively few plots taken up.vehicle acces tospace exists and area not required for allotments prepared at minimal expense mauch as fields were converted to airfields in wartime.It just need some imagination.Consider it! 2)residents 1st traffic 2nd as well as parking thinks about kerbing speed 20mph reactive signs RESIDENTS FOR THE LAST 47 YEARS
443	Church Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1			1		proposed parking bay opposite allotment entrance will cause problems for tractor and large delivery lorries for soil etc which has had difficulties in the past.
446	Church Avenue	10 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1		1			1	I have been at the house for over 30yrs.Most house owners park off road.No more than 6 cars park day or night at any time.See note on plan (indicates there should be dyl on NW side CA near rbt)
504	Church Avenue	04 06 10	1				1			1			1	happy with current situation;doesn't like painted boxes on road;if council want to improve life for resi then turn CA into a Close to stop heavy/fast traffic using CA as short cut
506	Church Avenue	31 05 10	1				1			1			1	no comments
556	Church Avenue	12 06 10	1			1		1				1		No1-28 have drives not shown on plan 4 of 13 therefore propose that there is NOT a requirement for any rpb within this portion of CR
567	Church Avenue	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	restrictions should be introduced in main rd used by bus
568	Church Avenue	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	only traffic prob in CA is speeding
571	Church Avenue	08 06 10	1				1			1			1	no parkg prob in CA apart from proposal which will mean fewer spaces for residents;concern for wife who is disabled driver will have far less opertunity to find space near house
620	Church Avenue	09 06 10 Rec'd	1				1			1			1	no comments
624	Church Avenue	05 06 10	1				1			1			1	no problem and no action required
626	Church Avenue	30 05 10	1				1			1			1	parkg not prob in CA i do NOT want cpz in our road
639	Church Avenue	02 06 10	1			1				1			1	lose more spaces with plan.cost is expensive,not gaurenteed parkg space
649	Church Avenue	07 06 10	1				1			1			1	if introduced have no option but completely pave front garden as not enough parkg bays in rd
650	Church Avenue	09 06 10 Rec'd	1				1			1			1	34yrs never had prob with parkg,pity don't concentrate on Downs & Church being used as rat run
651	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1			1			1	no comments
675	Church Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1			1		should be at least 2 bays near Icelands for drop of and pick up
690	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1			1			1	we do not justify extension and absolutely not consider supporting,not affected by commuter parkg

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments
704	Church Avenue	12 06 10	1			1			1	1		1		does not address THE MAJOR prob of the parkg bays in Ranyers Ln by the shops
728	Church Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do NOT support cpz in CA absolutely NO need;no commuters park here
736	Church Avenue	20 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no comments
749	Church Avenue	27 06 10	1			1		1				1		no comments
807	Church Avenue	26 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	isn't any park prob in CA,figment of someones imagination or deliberate to raise revenue for council;quantitative evidence not presented to residents;totally opposed to the proposal (photos included)
812	Church Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob in CA;imposition of cpz would just make things more difficult for resis
813	Church Avenue	20 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do not experience parkg probs in CA;if introduced concerned resis will feel pressured into paving over front garden which will have detrimental eeffect on character of road;intro of bays will reduce overall amount of parking space available;will create more parkg porobs for resis if introduced
823	Church Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	in principle no issue about intro of cpz but bays not big enough for number of cars;previous drug activity and police action need to be covered by providing bay in certain part of rd
898	Church Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1				1		no comments
906	Church Avenue	16 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	lived 49yrs,find it totally unnecessary for parkg restrict in rd;not enough cars parkd during day to cause prob;VW only has syl on one side and people wanting to park all day can park there
909	Church Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1				1		no comments
918	Church Avenue	16 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob and never has been;view this as totally unnecessary and possibly money making exercise by the council;no box being so close to yes designed to create a yes verdict

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
98	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Paid for kerb to be dropped,"NOT CHEAP", so my daughter and I can park on drive and other park on road in front of drive.if you put yello lines we will not be able to leave car across our drive all day while at work.We use transport for London to commute as this is what everybody wants us to do.If yello lines are across drive we will get ticketseveryday.Give me my £2000 back to pay for the parking permits I will need and a guaranteed resident parking bay
99	Clitheroe Avenue	03 06 10	1			1			1				1	No comments
106	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
110	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	Reasons for NOT supporting the extension of cpz to CA:-1)I am living on a fixed income,ie a pension,2)I pay my road tax,3)I pay my insurance(car),4)I park my car in my garage,usually; therefore I am NOT willing to pay £46 for a resi park permit for the rare occasions when I wish to park my car in CA (Is the £46 fee for a year? please inform)Thank you Resident for OVER 65 years
120	Clitheroe Avenue	03 06 10	1			1						1		lives on mini rbt & would support dyl on corners of CA & Rayners Ln as always fear will be accident with bus as parking on corner of each road.I would be pleased if this could be agreed to
122	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
154	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1			1			1				1	No comments
169	Clitheroe Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
175	Clitheroe Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	map incorrect 13 Clitheroe has a crossover
215	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
218	Clitheroe Avenue	03 06 10	1			1						1		No comments
275	Clitheroe Avenue	22 06 10	1			1			1			1		We support the cpz's and are fed up with non residents and comuters parking on our road
280	Clitheroe Avenue	21 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
432	Clitheroe Avenue	15 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	No comments
439	Clitheroe Avenue	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	no comments
464	Clitheroe Avenue	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	Parking zone to make money;Won't make any improvement;council should provide 2 free permits per house additional charged at higher rate
471	Clitheroe Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		Wants holes in the road repaired as owing to large number of cars parked on either side makes it dangerous driving down centre
491	Clitheroe Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
495	Clitheroe Avenue	07 06 10	1			1			1			1		No comments
496	Clitheroe Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
520	Clitheroe Avenue	10 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
528	Clitheroe Avenue	11 06 10	1			1			1			1		No comments
573	Clitheroe Avenue	13 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
586	Clitheroe Avenue	13 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
672	Clitheroe Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	own drive never had problem
688	Clitheroe Avenue	04 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
694	Clitheroe Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		do not want bay between 29/31 as vans and hgvs park and block light to my house
715	Clitheroe Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
725	Clitheroe Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	relies on family members for care,you are just trying to make money
734	Clitheroe Avenue	07 07 10	1			1		1				1		available parkg spaces
738	Clitheroe Avenue	26 06 10	1			1		1				1		
750	Clitheroe Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1				1	like intro of cpz,most resi have more than one car and park probs eve,make sure only resi of CA can park there
758	Clitheroe Avenue	01 07 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	not major issue,yellow lines and bays unfair as already pay enough through road tax and C tax
773	Clitheroe Avenue	25 06 10	1			1		1				1		just another tax earning exercise.permits for resi should be free.more detailed consultation with residents is required
842	Clitheroe Avenue	18 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		would like parkg to be in force 8am to 630pm
853	Clitheroe Avenue	23 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		providing only applies cpz times;parkg both sides creates speeding to avoid giving way;MUCH BETTER if "one way" use is intro to many of these parallel streets
854	Clitheroe Avenue	19 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
866	Clitheroe Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1				1		most comments are about mini rbt Clitheroe/Rayners;more give way signs cameras or t/l;visibility for drivers
912	Clitheroe Avenue	15 06 10	1			1								no comments
														in principle agree but have views how they operate 1)have dropped kerb why yeelow line across it? 2)why should have to pay for the privilege for either myself or visitors to park o/s /near my residence 3)why are illegal parkers not held responsible for contravening the law 4)whatever outcome is imperative that yellow lines particularly by rbt are introduced and enforced as per plan

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
929	Clitheroe Avenue	18 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
15	Dewsbury Close	31 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
26	Dewsbury Close	30 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	There is no need for parking restrictions in DC. We are to far away from RL station for anyone to consider parking here. It will simply restrict what parking there is still further
180	Dewsbury Close	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	We do not have any parking problems in Dewsbury close
456	Dewsbury Close	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no comments
541	Dewsbury Close	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	not a prob with parkg in our road or surrounding rds; all resi opposed and in democratically elected government this should be the fixed decision, not a fixed decision made by a handful of people who sit in the local government offices.
621	Dewsbury Close	31 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	currently no parkg prob if add yellow lines then there will cause parkg probs
831	Dewsbury Close	20 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	For and on behalf of all residents of Dewsbury Close-see attached petition (photocopied front questionnaire sheet and no petition attached)

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
7	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
31	Downs Avenue	31 05 10	1			1	1		1		1		1	The proposed plans are not necessary I have never experienced difficulties in parking
41	Downs Avenue	31 05 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
51	Downs Avenue	04 05 10 rec'd	1				1		1				1	I find syl with restriction quite unnecessary for the end of DA and also that resident permit bays are not needed here. However I don't feel dyl on the bends at the jct between Church Ave and DA are certainly needed for road safety. It would need to be enforced regularly
76	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
82	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
88	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
90	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
153	Downs Avenue	02 06 10	1				1	1		1			1	Doesn't think parking bays or Resident permits are req'd there are cars that park and leave their car all day they should be penalised
202	Downs Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1				1	Is against the proposed resident parking bay opposite
236	Downs Avenue	08 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
416	Downs Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
435	Downs Avenue	10 06 10	1			1		1				1		Existing zone good but displacement parking significantly worsened over past few years and despite numerous complaints remains unchanged. Prevention of accidents should be paramount and greater attention should be paid to non traffic functions of residential roads. In the circumstances therefore this review of the cpz is very welcome.
447	Downs Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
536	Downs Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		already prob with speeding motorists if restriction put in would allow higher speeds, speed deterrent needed
580	Downs Avenue	11 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
590	Downs Avenue	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	since moving here he doesn't think there is a problem looking for a park space, if permit park implemented would be a burden on us especially with financial crisis everybody's facing
605	Downs Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	parkg not a prob at this end of DA
618	Downs Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1						No comments
622	Downs Avenue	09 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1				1		No comments
646	Downs Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
699	Downs Avenue	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
708	Downs Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
719	Downs Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		don't have prob at moment o/s property but if bay o/s then neighbours large vans may park, does bay have to be so long
722	Downs Avenue	13 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
724	Downs Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
727	Downs Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1					1	NO to resi parkg bays; YES to syl 10-11 to stop commuters
735	Downs Avenue	12 07 10 Rec'd	1				1		1			1		don't want cpz as at moment visitors can easily park (ticked yes but comments no)
810	Downs Avenue	28 06 10	1			1		1				1		fully supported as it will improve situation considerably
874	Downs Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1		1		1		very good decision
880	Downs Avenue	21 06 10	1				1		1				1	parkg bay opposite drive so would not support layout drive would be unusable; no parkg prob in rd, this proposal will further depress demand and thereby house prices
895	Downs Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		good idea, will prevent holiday makers, lorries and car transporter far too big for these roads parkg night and day as if is garage

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
54	Drake Road	08 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
71	Drake Road	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	The permits should be free of charge for residents
77	Drake Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
79	Drake Road	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
112	Drake Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
151	Drake Road	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
158	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
162	Drake Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
163	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	There are no parking problems
187	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1	1		1			1	council should consider cheaper day parking
245	Drake Road	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
267	Drake Road	08 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
429	Drake Road	30 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
441	Drake Road	12 06 10	1				1							We do NOT need any yellow lines or boxes or money-milking Parking Ticket Booklets.We still have plenty of Parking spaces (Mon-Fri) after nine o'clock.We opposed this some years ago by "petitioning collectively" and OUR WISH NOT TO DRAW THE LINES WAS ACCEPTED What has changed;houses into flats,more tennants rather than residents,empty spaces ON BOTH SIDES OF DRAKE RD are used by station-goers.What is desired by a MAJORITY OF RESIDENTS;maintaining character of street residents consulted prior to permission granted to build flats,allways full of foxes.They should be cleaned at least once a year,metal gates to stop school children.Mums-in-hurry cause accidents,Trees pruned. So Mr New-Councillor LEARN THE ROPES and respect wishes of residents rather than tennants.Please do not ask for more money.Please do not look for problems soon after arrival but solve existing problems. Priorities now-a-days are decided by the rate-payer
442	Drake Road	08 06 10	1						1		1		1	Don't own car or drive but have family and friends visit and don't want hassle and expense of trips to civic centre for purchasing visitors permits and ensuring always have them
469	Drake Road	04 06 10	1			1		1				1		Commuter;cars from other roads;medical centre;selfish parking by tennants with 2 or more cars;residents impeding safe access & site lines to property
470	Drake Road	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
475	Drake Road	15 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
483	Drake Road	14 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
513	Drake Road	09 06 10	1				1	1		1		1		No comments
526	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	thinks idea is really stupid;hour between 10-100 doesn't change anything in parking issues;talking with other resi they think it is idea for council to make more money, so no I don't want any more changes on our road
548	Drake Road	09 06 10	1			1		1				1		further to conversation with PT would like following cosidered for inclusion in scheme;dyl DR from Alexandra Ave to stop litter dumping from parked cars;service rd between 55&57 made offical school entrance as used by lots of children now but with parkg restrictions to stop parents as quite often block drives and cause traffic problems
581	Drake Road	12 06 10	1			1		1				1		parkg bays should be on both side of drives to stop vehicles parking over drives and should be installed where yellow lines proposed
594	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1		1				1	no parkg prob in DA & nearby streets.introduction of scheme seen as another methid of extracting money from residents.I will strong oppose this proposal & will contact local MP & if necessary escalate this to higher levels
600	Drake Road	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	money would be better spent correcting rediculous parkg that has been put in palce in Rayners Ln (shopping area) between Alexandra Ave and Village Way
603	Drake Road	07 06 10	1			1		1				1		please cpz is being considered hope they are approved;also requests dyl at exits of service rds for safety
608	Drake Road	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
674	Drake Road	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no commuter prob day,prob eve when everyone home,cpz in DR be a waste of tax payers money
682	Drake Road	05 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
684	Drake Road	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob at present,could not afford permit as disabled
695	Drake Road	08 06 10	1			1			1		1		1	mainly due to resi using garages for store goods instead of putting cars in (poss confused about tick box layout)
700	Drake Road	14 06 10			1		1		1			1		No comments
716	Drake Road	15 06 10	1			1			1		1		1	consider initiatives should be taken to increase parkg space as the increase of car ownership,people with garages at the back should not be given permission for drives thus taking away on street parkg space
753	Drake Road	26 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
778	Drake Road	23 06 10	1			1		1				1		there are too many houses with too many cars,too many commercial vehicles parkd in residential rds.parent coleecting child at school cause probs,too many vehicle parkd across drives,extending yellow lines 1.5m each side of drive is a good idea
786	Drake Road	25 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
797	Drake Road	22 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	another way of council to generate money;do not know many resi that want it;booklet not very impartial;road tax contry wide for driving/parkg;trying to introduce toll;council should be thinkg of removing cpz instead;disgusted council wasting money introducing a scheme that nobody wants;devalue property;human rights are being set back;moved to area because of freedom to move about now placing obstacles in way;people have to park somewhere and should not have to pay for it
815	Drake Road	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no comments
816	Drake Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do not see any parkg probs in our rd
817	Drake Road	23 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	should be no charge for any vehicle for parking permits when as resi i pay COUNCIL TAX,ROAD TAX and its subject to annula review in order for the COST TO GO UP EACH YEAR;i do not want parkg permits
822	Drake Road	18 06 10	1			1			1		1		1	do not see how 10-11 will help as most park prob parents drop off and park over drives;why should we be paying to park in front of our house;permit cast can increase at anytime;DR far from station so exercise is not justified;real prob traffic during school hours and this does not address this
829	Drake Road	15 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
838	Drake Road	21 06 10	1			1			1		1		1	No comments
843	Drake Road	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	don't have car only have occasional visitors;i do not see any benefits of cpz;also long way from station;not affected by long stay comms parkg;if cpz intro I need to pay for the service I do not require
855	Drake Road	22 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
857	Drake Road	18 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	haven't experienced any parkg difficulties and only noticed usual resi cars parkd;do not feel any need for change on this rd
862	Drake Road	19 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	I have garage which I use
868	Drake Road	18 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
916	Drake Road	14 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no serious prob of parkg on DA;suggest visit this prob after about 2 yrs
924	Drake Road	13 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	welcome proposal if permits FREE for all homeowners;would think people at begin of DA have prob and this may suit them
931	Drake Road	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
668	Exchange Walk	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
93	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	This is & always has been a quiet road where 99% of res park on own drive.If you extend the cpz in other surrounding roads it could possibly cause parking probs in FD.To change something that isn't a problem is categorically stupid and a huge waste of council tax payers money.IF ITS NOT BROKE DONT FIX IT! I strongly disagree with this councils policy.This is yet just another way of raising funds to prop up an ailing council to the detriment of over-burdoned council tax payers.
105	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1						1	No comments
119	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1	1				1		Alfriston Ave is worse than FD & visibilty & access in Shaftesbury Ave (from rbt) is bad.I uphold the scheme not because I think we currently have prob but if charges are made around us it will undobtedly have a knock on effect
130	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
138	Fernbrook Drive	04 06 10	1				1	1				1		parking prob not in FD but Alfriston Ave.if there was parking restriction on AA then there would be a parking prob in FD as commuters would move up.This is why in favour of controlled parking between 10-11am
141	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		cannot read writing
147	Fernbrook Drive	04 05 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
148	Fernbrook Drive	04 06 10	1				1			1			1	majority of the residents have of street parking there's no conjestion, would be uneconomic, waste of resources, would prefer a cycle lane
166	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
167	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1	1			1			The bend outside the house can be very dangerous
174	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
177	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	leave us alone
185	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
188	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		plans are insufficient
189	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
231	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		comment not conserning the proposal
246	Fernbrook Drive	08 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
281	Fernbrook Drive	21 06 10	1				1			1			1	This will not solve parking problems will only move it somewhere else
407	Fernbrook Drive	19 06 10	1			1		1		1			1	No comments
448	Fernbrook Drive	08 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
454	Fernbrook Drive	10 06 10 Rec'd	1				1			1			1	No comments
462	Fernbrook Drive	08 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
465	Fernbrook Drive	06 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
479	Fernbrook Drive	16 06 10	1				1			1			1	generally in favour of cpz extension but concerned about where cars will go
488	Fernbrook Drive	05 06 10	1			1				1			1	support dyl at jcts;if Alfriston Rd has controls then FD should also have to stop displaced parking
499	Fernbrook Drive	07 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
510	Fernbrook Drive	11 06 10	1				1			1			1	draw attention to accs waiting to happen Alfriston/Ridgeway/Afriston Ave grid lock traffic should be no parking on right hand side going to The Ridgeway;lived 30yrs had no probs;has carer come in 3 times week
534	Fernbrook Drive	08 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
551	Fernbrook Drive	06 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
584	Fernbrook Drive	09 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
585	Fernbrook Drive	07 06 10	1				1			1			1	feel prob is double parkg in Alfriston into Fernbrook would endors any parking retrictions there
596	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	believes parkg prob caused by catholic church and local doctors;restricting thiswill only move parkg;can not expect ill and disabled to walk miles;penalising driving when transport not that good or convenient
598	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1	1		1			1	bungalow only have one car and own drives;speed bumps would be beneficial in AA as used as cut through to dodge Ridgeway t/s
604	Fernbrook Drive	06 06 10	1				1			1			1	No comments
680	Fernbrook Drive	04 06 10	1				1			1			1	obviously a money making ploy by council,totally unnecessar,all day parkg not prob
697	Fernbrook Drive	03 06 10	1				1			1			1	no parkg prob in FD relating to commuters,cpz would increase probs for resi,supports dyl at jcts
710	Fernbrook Drive	14 06 10	1				1	1		1			1	No comments
721	Fernbrook Drive	07 06 10	1				1			1			1	doesn't seem to be prob in road,does not drive
743	Fernbrook Drive	02 06 10	1				1			1			1	no parkg prob in FD
776	Fernbrook Drive	24 06 10	1				1			1			1	sincrely do not agree,we don't have any parkg probs,permit would increase our expenses unfairly,passionately against and current ecomonic climate does not make things any easier for me
779	Fernbrook Drive	25 06 10	1				1			1			1	concern with amount of parkg in Alfriston spur leading out of Ridgeway,vision very restricted
789	Fernbrook Drive	21 06 10	1				1			1			1	Alfriston Ave has parkd cars therefore cpz there would be advantage for passing through,however if can't park there we do not want them using FD

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
798	Fernbrook Drive	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no apparent parkg probs in FD;waste of resources to crate cpz and cause needless irritation;signs and lines detract from the visual appearance;high number of elderly resis added cost for them
805	Fernbrook Drive	22 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob in FD;strongly oppose any parkg restric as it has no benefit
808	Fernbrook Drive	27 06 10	1				1	1		1		1		no comments
814	Fernbrook Drive	21 06 10	1				1		1	1		1		very important to have dyl at jcts
830	Fernbrook Drive	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	I object to parkg scheme there is no prob with safety;there are NO cars parkd causing probs;there is NO access probs;the council is MOVING tha parkg prob not SOLVING it;there is under used car aprk at north Harrow station;this scheme will bring MORE traffic and create chaos
841	Fernbrook Drive	22 06 10	1				1	1		1		1		should be dyl when Alfriston Ave turning opens into FD
852	Fernbrook Drive	20 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	FD very narroaw and can not have parkg both sides;suggest ext to RL car park and reduce cost
901	Fernbrook Drive	19 06 10	1				1	1		1		1		fully support dyl on all bends
923	Fernbrook Drive	14 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	don't think any serious parkg prob in rd;do agree with dyl at jcts

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
437	High Worple	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	The arrangements are ok as they are now I do NOT want any changes.Please leave things as they are now
438	High Worple	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	The existing arrangements is fine there is no need for extension Just keep it the sameway as is Now!!!
493	High Worple	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
563	High Worple	13 06 10	1				1		1				1	liferd last 5yrs 10-11 restriction never had any probs.don't want parking bays would unnecessaril cause inconvenience to our guests
609	High Worple	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	current parkg arrangement fine,no need for extension;can't see any other reason than raising revenue;make improvements to road surface instead
863	High Worple	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	yet another case of expensive consultation paid by council at tax payer expense without any nedd!;there is no case for ext of CPZ L;1)proposed dyl overdone and reduce parkg bays,2)permit bay will come at cost to resi,3)cpz will bring value of proerty down,4)if imple then limited cars parkd will turn roads into speed track

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
1	Hillcroft Avenue	30 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	Will cause an inconvenience
5	Hillcroft Avenue	31 05 10					1		1		1		1	Has never experienced any difficulties in parking
11	Hillcroft Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
13	Hillcroft Avenue	30 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	No parking problems
25	Hillcroft Avenue	29 05 10	1			1		1		1		1		DYL around cnr should be extended;times should be extended to say 10-12 & 3-5.People using RL station must be encouraged to use station car park rather than using roads with no controls
40	Hillcroft Avenue	31 05 10	1				1		1				1	we are very strongly opposed to any extension of the cpz
50	Hillcroft Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	I do not support this proposal and prefer for the current situation to remain as it is
81	Hillcroft Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
86	Hillcroft Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
131	Hillcroft Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1				1	feel proposed 'controlled parking' will cause probs where there aren't any to begin with
140	Hillcroft Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	I pay enough money in road tax for our vehicles,why do I need to pay yet more money for a parking permit?If permit scheme were to come in it would make more sense for times to be 10-11am and 2-3pm
170	Hillcroft Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
264	Hillcroft Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1			1			All roundabouts should have double yellow line on the approaches to them and on them
269	Hillcroft Avenue	07 06 10					1		1				1	There are currently no parking problems with non-residents
410	Hillcroft Avenue	22 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
414	Hillcroft Avenue	28 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Thinks its another money making plan by a labour run council no parking problems totally against it
422	Hillcroft Avenue	28 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	If scheme were to be free or cheaper will support it but for now there are no problems on in rayners
440	Hillcroft Avenue	13 06 10	1			1		1					1	Proposed rpb should be on opposite side of road as residents do this now because of previous accidents by cars turning left into WA from Hillcroft Ave
444	Hillcroft Avenue	08 06 10	1				1	1		1			1	Welcome introduction of syl 10-11am but does not feel need for rpb because most have drives.If bay goes in does want one opposite as obstruct getting in and out of drive as currently happens when car parked opposite
452	Hillcroft Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1			1			Commuter parking has increased over years and will worsen.Lived here 34yrs feels residents have good reason to support extension of parking restrictions
458	Hillcroft Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1			1			no comments
460	Hillcroft Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
480	Hillcroft Avenue	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
575	Hillcroft Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1					1	when first lived here 1978 parkign organised itself in West Ave on opposite side to that suggested;more commuter parkg now on my preferred side but being in cpz hopefully will keep all day parkers away;also crossover not shown-has indicated it on returned plan
627	Hillcroft Avenue	30 05 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
760	Hillcroft Avenue	26 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
804	Hillcroft Avenue	22 06 10	1			1		1		1			1	no dyl totally unsociable to all resis possible money spinner for council;2 drives both with gates and would be breaking law every day when i was unlocking/locking gates;plan provided does not show true layout of rbt also post post again dyl infringes our rights;parkg bay are intrusion;some resis spokjen to think dyl ok topark on after cpz time
837	Hillcroft Avenue	21 06 10	1				1	1					1	don't want bay and therefore cars parked outside house;no need for dyl syl will suffice;prob with commercial/breakdown trucks parkd(pg 8 booklet says vehicles displaying busineses permit can park in resi bay) this is unacceptable
899	Hillcroft Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	no comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
104	Kings Road	02 06 10	1			1		1					1	I do not want any further widening of KR or the reduction of the grass verges by the increase of parking permit bays.I believe that there are too many parking bays along KR already - no more please
207	Kings Road	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	Doesn't want anything to change
279	Kings Road	15 06 10	1			1		1				1		If we buy a parking permit can we park in othe roads adjoining?
461	Kings Road	08 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
463	Kings Road	07 06 10	1			1		1				1		Agrees with cpz but doesn't want yellow line opposite house as that is where they park.If council insists on yellow lines council should provide drive way.where do we suppose to park our cars
497	Kings Road	08 06 10	1				1		1				1	Show bay where there is dropped kerb;every time you alter parking arrangements you make it worse for resi as most resi have two cars;only reason is to raise money from motorist;only prob experienced with parking is Yes/No boxes placed close to each other to cause confussion
502	Kings Road	07 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
633	Kings Road	04 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
634	Kings Road	02 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
648	Kings Road	05 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	proposed control introduce lot probs for resi and guests,lot resi don't have off street parking,increasing control unfair and extortionate
731	Kings Road	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	rd doesn't seem particularly congested.have off street parkg at property
741	Kings Road	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		dyl Capthorne to Chichetser; jct Kings/Capthorne incorrect on plan
870	Kings Road	15 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
903	Kings Road	14 06 10			1				1				1	space opposite bus stop o/s 232 KR rarely used for parkg during day or indeed at night;do not feel resi between Drake & Capthorne have any probs with parkd cars during day;don't believe any comms park that far from stn

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
63	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
107	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
109	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
111	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
127	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
164	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	The parking problems are not caused by commuters
165	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
193	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
227	Lucas Avenue	no date	1				1		1		1		1	finds it ver disturbing devaluating his property by adding parking restrictions put better use to council tax's
408	Lucas Avenue	23 06 10	1			1		1		1	1		1	No comments
428	Lucas Avenue	27 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
433	Lucas Avenue	08 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	why should have to pay for privilage of parking outside their own home
485	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
500	Lucas Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	big prob with old trucks left with washing machines and fridges etc in them which brings road down
546	Lucas Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	don't believe have commuter parkg in rd;difficulty is several h/h have 4+ cars;unwilling to pay for permit as have converted drive as parkg spaceand feel friends should be allowed to park in front of drive for free
560	Lucas Avenue	13 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	during day only few commuter cars in LA;proposal does not cover eves or weekends when parkg can be a prob;should lower car park fees;does not improve condition of street but is indiscreet revenue earner by forcing h/h to buy annual permits;scheme no benefit for me;like to see clamping of vehicles parked over drives
569	Lucas Avenue	13 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	hope daughter will be able to park o/s at anytime if system comes to fruition
572	Lucas Avenue	11 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob as LA is a no through road;can't see point of including weekend when commuter traffic for station would be significantly less;vote for road to remain as it stands without regulations
587	Lucas Avenue	11 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	strongly oppose as there appears to be no commuter parking issues in my road
599	Lucas Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	parkg is prob in eves when all residents home rather than day
632	Lucas Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
676	Lucas Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
679	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do NOT want permit parking in any way shape or FORM!!
686	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	hope proposal will get enough support and be implemented in my road
718	Lucas Avenue	12 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no comments
726	Lucas Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
740	Lucas Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	happy in road do not want any changes
755	Lucas Avenue	23 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	this will do nothing to my life.i need proper adequate help
756	Lucas Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
762	Lucas Avenue	23 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
770	Lucas Avenue	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	have discussed with other resis NOT A SINGLE ONE IS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CPZ.PLEASE NOTE
774	Lucas Avenue	23 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	DO NOT want any parkg control in LA please leave it as it is
792	Lucas Avenue	26 06 10	1			1		1		1	1		1	No comments
794	Lucas Avenue	28 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1		1		1	who is the benefecary of this.lived 6yrs there has been no prob with parkg drives are fairly big
811	Lucas Avenue	14 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	have drive but as resident agree with cpz;not many if any comms park in rd;main prob is scrap metal business
824	Lucas Avenue	26 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	totally against the parking rules
825	Lucas Avenue	26 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
826	Lucas Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
832	Lucas Avenue	21 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	main prob trademans vans park in LA overnight and weekends;piled high with scrap metal and tyres
849	Lucas Avenue	22 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	no comments
926	Lucas Avenue	17 06 10	1			1		1		1			1	plan does not give me individual space as pensioner why pay for permit can't use;money I can ill afford to spend

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
114	Newlyn Gardens	03 06 10	1				1	1					1	Introducing dyl on even side of NG would be counter productive as people park on this side.due to drives on this side more cars are able to park without blocking access for emergency vehicles etc.the proposed restrictions will only increase parking probs instead of solving them.The prob bays will not be adequate to accomodate the number of cars on this road.Also if have to pay for permit there will be no guarantee that we'll get a space outside our house.As there are no curreny parking probs on this road,please do not change anything!
230	Newlyn Gardens	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
484	Newlyn Gardens	16 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	already have syl at entrance to road that operates 10-11am
579	Newlyn Gardens	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	1)why etenicity count when member of mixed community not segregated area 2)in general no probs with parkg 3)visitors and guests should have full access to parkg with there being lots of amenities nearby
653	Newlyn Gardens	07 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		as former res of Warden suggest restrictions extended there as always prob;surprised at amount of paper used can it be done electronically;whats connection between "parking survey" and "monitoring equality"
656	Newlyn Gardens	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	DO NOT have parkg prob all resi co-op with parkg;taking cars off road force paving over front gardens
768	Newlyn Gardens	24 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
793	Newlyn Gardens	28 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
847	Newlyn Gardens	25 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1		1		1	has never been ANY parkg probs on NG for resis;just cynical exercise to raise revenue at expense of resis

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
270	Ovesdon Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
538	Ovesdon Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
577	Ovesdon Avenue	13 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
681	Ovesdon Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
771	Ovesdon Avenue	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	stop this,please provide good service than taking more money from public
783	Ovesdon Avenue	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	think it is money making programme,no need for dyl or syl,should be able to park near house otherwise shouldn't be paying c tax,please consider no parking zones

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
173	Raynton Close	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No to parking restritions
486	Raynton Close	15 06 10	1			1		1					1	Do not support bay layout as would cause problem getting in/out drive;would support dyl through out close or parking bays on opposite side of road
533	Raynton Close	11 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
637	Raynton Close	05 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
706	Raynton Close	14 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	don't want bay opposite drive,no parkg prob but would be if cpz went ahead.High Worple parkg prob at night so daytime restricts would be waste of time
767	Raynton Close	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		proposed bays only allow for 4 car when 16 properties,bays should be on same side as houses which would allow 8 cars.syl around rest of close the same facility as Trescoe & Newlyn.attended exhibition and was told bay could not be put at end as fire could not turn around,absolute nonsense disabled bus,refuge back out why can't fire engine if driver can't then shouldn't be driving fire engine
844	Raynton Close	21 06 10	1				1	1					1	do not have parkg prob in rd;however support limited parking 10-11 but need the two bays at 29 & 11;completely opposed to dyl as impose lot of difficulties finding parkg space
889	Raynton Close	11 06 10	1				1		1	1			1	1)lived 12yrs dust carts never had difficulty;2)every day care home has 4 ambulances always reverse down rd;3)dyl for whole rd would inconvenience evryone;most importantly bays on wrong side of road making it difficult for resi turning into drives,if absolutely necessary then 4 bays on same side as drives should be considered
928	Raynton Close	17 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no parkg prob in RC

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
116	South Close	02 06 10	1			1		1					1	1)a designated disabled bay should be created in SC for increasing number of elderly and disabled residents' many carer and visitors 2)dyl should be extended to No15 at least to enable safe access and egress at the corner
129	South Close	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
136	South Close	05 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
144	South Close	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
178	South Close	05 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
492	South Close	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Extension of cpz in road not necessary and strongly object if implemented;not currently experiancing commuter parking;restriction devalue house;SC private road so highly inappropriate to install yellow line;please investiget;to be kept inform of outcome of this proposal
537	South Close	10 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
558	South Close	10 06 10	1			1		1					1	am disabled and get deliveries of food etc and carers;designated disabled bay would be a benefit to the increasing number of elderly and disabled people in road

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
277	Southbourne Close	22 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	We have no problems with parking on our road
542	Southbourne Close	09 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
565	Southbourne Close	12 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
589	Southbourne Close	13 06 10	1				1	1			1	1		No comments
601	Southbourne Close	06 06 10	1				1	1					1	No comments
667	Southbourne Close	07 06 10	1				1	1					1	dyl at end of close unnecessary,disagree with proposals,bays are not necessary
747	Southbourne Close	28 06 10	1				1		1	1			1	No comments
759	Southbourne Close	27 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
787	Southbourne Close	26 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do not understand need fo dyl at end of SC,would NOT appreciate paying for permit
795	Southbourne Close	13 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do not consider our rd has prob.even if cpz extended along VW we consider there will be no overspill as 0.6mile from RL.dyl in Exchange Walk a bit oot.dyl & syl in Sccompletely uncalled for,if put in would create prob
850	Southbourne Close	22 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	I do not want this,currently good parkg;new would reduce parkg then be big problems
851	Southbourne Close	21 06 10	1			1		1					1	main prob at jct with VW;dyl o/s 22-23 irrelevant;better to extend dyl BOTH sides from VW to 1&2 SC;this is prob area;o/s 25&24 could be bay and rest of that area be syl
905	Southbourne Close	14 06 10	1					1				1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
100	Spinnells Road	02 06 10	1			1		1					1	According to the plan a resident parking bay would be sited outside number 12-14 and numbers 1-3.This would make it very difficult for the dust cart to reverse up the road, which it does (both carts) every Monday
101	Spinnells Road	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		The whole of SR is used as a 'rat-run' of speeding traffic.Reinforcements are needed to slow down the traffic eg:sleeping policeman and 20mph zone.Accidents frequently occur on the junction of SR with Torbay Rd
150	Spinnells Road	02 06 10	1			1			1	1			1	the road is very narrow road and this would make it very difficult to use the driveway
644	Spinnells Road	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
689	Spinnells Road	10 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1		1		1	very narrow rd to put restricts as proposed would make worse,if you park on both side you block rd

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
20	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		Strongly support proposed extension CPZ L to include remainder of TA. Inconsiderate resident and commuter parking has made access to our property very difficult or impossible. Such parking also impeded the access/progress of essential vehicles
21	The Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1				1	I don't consider parking to be a problem outside my property. Probably is towards TA and Hillcroft Ave. Also do not agree with paying for a permit for any of my vehicles. I think the Council Tax we pay should more than cover that. Also aesthetically it ruins the look of the surrounding area. In this tight economic environment it seems ridiculous that residents should pay for their own cars. I think that it is something the council should provide, not us
23	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		See my letter 7 Nov 2001 & my correspondence 8 July 2009 detailing congestion; inconsiderate parking overlapping driveway; speeding with possible accidents likely
34	The Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		Finds it difficult to leave and enter drive it is an accident waiting to happen
37	The Avenue	30 05 10	1				1		1				1	There is no way this road req's cpzs will speak in public has strong feeling about this NO CPZS
42	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
45	The Avenue	30 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
55	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
85	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		The bay would assist greatly as vehicles regularly park partly across drive as at present it is first available spot outside the current zone. However if the bay is marked centrally 58&60 vehicles that could not park in bay would probably still park between bay & my drive potentially blocking entrance. I would appreciate consideration given to the bay being marked slightly closer to my drive making it impossible for vehicles to park between bay and drive. I am blind in right eye making it difficult to see to the right if vehicle park up to or over drive. Due to my handicap I would appreciate any assistance regarding the above.
87	The Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
96	The Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
121	The Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		Think road safety improved if dyl OPPOSITE a T jct eg along the front of 10,12&14 Church Ave & 28-32 Church Ave. when someone parks opposite The Ave it is much more difficult to get out & if the sightline is obscured by a parked car or two it can be very tricky. You've not put parking bays there so there would not be any great loss of parking. This could with advantage be implemented on all such jcts
142	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
143	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
146	The Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
176	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
213	The Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		are not in favour of parking bay opposite our drive blue badge holder
423	The Avenue	21 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
449	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
459	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		very please to receive consultation and strongly approve of the proposals as laid out in your plan
505	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
519	The Avenue	09 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
532	The Avenue	13 06 10	1				1		1			1	1	not in favour because it is not prob on our road but is throughout borough. if one road put in the next will have parking prob
545	The Avenue	06 06 10	1			1		1				1		10-11 is very good time. any later may cause issues when friends/grandparents come for lunch
547	The Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		1) should definitely be dyl at jct and rigorously enforced; 2) Church Ave is busy rd giving access to other rds therefore parkg restrictions would make life easier
553	The Avenue	31 05 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
561	The Avenue	13 06 10	1				1		1			1		1) apparently supported by minority within our rd this is NOT supported by all as we do not all suffer inconvenience 2) also considered method of council to raise revenue 3) timing error in Q4 4) with more thought an improvement in car parkg places could be obtained thus increasing spaces available to that shown on plan 4
566	The Avenue	16 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1						No comments
611	The Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	do not consider prob as long don't block drive
628	The Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1					1	parkg prob not going away just moved, should think outside box, council earn good money, suggests come up with new strategy by using dead areas of road
664	The Avenue	04 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
665	The Avenue	09 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1				1		require parkg bays to stop long day parkg but doesn't want to pay
691	The Avenue	30 05 10	1				1		1				1	no comments
732	The Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		consultation long overdue, this part of TA should have cpz

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
782	The Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1				1		no comments
834	The Avenue	01 06 10	1				1	1				1		know parkg annoys some neighbours which is why answered Y to Q2;my drive has room for 2 car so I don't have difficulty parking;only prob id selfish parking on street by some taking up more space than should
859	The Avenue	22 06 10	1			1			1	1			1	bay between 105 and church needs to be shorter,starting further away from 105as no sight line to see oncoming traffic backing out of drive because of wall and tree
867	The Avenue	18 06 10	1				1		1				1	TA quiet rd and no need to intro yellow lines;know comms park in rd but have no prob with that;accept have to park away from my house from time to time;other probs that aware of and accept;after due consideration I think the propped cpz is not necessary
878	The Avenue	20 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
891	The Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
27	The Close	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		When the school finishes across the road from TC all parking bays including yellow lines are full with cars and overhang and obstruct entrance and exit to TC and other surrounding roads.This is frustrating for res and visitors because we have no were to park and is also dangerous that it has caused a few near misses.I myself have purchased 2 residential parking permits and a numbe of visitor passes and neither myself or visitors are able to park.I feel there should a parking controll officer patrolling the area in question
33	The Close	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		Finds it hard to leave and enter driveway 90% of the time please help before someone gets hurt
210	The Close	01 06 10	1				1	1					1	wants some of the double yellow lnes not all, all would be an inconvenience
588	The Close	12 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	disgrees with dyl in whole road as no real prob at moment but agrees needed at jct

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
22	The Glen	31 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
28	The Glen	01 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Doesn't support the cpz there are no problems with parking
48	The Glen	31 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	Our first comment must be that in 18yrs lived here,we have not experienced any serious parking problems.On studying your map we see amount of crossovers is incorrect.All dwellings in our leg of TG (39-49) have crossovers.The width of the carriageway called TG is only 5.3m compared to Downs Ave 5.6m and Hillcroft Ave 7.92m.Taking average length of family car approx 4.1m and width of parking bay 1.85m your proposals would make it extremely difficult to either reverse in or out of my drive.Therefore I would oppose these proposals.
133	The Glen	02 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
204	The Glen	03 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	No comments
223	The Glen	09 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
424	The Glen	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
455	The Glen	31 05 10	1			1		1			1		1	a)In favour of plan in Downs Ave and The Glen if Village Way extended as realise cars would then park in their road b)people need to park why not reduce price of parking in RL station car park? consider reducing size of rbt in TG so safer for two cars to pass each other
503	The Glen	12 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	consider reducing size of rbt in TG so safer for two cars to pass each other
512	The Glen	14 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
524	The Glen	29 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	strongly object;don't want this intrusion and absolutely unnecessary restrictions of ours and our friends liberties;strongly object to bays indicated on plan as would restrict acces to drive;unwritten rule everyone parks on our side of road the opposite side to proposed bays;37-49 not necessary to have controls particularly inconvenient for manoeuvring in/out drive to have bays opposite;do not do this
530	The Glen	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	extension goes 0.5km from shops and station;local businesses are suffering downturn compared with thriving Eastcote area;many shppoers/commuters park on Village Way and our rd. 0.5km walk is encouraging healthy walks to shops-something we as a nation must allow;above are reasons for objecting to extension and I have not found shopper/commuter parking around us a nuisance
540	The Glen	09 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
591	The Glen	13 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Parking on the pavement
625	The Glen	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
761	The Glen	27 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	23 & 30 have crossovers not shown on plan so bay does not fit,selfish parking will not be solved by scheme
772	The Glen	25 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
809	The Glen	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	TOTALT AGAINST;absolutely no parkg prob in TG;introducing would cause probs for elderly resis
828	The Glen	24 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
879	The Glen	19 06 10	1			1		1		1	1		1	this is a great idea!;it would mean easier access for emergency services and lesson need for bin men to knock on my door and ask to move car outside my house that I don't own so they can get through
882	The Glen	18 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	TG unusually narrow road and bay opposite drive would make drive unusable;also drive next to is for electric sub station and has had call outs in past vehicles would not be able to access this if bay opposite
900	The Glen	10 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	lived 20yrs never had prob with parkg;majority of houses have drives;not able to use drive if bay opposite;copy of petition enclosed
911	The Glen	15 06 10	1				1		1	1	1		1	do not have parkg prob on TG;l would consider this work to be a waste of money

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
62	The Ridgeway	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	there are no parkings problems in the area only on sundays outside the church
70	The Ridgeway	03 06 10				1	1		1		1		1	No comments
134	The Ridgeway	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Would really appreciate if the pavement on TR is re-laid
190	The Ridgeway	03 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		At last but it only tackles only half the problem
250	The Ridgeway	10 06 10	1				1		1		1			Not sure if it would be a good idea
263	The Ridgeway	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	Suggestion-aren't the council allowed to cut into the side walk to create parkig bays
276	The Ridgeway	18 06 10	1				1		1				1	There are two drivers in the house and will cost more to maintain all the cars
278	The Ridgeway	16 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
418	The Ridgeway	01 06 10					1		1				1	Don't change anything parking isn't a problem
421	The Ridgeway	22 06 10	1				1		1				1	Already has problems coming in and out of driveway because of yellow lines and bus stop
436	The Ridgeway	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	Lived on TR for over 2yrs and never had difficulty parking in own road any time. Therefore not seen as area where drivers take advantage of current parking arrangement. Introducing proposed cpz would cause inconvenience and expense for residents
473	The Ridgeway	16 06 10	1				1		1				1	What's wrong with you people, people pay road tax to drive and park vehicles on road. if can't park here will move to other roads; where do you want people to park their vehicles?
481	The Ridgeway	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
482	The Ridgeway	11 06 10	1				1		1				1	No need for controls as no prob in 10yrs lived there
498	The Ridgeway	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	Council should consider station car park and charge low daily fee this will automatically reduce congestion in the streets where cpz proposed; Council can not restrict/penalise commuters not staying close to station without providing alternative as above; additional secure bike racks, lower bus fares etc; restrictions on TR make it difficult for patients and doctors to find parking
515	The Ridgeway	12 06 10	1			1			1				1	No comments
641	The Ridgeway	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	disagree with cpz as bays will reduce amount of parkg, also not be able to park across drive, risk of penalty for non compliance, visual appearance of stret reduce property value. i require to pay £102 every year plus inflationary rise, which is nothing more than tax on residents
643	The Ridgeway	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	proposal completely unnecessary, commuters do not park here
685	The Ridgeway	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
703	The Ridgeway	10 06 10 Rec'd					1		1				1	just another revenue collection, TR does not have parkg prob, most people have drives
711	The Ridgeway	13 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
714	The Ridgeway	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	appropriate if council officers start thinking about improvements rather than non stop revenue generation
742	The Ridgeway	29 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
754	The Ridgeway	28 06 10	1				1		1				1	don't support, please DO my own parking as disabled
764	The Ridgeway	24 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
784	The Ridgeway	28 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	think absolutel ridiculous expected to pay to park o/s house, there is no parkg prob here, strongly oppose this revenue generating exercise, this is just typical of Harrow Council
788	The Ridgeway	12 06 10	1				1		1				1	no comments
806	The Ridgeway	25 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
840	The Ridgeway	21 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
869	The Ridgeway	20 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
877	The Ridgeway	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	do not support extn of cpz or proposal that puts dyl at cnr of TR & parkthorne Dr this will meamn no parking for anyone including resis; surgery opposite and resi bays will prevent resi finding space when surgery in use; resi not wanting to purchase permits will have to look for 'free' parking down other rds
884	The Ridgeway	12 06 10	1				1		1				1	no parkg prob on TR; very against proposal; TR surgery lots of elderly patients will be effected with probs when they come to surgery; hope this plan does not go ahead and feel fellow resi feel same
914	The Ridgeway	14 06 10	1			1		1	1				1	proposal would remove approx 10 spaces from TR which is already short of spaces
915	The Ridgeway	15 06 10	1				1		1				1	have no probs in our rd, lets not create any!!!

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
123	Torbay Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	simply not warranted,this proposal is anti drivers/driving.I am disappointed to note money - yet again - wasted in such matters.The LA might want to actually keep our street cleaner
124	Torbay Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
125	Torbay Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Points:1)plan 9of 13 out of date 387 TR has dropped kerbs to 2 drives not shown.2)plan show the drives obstructed by proposed bay which would obstruct manouvers.3)proposed bays o/s 387&314 would cause danger to residents exiting drives given speed of traffic esp at commuter and school times.this would require some form of traffic calming north of 314/389 to reduce risk(3)dyl would clear jcts resi bays would cause serious obstructionas 385 is a care home which has social transport pickups each day.4)rpb in this vicinity & configuration would block rush hour traffic/school runs&during weekly refuse collections.5)379-389&310-316 area used by coaches & delivery vehicles daily to/from school.6)narrowing with rpb would also present probs during inclement weather eg:heavy snow in the last two years
156	Torbay Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
159	Torbay Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
160	Torbay Road	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Doesn't believe double yellow lines could be added to all junction points
186	Torbay Road	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	against the cpz
233	Torbay Road	08 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
239	Torbay Road	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
466	Torbay Road	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Parking always prob at any time just too many vehicles on roads;agree with dyl at jcts
468	Torbay Road	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
478	Torbay Road	15 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
489	Torbay Road	08 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		living costs expensive doesn't want to pay any extra for parking am happy as it is now
509	Torbay Road	11 06 10	1				1		1	1			1	parking around TR is fine and quiet no need for cpz;however if surrounding roads have cpz then displaced parking into TR which will cause probs
523	Torbay Road	12 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
525	Torbay Road	10 06 10	1				1		1				1	no comments
527	Torbay Road	11 06 10	1				1		1				1	surprised by proposal for cpz as no probs finding parking space;how much has it cost to produce consultation when not needed;why doesn't council listen to rate payers what needs doing on the road eg trim large tree o/s 353 TR as he and Cllr Noyce requests have been ignored for 2yrs
531	Torbay Road	09 06 10	1				1		1				1	feel only prob area is Warden Ave not TR
544	Torbay Road	09 06 10	1				1		1				1	existing 10-11am has stopped commuters so fully satisfied our needs;intro of permit bays is money making business for council;no need for permit bays
555	Torbay Road	03 06 10	1				1		1	1			1	Q4 not dependant on Q£ as times are not that different;Obviously if cpz introduced in surrounding roads there will be impact then yes please include us but rather not
583	Torbay Road	13 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
613	Torbay Road	02 06 10	1				1		1				1	don't want any lines we want free parking bay as it is now!
614	Torbay Road	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
629	Torbay Road	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	current situation works very weel and had no probs,any change is just another method for council to extract more money WITHOUT adding benefit to c tax payer.no change necessary
630	Torbay Road	07 06 10	1			1		1		1				No comments
636	Torbay Road	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	parkg restrictions in area are effective do not wish council to spend additional money to extend
669	Torbay Road	09 06 10 Recd	1				1		1				1	recommend fine for drivers that take to much space,neighbours have more than 2 cars and park inconsiderately
673	Torbay Road	07 06 10	1				1		1			1		wants mini rbt at High Worple/Warden Ave
701	Torbay Road	17 06 10 Recd	1				1		1				1	whats this to achieve,whole area should be cpz,syl and bay ridiculous
707	Torbay Road	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	existing layout adequate and have seen no probs
739	Torbay Road	01 07 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
746	Torbay Road	19 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
757	Torbay Road	26 06 10	1			1		1					1	No comments
766	Torbay Road	25 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
777	Torbay Road	25 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
827	Torbay Road	22 06 10	1				1		1				1	never seen any "commuter cars" parkd in area;most cars parkd and used by resis;jct between Warden/Torbay is NOT a T junction hence no need for dyl;there is plenty of space fro emergency vehicle to move,even when cars parked,please come and have a look

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
836	Torbay Road	17 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	live next to current cpz but have had no prob;mostly resi cars and not enough bays for cars;based on this think proposed cpz is nonsense;if cpz brought in will encourage front gardens turned into drives;cpz not needed one can't help but see it as nothing more than opportunity created for another stealth tax
845	Torbay Road	19 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	restricts introd few years ago more than adequate and do not need extended;seems nothing more than money making idea devised by the Council in light of freezing c tax and vehemently opposed to it
846	Torbay Road	22 06 10	1			1		1				1		no comments
864	Torbay Road	19 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
871	Torbay Road	20 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
881	Torbay Road	21 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	no prob parkg in my rd therefore do not wish to have cpz in my rd
888	Torbay Road	16 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	we do have commuter parking on our road ever so we feel there is no need for yellow lines.It will cause unnecessary hassle for residents. Sdo we strongly are not in favour
890	Torbay Road	15 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
52	Trescoe Gardens	06 05 10	1				1		1		1		1	Not witnessed any commuters occupying parkg spaces on TG or any surrounding roads.We have very close neighbourhood and we were all shocked to hear the proposals intended
95	Trescoe Gardens	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
118	Trescoe Gardens	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	lived in TG 40yrs and have always managed our on street parking & no real prob with commuter parking.Strongly in favour dyl at dangerous & blind jcts and entrance to the park but for the 3 narrow cul-de-sacs it surely cant' be reasonable option and would virtually force residents to pave front gardens causing massive probs with drainage and the local water table.Spend the money on long needed road and footway repairs
139	Trescoe Gardens	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	currently do not have prob with commuter parking.by adding restrictions,particularly dyl,this will encourage people to pave over their front gardens and this will have detrimental effect on area which is virtually impossible to reverse.the area in general already in decline and I feel strongly that gardens/hedges and use of garages where possible should be encouraged.
171	Trescoe Gardens	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	strongly objects to the proposal
247	Trescoe Gardens	07 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	More accidents,especially for the elderly,mobility impaired and pedestrians are CAUSED BY the very poor conditions of the road surface and pavements than by traffic since TG is a cul-de-sac
409	Trescoe Gardens	no date	1				1		1		1		1	Have been living there for the last 15 years and havent had any parking problems at all
426	Trescoe Gardens	04 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Against the proposals
472	Trescoe Gardens	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Do not have parking prob in road so control measures NOT appropriate in TG.if does go ahead not enough spaces provided.road needs resurfacing has not been done since 1971 and have lobbied council for 10yrs
507	Trescoe Gardens	09 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	small close not troubled by commuters no need for additional legislation;would like money saved from NOT implementing scheme to be used to resurface road as not done for at least 30 years
552	Trescoe Gardens	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	do not need parkg controlled in our road
713	Trescoe Gardens	14 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	there are NO parkg probs
763	Trescoe Gardens	25 06 10			1		1		1		1		1	Pre school and scouts didn't get consultation,oppose the proposed extension,various reasons included on separate sheet from them
893	Trescoe Gardens	16 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	small cul de sac which is just right size to serve resis;do not have probs with non resi parkg;our road really does need to stay as it is

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	
14	Village Way	31 05 10	1			1		1						No comments
16	Village Way	01 06 10	1			1						1		The syl proposed is long overdue as congestion can at times be overwhelming;will be important to enforce the restriction as it is often completely ignored on the existing yellow line.The bus route using VW will be much improved, as will the quality of life for the residents
35	Village Way	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		Long overdue commuter park outside properties and also is a problem for emergency vehicles
39	Village Way	29 05 10	1			1	1	1		1		1		No comments
46	Village Way	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		Consider VW to be an extremely dangerous road where vehicles travel too fast and I would welcome the introduction of speed bumps to control the traffic
47	Village Way	29 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
53	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		I think it is high time restrictive parking is introduced on VW.I am having great difficulty coming out of my driveway safely especially in the morning when cars parked next to my driveway and tall vehicles that obstruct my vision.This is a hazard
57	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
73	Village Way	30 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
102	Village Way	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	This is an ill thought out proposal I would suggest as there is no existing problem.I have never seen vehicles parked across drives on VW.The large majority if not all res have off street parking.Our street parking is extremely effective at reducing vehicle speeds on what is otherwise a straight section of road.The installation of yellow lines would be unsightly,although I would not object to it being implemented at jcts as protecting the visibility splay is essential.We would prefer you to resurface the road,as tyre noise is particularly loud,whereas between First and Central Ave there is a noticeable reduction in tyre noise
132	Village Way	03 06 10	1				1		1		1			WE STRONGLY AND HOTLY OPPOSE THIS PROPOSAL.If syl both sides you will remove the ONLY THING that slows traffic.Excessive speed is a problem,CONSTANT PROBLEM,that we have reported to council,London mayor & traffic authority on number occasions.If you do this may as well remane road "Pinner Speed Way" that's the effect it will have.By all means 'yellow line' people's drives but not whole street!!! IN ADDITION you have left NO bays on either side for visitors or residents.Frequently have guests that park opposite house,have little children & can not be expected to carry them half way up the road just so that you can further enable speeding motorists
155	Village Way	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
191	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		supports but the restrictions should be 2-3pm
201	Village Way	04 06 10	1				1	1				1		No comments
205	Village Way	01 06 10	1				1		1			1		The cpz should be from 8am to a minimum of 5pm
208	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		parking bays should also be added along with the yellow lines to ensure no overlapping whilst parked
211	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		says the road is dangerous please implement parking restrictions as soon as possible
212	Village Way	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
219	Village Way	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
222	Village Way	08 06 10	1				1	1					1	Definatley against the introduction of the yellow lines
262	Village Way	08 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comment concerning the proposal
265	Village Way	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
272	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		Can't comment have just moved into the area
274	Village Way	20 06 10	1			1		1				1		Would prefer 11am-12noon rather than 8am-6:30pm
282	Village Way	19 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
413	Village Way	06 06 10	1			1			1					Would like parking restrictions on own road, finds it dangerous to park on own drive
#	Village Way	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		Dyl would be better,but if this only option then better than parked cars on road.A clear road is safer-a comment was made that if cars parked this would slow traffic and speeding motorists-this is not the case as they still speed and seem to like it better when they swerve around.in 2000 a van did this and it brought down a bus stop, my wall and garage
457	Village Way	07 06 10	1			1		1				1		20-34 VW should be able to have permits for The Ave & Central Ave as we used to park on both sides of road outside our house if new goes ahead wont be able to therefore should be compensated with permit
477	Village Way	13 06 10	1			1		1				1		Nearby house has 6 cars some park on drive some taking up parking this is unfair and should be a limit per household for parking bays
490	Village Way	03 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
535	Village Way	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
539	Village Way	05 06 10	1				1	1				1		proposed syl not acceptable,current yellow line sufficient to control parking outside;if do have restrictions visitors nowhere to park
543	Village Way	07 06 10	1				1	1		1		1		No comments
550	Village Way	10 06 10	1			1		1				1		VW has been congested for long time,buses large lorries make hazardous for esi getting in/out of drives
554	Village Way	14 06 10	1			1		1				1		welcome plan for yellow line

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
564	Village Way	13 06 10	1				1		1				1	no need extension for cpz in Rayners Ln, Village Way, Pinner or Eastcote Why? Why? Why?
574	Village Way	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	as we live on VW we haven't marked Q3 and Q4 as we are happy with the plan 7 of 13 with waiting 8am-630pm Mon-Sat
595	Village Way	10 06 10	1				1		1				1	would propose extension of dyl to traffic lights at Rayners Ln/Village Way jct, busy road, cars block drives
607	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	VW busy and noisy rd, buses, large vans parked overnight, detract residents in/out of property, should be speed restrictions
615	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	serious parkg prob in VW due commuters
617	Village Way	06 05 10	1					1	1				1	VW does not have parkg prob, excessive speed is the prob, removing cars allow speed to increase
623	Village Way	09 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	oppose any more rules and regulations-parts of harrow becoming more confusing due to signs and lines
654	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
655	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	prefer cpz instead of syl; cpz should operate 10-11am and 2-3pm
662	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
663	Village Way	06 06 10	1				1		1				1	commuter parkg all day, buses have probs getting through
666	Village Way	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	to ease parkg better to have syl, carpark behind pub be used for commuter parking
692	Village Way	02 06 10	1					1	1				1	NO need for additional restricts, existing restricts on VW already to severe, please don't knee jerk to a few complaints
693	Village Way	10 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	agree with plan to extend cpz (but seems confused about what side of road restricts will be)
717	Village Way	14 06 10	1				1		1				1	wants improved enforcement of 30mph and no double deck bus using VW
720	Village Way	12 06 10	1				1		1				1	sign giving the "letters" zones should include appropriate time for zone, causes confusion without
730	Village Way	30 05 10	1				1		1				1	existing needs to be enforced, speeding prob in VW traffic calming should be considered
775	Village Way	24 06 10	1				1		1				1	better if dyl run sth side VW from cnr service rd to proposed dyl at South Close. this would alleviate congestion because of parked vehicles
785	Village Way	25 06 10	1				1		1				1	pleased to receive letter re parkg restr in VW, would make life lot easier
799	Village Way	23 06 10	1					1	1				1	No comments
818	Village Way	28 06 10 Rec'd	1				1		1				1	request dyl along sth of VW from service rd to Sth Close
820	Village Way	22 06 10	1					1	1				1	No comments
839	Village Way	20 06 10	1					1	1				1	think new yellow line in VW should only be 10-11am with some dyl to allow buses to pass; because if no parkg allow all day traffic would race down the road; some parkg in VW would allow people to park free for shops/visitors
865	Village Way	19 06 10	1				1		1				1	if no parkg in VW 8-630 m_S would be restricting for resis; also more speeding traffic; most parkg is comms and 10-11 would stop this
873	Village Way	21 06 10	1				1		1				1	I agree with intro restricts but DO NOT agree with the length of time; prefer 10-11am with permit bays or 830-1030 & 430-630 and permit bays; eliminate comms parkg is the issue rather than shoppers; also need to remove owners who park for weeks at time; hope something implemented soon
897	Village Way	18 06 10	1				1		1				1	support hours of 10-11 M-F as this will stop all day parkg; zebra crossing or island; map enclosed
921	Village Way	17 06 10	1				1		1				1	live on VW currently not entitled to permit; object to proposal for syl on sth side as both sides of VW will not be able to park during day; if go ahead then give right to have permit for other roads

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellow Line)
78	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	Three vehicles would mean three permits does not find this fair
103	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	looking at the plans I believe that many parking spaces will be lost with the proposals. For example I think that outside 55 WA it should be a bay as opposed to a syl. Outside 92 WA the same applies. I also think that if the RL station car park could be improved eg made multi story for example and made cheaper it may resolve the parking issue in surrounding roads
108	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
135	Warden Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
168	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1				1	1	1		1			No comments
184	Warden Avenue	02 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
192	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1	1		1			No comments
198	Warden Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1			1			Supports the proposal for th yellow lines
419	Warden Avenue	23 06 10	1			1		1			1			Double yellow lines are definitely required
420	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
501	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
522	Warden Avenue	09 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
529	Warden Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	not necessary as no probs with commuter parking in WA
557	Warden Avenue	12 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
578	Warden Avenue	10 06 10	1				1	1	1		1			No comments
606	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1	1		1			No comments
610	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1				1	1	1		1		1	never had prob finding parking space near house, we do not need cpz
638	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1			old disabled bay still on plan but not on site as person not there anymore
677	Warden Avenue	05 06 10	1			1		1			1		1	do not support extension covering the period mentioned
678	Warden Avenue	06 06 10	1				1	1	1		1		1	no parkg prob Harrow council only want to make money, concentrate on improving roads with pot holes
687	Warden Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1			1			will go along with parkg bays but very happy dyl at jcts
712	Warden Avenue	12 06 10	1			1		1			1			Parkg in WA has increased over years, most probs occur when vans park
723	Warden Avenue	13 06 10	1				1	1	1		1		1	No comments
748	Warden Avenue	15 06 10	1			1		1			1			suggest most strongly that 'No parking lines' jct Warden/Spinnells extend sufficiently so peds can see traffic
751	Warden Avenue	28 06 10	1				1	1			1		1	strongly agree with dyl at jct Torbay and Capthorne
821	Warden Avenue	20 06 10	1				1	1			1		1	diagram does not state 'typical' road spaces in each blue line; does not state when next review will be eg if resis feel not working will cpz be removed and when
833	Warden Avenue	21 06 10	1			1		1			1			No comments
886	Warden Avenue	16 06 10	1			1					1			I want to park my car o/s my property (may be some confusion of yes/no ticks on form as ticked yes but doesn't seem to want it)
894	Warden Avenue	18 06 10	1			1		1		1	1			No comments

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

			Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Are You			Do you consider there is a parking problem in your street?		Would you support the ext of the controlled parking zone L 10am-11am mon-fri into your road		If you answered No to Q3, should parking controls be introduced in the road next to yours, would you then support residents parking proposal ?		Would you support the layout of the parking permit bays and parking controls shown on the plan in your road		Any comments
Ref	Road	Date	Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Comments (SYL- Single Yellow Line. DYL - Double Yellwo Line)
56	Waverly Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
425	Waverly Road	17 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
427	Waverly Road	25 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	We do not want cpz in our road and it is the common view in the two road that go off the rbt Raynton & Treside we will be raising a petition to the effect.Taking into consideration the number residential cars in these street,cpz will in effect create more problems amongst the residents!!!
451	Waverly Road	08 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
487	Waverly Road	11 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	NO NOT consider cpz will help or solve any problems
516	Waverly Road	14 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1				1		concern over amount of dyl in surrounding street and whether there are enough bays for resi because of
670	Waverly Road	02 06 10	1			1		1				1		fully support extension,lots of commuter cars
696	Waverly Road	03 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	No comments
745	Waverly Road	26 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	proposed will give rise to congestion in areas where it is not now,limits car park spaces for resi,no current probs
856	Waverly Road	22 06 10	1			1		1				1		would like to see enforcement of cars over drives;support action to correct poor parkg habits
925	Waverly Road	12 06 10	1				1		1		1		1	would agree with syl 10-11 and NO PARKING BAYS; we choose not to have any parkg restricts,it is not prob for us or the street

Rayners Lane Consultation Responses - June 2010

APPENDIX F

Ref	Road	Date	Question 1			Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6
			Resident	Business	Both	Q2 Yes	Q2 No	Q3 Yes	Q3 No	Q4 Yes	Q4 No	Q5 Yes	Q5 No	Any comments
3	West Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1						No comments
4	West Avenue	31 05 10					1		1				1	There are no parking problems
9	West Avenue	01 06 10	1				1		1				1	We have never experienced any parking problems
12	West Avenue	31 05 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
18	West Avenue	31 05 10	1			1		1				1		Worried about cost of permits although have parking on drive for my vehicles I do have visitors.However believe this is way forward to ease congestion of parked vehicles on WA
43	West Avenue	29 05 10	1				1		1				1	No comments
83	West Avenue	30 05 10	1			1		1				1		In support of the cpz as road is too congested
91	West Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
94	West Avenue	30 05 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
115	West Avenue	01 06 10	1											no longer drive,do not own car, so parking regulations do not affect me
117	West Avenue	02 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		no comments
137	West Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		
145	West Avenue	28 05 10	1			1		1				1		PLEASE REDUCE PARKING PERMIT BAYS FOR WEST AVENUE. This plan shows too much parking in WA-there are far fewer bays in The Avenue.West Avenue:-residents great difficulty entering & leaving their own drives.Painting the lamp standards BLACK was an expensive act of lunacy.Can not be seen when reversing in dark.Village Way increasingly hazardous.had to drive into someones front garden to let two buses pass each other
172	West Avenue	03 06 10	1				1		1				1	the parking makes the road congested which makes it difficult to move out of the drive
179	West Avenue	05 06 10	1				1		1				1	There are no parking problems at all on west avenue theres no practical need for bays
181	West Avenue	04 06 10	1				1		1				1	No comment concerning cpz
194	West Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
206	West Avenue	03 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
209	West Avenue	no date	1			1		1				1		No comments
214	West Avenue	31 05 10	1				1		1				1	no parking restrictions does not want to pay £46.00 to park outside own home
232	West Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
417	West Avenue	21 06 10	1			1		1				1		With all the parked cars likes the new parking restrictions would be no more difficulties
445	West Avenue	07 06 10	1				1		1				1	Paying additional money to council beyond the already exhoribant council tax is completely unacceptable.There is NO parking prob at top of WA and NO council interference is required.
453	West Avenue	08 06 10	1				1		1			1		No comments
562	West Avenue	12 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		if 8-630 in VW considered traffic flow will make crossing for pedestrians a greater risk 1)traffic island or ped xing may be required;2)cycle lane could be introduced on this "improved" road;3)could be increase in speeding if no parked cars
576	West Avenue	08 06 10	1			1		1					1	proposed bays on west side of WA/Village Way should be on EAST side as left turn into WA is tight and has bad sight lines (this is as the parking currently organises itself)
602	West Avenue	09 06 10	1				1		1				1	do not percieve parkg prob in my road would not like to see street furniture/lines,detrimental to area,wouldn't like to have bay in front of property
612	West Avenue	09 06 10 Rec'd	1			1		1				1		1)yellow line south side VW will increase traffic speed possible to put in zebra crossing 2)WA bay o/s 54 VW rather than o/s 52VW,can keep o/s 52 as well?
616	West Avenue	07 06 10	1			1		1				1		very much in favour of cpz in WA
671	West Avenue	01 06 10	1			1		1				1		prob onlystarted when council put in scheme in Rayners Ln,parked cars block view getting out of drive
744	West Avenue	29 06 10	1				1							if VW in made fully "no waiting" then support extension into WA,if VW becomes clear drivers use excessive speed,how will area be safe for cyclists and peds?
752	West Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		feel need for permit parking in WA,parkg on both sides where before only one side
802	West Avenue	06 06 10	1				1		1					hopefully there will be dyl at jct WA & Hillcroft Ave;cars currently block sight lines
819	West Avenue	22 06 10	1			1		1				1		shorten bay on entrance to WA from VW so parkg not near jct
858	West Avenue	21 06 10	1				1						1	opposed to bay opposite drive;other comments about general use of road;lived there 30yrs always understanding resis park on east side of this part of WA is the safest option
876	West Avenue	19 06 10	1			1		1		1		1		No comments
907	West Avenue	19 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
908	West Avenue	16 06 10	1			1		1				1		suggest all bayson same side of rd allowing clear access for emergency services
913	West Avenue	10 06 10	1			1		1				1		No comments
919	West Avenue	16 06 10	1				1		1			1		understand 'no parking' also applies bank holidays;i feel this is VERY unfair and these days should be exempt