

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
BADGERS CLOSE 175	I do not own a car.	No response required
BESSBOROUGH ROAD 982	For 25 years there is no parking to the front of our property. The new proposed parking restriction is going to cause a huge inconvenience to our whole family. Suggested alternative times for restrictions.	Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ not progressing.
BESSBOROUGH ROAD 027, 755, 966	Restrictions and times excessive.	Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ not progressing.
BESSBOROUGH ROAD 885	Business objecting to loss of employee parking nearby if Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ went ahead.	Business already located within existing CPZ. Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ not progressing.
BESSBOROUGH ROAD 939	Please upgrade the zebra crossing at the junction of Bessborough Road and Roxborough Avenue	Defects identified forward to street lighting team. Request for different style of lights forward to road safety team. Both issues outside remit of this consultation.
BESSBOROUGH ROAD 027, 755	Parking could be accommodated on wide part of Bessborough Road which would help school	Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ not progressing. Parking could be provided as part of revised scheme.
BLENHEIM ROAD 029	Pay and display parking bay on Blenheim Road and The Gardens should be taken out and apply restricted 10.00am - 11.00am no parking zone.	Not advertised as part of the Statutory Consultation so cannot be considered in this process.
BLENHEIM ROAD 029	Additional hour Mon-Friday-2.00-3.00pm will not restrict further commuters traffic but will hinder our local businesses	Afternoon hour not being progressed. Other residents have said this business is part of the parking problem in area.
BLENHEIM ROAD 028	There should be double yellow lines opposite Bladdon Close and single yellow line on Blenheim Road because of commuter parking.	Not considered as part of Statutory Consultation but is noted.
BOUVERIE ROAD 176, 994	More restrictions will turn West Harrow into a No go area. The current parking arrangements are adequate	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ
BOUVERIE ROAD 176, 898, 950, 994	It's all about the Council getting in more money. I do not wish to have to pay to park where I live.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
BOUVERIE ROAD 950, 994	I do NOT agree with pay and display meters on Vaughan Road as I believe in the present economic climate, the small businesses will suffer and the Council should be doing all it can to support these businesses	It was intended that these Pay & Display bays would help local businesses by freeing up short term parking outside the shops
BOUVERIE ROAD 994	The council have, in fact, exacerbated the parking situation by allowing 9 new flats on Bouverie Road, without adequate consultation and without requiring parking facilities specifically for the flats.	The flats does have limited parking as part of the development as per national guidelines
BOUVERIE ROAD 994	Taking into account the very wide width of this road - the length of the double yellow line at junction is totally unnecessary	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
BOUVERIE ROAD	Email response received requesting clarification of permit costs	Reply provided and no further communication was received from resident
BOUVERIE ROAD 031, 305, 950	Rest of the road should be in CPZ because of new flats. Traffic congestion of more people looking for parking space.	Not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support for CPZ in end of road
BOUVERIE ROAD 033	Fully support the changes/additions to CPZ-W and hope it is monitored on a daily basis especially the new 2-3pm slot	Additional afternoon time not being progressed
BOUVERIE ROAD 033		
BOWEN ROAD 609, 874, 1006	I want to be included in the CPZ.	Not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support for CPZ in road
BOWEN ROAD 607, 751, 753, 804, 807, 826, 867, 874	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time
BOWEN ROAD 608, 826, 1006	The real parking issue in the area is in the evenings and is regularly at it's worst on Sunday evenings therefore the parking issue is not a commuter or day time issue.	Previous consultations indicated commuter and shopper parking as the main issue. The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
BOWEN ROAD 608	Fail to understand the need for a parking zone for Whitmore Road, which has plenty of off road parking & space particularly by the cricket pitches.	Requested by residents at the time of their consultation in September 2010 due to excessive parking in area due to school redevelopment
BOWEN ROAD 704	The parking in this area meets everybody's needs and needs no further restrictions.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
BOWEN ROAD 704, 804, 826	I strongly object to any further restrictions in the west harrow area. It is not necessary and I feel it is just a way for the council to make extra revenue.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
BOWEN ROAD 964	Claims consultation is confusing and misleading. If "I agree with the proposals developed for my section of road or area" By the answer above (YES) I mean that I DO NOT want CPZ in Bowen Road.	The consultation documents are as concise as possible and no assistance was requested by the resident in seeking clarification.
BOWEN ROAD 804	The council never do anything to alleviate the traffic problems they simply push them down the road moving the problem in the same direction	The council does try to keep the highway network operational for all road users although it is accepted that some residents may disagree. However, parking controls are very effective at reducing congestion caused by obstructive vehicles and making roads accessible to traffic.
BOWEN ROAD 306, 965	Commuters will park in roads like mine. Make everywhere controlled and give all residents a permit which has to be displayed	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
BOWEN ROAD 607	Didn't include any consultation on the length of the DYL.	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered.
BOWEN ROAD 874	Previous overnight parking survey results inaccurate and mis-leading. This misrepresentation of the true situation did not allow residents to make an informed decision	The overnight parking space survey was conducted and the councillors and the WHRG were given these numbers to verify.
BUTLER AVENUE 896	I still cannot understand why the council is not including the whole of Butler Avenue in the revision to the CPZ.	Not all residents agree with this statement and was not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support for CPZ in end of road
BUTLER AVENUE 180, 307, 611	It will not work, but will merely push parking problems from one street to another.	Displaced parking can be an issue. Residents have to decide if this is a factor to consider and complete their responses appropriately.
BUTLER AVENUE 178, 828, 845, 855, 864, 865, 866, 897, 1000	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
BUTLER AVENUE 828	Opposed to the extension of all CPZ W without exception. There is no requirement on any public safety or improvement grounds or any other reasons to extend the CPZ W	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
BUTLER AVENUE 182	Happy with status quo	No response required
BUTLER AVENUE 864	Object to the CPZ plans because they reduce the total number of parking spaces wherever they are introduced.	CPZ parking areas are designed to allow parking where it is safe to do so and does not reduce emergency vehicle access. Out of hours single yellow lines allow residents to park in these areas overnight and at weekends if no other restrictions in place. Double yellow lines 'remove' parking following the well established rules of the Highway Code that forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles.
BUTLER AVENUE 864	Object to the proposal to allow CPZ residents to make use of the metered parking on the unnamed road that links Butler Ave/Rd with Vaughan Road Concerned that the metered spaces are more likely to be filled by CPZ users despite their ample parking options, and that this will leave me unable to park anywhere near my own home	The P&D bays are available to all outside of the restriction times. If CPZ permit holders use these bays this may free up other areas not within the CPZ for those other residents who do not have permits.
BUTLER AVENUE 864	Many of the new buildings nearby are being granted planning permission with significantly less than one parking space per dwelling and this can only add to the pressure on the limited road space available	The number of parking spaces for developments are controlled by national guidelines. The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
BUTLER AVENUE 1000	If this current strategy persists, Harrow Council will have fulfilled it's determined agenda to impose a CPZ on the entirety of West Harrow by stealth, when at the outset of the process by far the majority of West Harrow residents were firmly opposed to having a CPZ.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
BUTLER ROAD 178, 956	I would like you to extend CPZ on Butler Rd. The commuters take away all the parking for the day and we have no parking at ALL.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
BUTLER ROAD 812	I cannot see any justification for leaving our section of Butler Road - the closest to central Harrow - out of CPZ when the benefits of CPZs are being extended to so much of the adjacent area.	Not all residents agree with this statement and was not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support for CPZ in this section of road.
BUTLER ROAD 888	I have not had a strong opinion regarding the parking controls to date, other than I feel they should be funded from our Council Tax and not seen as an additional revenue stream for the council.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
BUTLER ROAD 888	Due to the vastly extended double yellow lines imposed when originally brought in, and the extension of parking controls elsewhere, we already do not have sufficient parking for those who live here, therefore increasing the pressure on this short section of road will hinder the lives of the people living on this street, greatly effecting our quality of life	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered. The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
BUTLER ROAD 036, 185, 886	The extension of parking controls is almost certain to have a-knock on effect as cars displaced by the CPZ seek other places to park Want to be in CPZ	Displaced parking can be an issue. Residents have to decide if this is a factor to consider and complete their responses appropriately.
BUTLER ROAD 834, 886	Parking controls do not make parking any easier for residents in evening	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
BUTLER ROAD 038, 184, 664, 665, 858, 951, 963, 968, 988	Wants to keep CPZ for safety and to deter commuters	Consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support to remove the CPZ from this area and a scheme was developed following this. It would have been beneficial if more residents of the area responded to the previous consultation
BUTLER ROAD 834	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
BUTLER ROAD 971	Please re-consult Butler Road residents (where Butler Road joins Butler Avenue), as to whether they wish to be included in CPZ V Re: Pay & Display bays in unnamed link road between Vaughan Road and Butler Avenue – wants available to all.	Not all residents agree with this statement and was not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support for this from residents outside of a CPZ.
BUTLER ROAD 308, 962	Too many people use Butler Road to commute from West Harrow tube without caring for people who live in this street.	One reason for proposing CPZ in West Harrow but results show no support for CPZ in most of Butler Road
BUTLER ROAD 036	It' a parking Tax.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
BUTLER ROAD 036	Stop wasting money on all these consultations. Scrap the lot of it.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
BUTLER ROAD 036	CPZ leads people requiring care with difficulties and expenses when visiting, it kills the sense of community.	Heath visitor permits are available. Not all road included. Free spaces in other roads nearby or park car park
BUTLER ROAD 037	Unnamed link road between Vaughan Rd and Butler Ave-should be resident permit holders too	Part of the statutory consultation to proceed
BUTLER ROAD 183	Where do my family park if and when the CPZ is in force.	Not all road included. Free spaces in other roads nearby or park car park
BUTLER ROAD 956	Low response rate to consultation in July 2011, low by any standard for democratic consultations	The council cannot force people to complete the questionnaire. Officers take a consistent approach to recommend what the majority of those that chose to respond wish regardless of the response rate or the outcome
BUTLER ROAD 036, 956	Develop a parking area near to the West Harrow station	The council does not have the budgets for that sort of endeavour
CHARLES CRESCENT 312	There is not a problem of double parking or any safety issue. It would be a waste of tax payers money.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
CHARLES CRESCENT 311, 312	Providing more parking areas for residents and visitors would be more useful rather than this continuous attack on motorists and would help local businesses to run better i.e. window cleaners, gardeners, builders etc.	There is approximately 120 private car parking and garage spaces in Charles Crescent area that residents and tradesmen can use. The majority of land in the area are under control of others and not the council highway authority.
CHARLES CRESCENT 311, 947	Happy CPZ be introduced in my road as parking has become a complete trial over the last couple of years. Concerned the introduction of double yellow lines on the corners and not enough space for all residents.	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
CHARLES CRESCENT 187	Residents, visitors parking only.	That is what a CPZ is but other parts of the road need to be controlled with single or double yellow lines
COLBECK ROAD 042	By increasing CPZ you will simply push the problem into other roads in the area	Displaced parking can be an issue. Residents have to decide if this is a factor to consider and complete their responses appropriately.
COLBECK ROAD 009	CPZs should be fully monitored by wardens and double yellow lines extended along side roads	CPZ regularly patrolled to seek compliance.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
COLBECK ROAD 009	Passing places in The Gardens	Not considered as part of statutory consultation but noted
COLBECK ROAD 612	I object to the extension of the CPZ to Drury Road as far as Sumner Road and including Heath Road and Colbeck Road. Existing CPZ has already increased parking in Colbeck Road, so that patients to the surgery sometimes very ill, either alone or accompanied, are preventing from parking close to the surgery, this being necessary.	CPZ not proposed for Colbeck Rd.  Short term emergency parking could be accommodated in church car park
DORCHESTER AVENUE 011	Our road some houses got 4 or 5 car & van and parking on the drive way and part of car & van on the street or pavement. The children walking & cycles using the payment is danger. Please do something	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
DORCHESTER AVENUE 043, 313	Displaced parking from Sandhurst Avenue CPZ	CPZ in Sandhurst Avenue not being progressed
DORCHESTER AVENUE 045	Historically in our street cars have only parked on one side extension of the CPZ there is a danger that cars may start parking on both sides.	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
DORCHESTER AVENUE 188	Low response – no point in making Sandhurst Ave. part of the CPZ and not the other 3 avenues surrounding it.	Not all residents agree with this statement and was not considered as part of Statutory Consultation as previous consultation indicated there was no support from residents in other roads. Sandhurst Avenue not being progressed
DRURY ROAD 315, 667, 670, 730, 744	I do not want permit parking in any way or form outside residential homes as no parking problem	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
DRURY ROAD 052, 318, 319, 320, 613, 614, 616, 667, 670, 744, 952, 970	CPZ is a fully fledged money making scheme for the council Permit should be free The payment of a parking permit does not guarantee a space	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
DRURY ROAD 738	Profanity laden rant in capitals by resident and also included the standard objection paragraphs in normal text	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
DRURY ROAD 319, 320, 616, 701, 744, 758, 860, 895, 952	Concerned about displaced parking outside area	The boundary was drawn in consultation with the ward councillors based on responses for road and majority support shown above Sumner Rd.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
DRURY ROAD 051, 316, 613, 756	CPZ as proposed on Drury Rd will displace cars to the non CPZ parts of Drury Road. Residents will find it harder to finding parking in front of their houses. CPZ should be all of Drury Road or none	The boundary was drawn in consultation with the ward councillors based on responses for road and majority support shown above Sumner Rd. As with all public highway there is no right or guarantee that any resident or business will be able to park in front of their own property
DRURY ROAD 319, 758	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
DRURY ROAD 320, 758	No need to introduce it into the Whitmore Road and Treve Avenue- very few cars parked there or have drives	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area.
DRURY ROAD 194	We thought it would be the end of matter when parking restrictions and yellow lines were introduced for the first time in West harrow	The councils policy was to review any CPZ scheme 6 – 12 months after installation and the consultation in July 2011 was the start of that process that this scheme was developed from.
DRURY ROAD 321	CPZ will significantly reduce the number of commuters using West Harrow tube station. Creating a real risk that this station may be closed by TFL in the future.	Unsubstantiated claim and commuter parking is highlighted by some as a major concern
DRURY ROAD 047	Commuter parking causes major inconvenience to residents. No other tube stations in the area have unrestricted parking so close to the station	Hence proposals that were supported in some sections of Drury Road
FARMBOROUGH CLOSE 269, 322	There should be a no parking at the junctions	The proposed double yellow lines will cover these
FARMBOROUGH CLOSE 323	Yellow lines are needed in Farmborough Close to prevent commuters & outsiders parking once the parking restrictions are in place.	The proposals cover this
FARMBOROUGH CLOSE 269	Make grass verges parking areas	The council does not have the budgets for that sort of endeavour
FERRING CLOSE 059, 619, 890	We do not have parking problems in this small close.	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area. Ferring Close not being progressed
FERRING CLOSE 618, 620	More money grabbing ideas from Council, another Tax	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
FERRING CLOSE 057	Excessive parking in the road could be resolved by increasing parking spaces at Whitmore School, as this is the primary cause of excessive parking.	School has provided some on site parking
FERRING CLOSE 056	Why need to have the scheme on Sat and Sun. This will affect visitors to residents and create yet another expense to already tight family budget.	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area. Ferring Close not being progressed
FORD CLOSE 325	If you go ahead with the proposals you will force the commuters into Ford Close. We have very little parking as it is and this will cause upset with the residents. At least include FORD CLOSE in you plans.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was no support for installing a CPZ in road
FORD CLOSE 013	No comments	No response required
GROSVENOR AVENUE 063, 064, 066, 705, 823, 945	I object to the introduction of a CPZ in Sandhurst Avenue Displaced parking Low response rate	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ in Sandhurst Avenue as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road. Residents in other roads nearby indicated they did not want any parking controls in their road and therefore none were proposed.
GROSVENOR AVENUE 326	These area has more split maisonette properties and all properties don't have driveways to park. Bringing such control increase the pressure on residents to park in unsafe or distance area.	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
GROSVENOR AVENUE 852	I would also advise you that filling in your questionnaire with a "No" should be also regarded as a formal objection - why require the public to write in separately to log it as a formal objection?	By legislation formal objects to a Statutory Consultation must be submitted in writing and must contain the wording 'object' or 'objection'
GROSVENOR AVENUE 852	Why do you persist in returning to this subject? You know from previous input that parking controls and other restrictions are rejected by a democratic mass majority	The councils policy was to review any CPZ scheme 6 – 12 months after installation and the consultation in July 2011 was the start of that process that this scheme was developed from. Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
GROSVENOR AVENUE 852	You have not explained through any independent research why you are imposing the double yellow lines - you have previously placed these in areas where for many years there have been no accidents.	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered. Double yellow lines remove parking following the well established rules of the Highway Code that forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles regardless of collisions
HAWKINS CLOSE 327	Do not reduce the parking places to both residents and visitors.	Nothing proposed for Hawkings Close



## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
HAWKINS CLOSE 975	These changes are going to create a lot more of parking problems than there are nowadays.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was no support for installing a CPZ in road.
HEATH ROAD 624, 806, 863, 878	Additional cost is most unwelcome. Revenue generator	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
HEATH ROAD 806	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
HEATH ROAD 624, 806, 863, 878	No reason for the council to have included Heath Road in this proposal.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road.
HEATH ROAD 328, 806, 863	Parking more problem in evenings	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
HEATH ROAD 806	The lengths of double yellow lines should be reassessed and measured, as they seem far longer than is necessary on grounds of safety.	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered. Double yellow lines remove parking following the well established rules of the Highway Code that forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles. These can be altered for site specific conditions
HEATH ROAD 070	New double yellow lines highlighted as new on Heath Road are unnecessary as they are at entrance to driveways and are used by those householders to park their cars.	All road space within a CPZ has to be controlled. Parking across drives is not a way of reserving a parking space and is difficult for parking wardens to determine if owned by property owner or someone that should not be there. There may not be the need to park across drives if commuter parking removed.
HEATH ROAD 967	The CPZ needs to be extended/widened as the problem with displaced parking from the current scheme is significant.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
HEATH ROAD 767	Low response and does not consider it a majority	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road. The council cannot force residents to respond if they do not for whatever reason.
HEATH ROAD 767	Should be bigger penalties for those households with more than one vehicle	There is a scale of charges for resident parking permits and it does increase as the number of permits per household rise. The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
LANCE ROAD 073	Concerned about displaced parking	Displaced parking can be an issue. Residents have to decide if this is a factor to consider and complete their responses appropriately.
LANCE ROAD 625, 961, 996	I believe the proposals to be more about finance than safety. Do not want to pay for parking in my road	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
LANCE ROAD 625, 985	I totally object to your proposals. We have no parking problems in our area apart from the ones you have created by bringing in a controlled zone near West Harrow Station.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
LASCELLES AVENUE 074	Wants yellow lines extended at entrance into Charles	Engineer feels there is no need to extend dyl on this side as new dyl are to be installed on other side of road from existing DYL at junction to around first bend in road
LASCELLES AVENUE 949	i agree with the control parking zones but would like to request some disabled parking space in Lascelles Avenue.	Usually a CPZ will remove significant parking enabling residents better parking availability. The council usually wait for a period after installation of a CPZ before considering a disabled bay. Application pack has been sent to resident as standard practice.
LASCELLES AVENUE 075, 368	I do hope this go through, parking is not getting any better.	No response required
LASCELLES AVENUE 075	Yet another stealth tax.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
MARSHALL CLOSE 626	I do not have a car so its immaterial to me.	No response required

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
MERIVALE ROAD 336	We welcome any scheme which should make crossing roads easier. However surprised whole of Drury Road is not included	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road.
MERIVALE ROAD 010, 014	Why are you intent on making money out of the CPZ	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
MERIVALE ROAD 015	No justifications or statistical evidence is given to support the recommendations of the TARSAP panel.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road.
MERIVALE ROAD 016	The enclosed map was very hard to read	Noted. It can be difficult to include the information we need to while still keeping the leaflets to a sensible size
MERIVALE ROAD 854	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
MERIVALE ROAD 854	We have no off street parking and we are already struggling to find car parking spaces.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was no support for installing a CPZ in this road.
MERIVALE ROAD 099	Concerned about displaced parking	Displaced parking can be an issue. Residents have to decide if this is a factor to consider and complete their responses appropriately.
MERIVALE ROAD 097	I strongly object to the CPZ and yet another extension of it.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
MERIVALE ROAD 098	Yellow lines obstruct comers - making parking difficult.	Double yellow lines remove parking following the well established rules of the Highway Code that forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles.
MERTON ROAD 089	Has any thought been given to how this will be enforced?	CPZ regularly patrolled to seek compliance.
MERTON ROAD 1002	I am a little confused by the timings you have chosen for the CPZ on Merton Road	Timings can from responses from residents about when the parking by non residents was a problem

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
MERTON ROAD 992	The charges are unfair and effectively are financially punishing local residents. Any charges should be levied against users other than residents of the associated roads.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
MERTON ROAD 087, 957	I do not want this parking restriction to be enforced in the road I live.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road.
MERTON ROAD 941	A sensible and modest improvement for safer parking on Merton Road	No response required
MERTON ROAD 083	The Whitmore school end of Merton Road is hazardous in the morning with cars erratically parked on the corner dropping children off. This needs to be absolutely NO PARKING.	Proposals include restriction along Porlock Avenue to address these concerns
MERTON ROAD 084	Good Ideas - Long overdue but thanks at last	No response required
MERTON ROAD 085	I am hoping that the parking restrictions, when they come into force, will decrease the litter	In areas where a CPZ is introduced it can provide better availability for street cleaning
MERTON ROAD 088	I feel the proposals are extremely unnecessary.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
MERTON ROAD 198	Would it be possible to have financial help to drop the kerb outside	The council cannot offer this type of assistance.
MERTON ROAD	Worry of the costs to residents of permits.	The councillor set the permit charges and is applied across the borough. Harrow are still one of the cheapest resident permit boroughs in greater London.
MERTON ROAD 094	The exit from Merton Rd. to Shaftesbury Ave. is in my opinion quite dangerous as because of parked cars on the inset cars park on Shaftesbury Ave. its not possible to see on coming traffic.	This is outside the remit of this consultation. It will be forward to the road safety team for their consideration.
PINNER VIEW 711	Objects to proposed parking controls in Charles Crescent and Pool Road because of limited parking in road and requirement for carer to some	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.  Health care workers can apply for borough wide permits
POOL ROAD 104	I would like to know if I can apply for a visitor permit. And from where I need to apply.	Details provided and will be sent to all resident and businesses in area once scheme progresses
PORLOCK AVENUE 857	Concerned free parking bay may cause accidents and cause congestion	Location of bay on site will be determined by site conditions and road width
PORLOCK AVENUE 102	I do not require a residents parking bay outside my property. I have a garage and there is ample parking on the drive and paved area of my front garden.	No permit bays proposed for Porlock Avenue

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
SANDHURST AVENUE 105, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 627, 628, 848	No parking problems and proposal unnecessary	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents that responded considered there was a problem with the amount of non resident parking occurring in their road. Sandhurst Avenue is not being progressed due to responses now received, it would have been beneficial for all concerned if more residents of the road had responded to the previous consultation in July 2011
SANDHURST AVENUE 105, 339, 340, 342, 345, 627, 848	We pay enough money as it is through council and government taxes, next we will be paying to park our cars.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ Sandhurst Avenue is not being progressed, it would have been beneficial for all concerned if more residents of the road had responded to the previous consultation in July 2011
SANDHURST AVENUE 106	The proposed CPZ will benefit us greatly by increasing the prospects of being able to park close to our house.	Sandhurst Avenue is not being progressed due to responses now received, it would have been beneficial for all concerned if more residents of the road had responded to the previous consultation in July 2011
SHAFTESBURY AVENUE 902	email received requesting info on whether their road will be included in the new cpz -	Spoke with resident to advise that there were no plans at this stage to include Shaftesbury Ave - suggested they return consultation response even being out of area - no further communication received from resident
SHAFTESBURY AVENUE 1008	The proposals do not stipulate if the controlled zones will be implemented in pans or in the whole of Merton Road	CPZ proposal plans clearly show CPZ area for whole of road.  Resident was confusing this consultation with a previous consultation for a safety scheme along Shaftesbury Ave which had no bearing on the CPZ proposals
SHAFTESBURY AVENUE 972	Having a CPZ on Whitmore Road between Shaftesbury Avenue and Treve Anevue is not required in my opinion.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
SPRINGWAY 111	Displaced parking from other CPZ	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that residents is these roads still did not want to be in a CPZ and therefore none are proposed
SUMNER ROAD 953	Already have commuters parking here. If the parking restriction are extended this will make it even more difficult for residents and the community.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The consultation conducted in July 2011 indicated that residents is these roads still did not want to be in a CPZ and therefore none are proposed

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
SUMNER ROAD 893	Most cars are parked in this area at night when everyone is at home. A CPZ extension will not change this.	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
SUMNER ROAD 893	The form needs to be read very carefully to notice that it is necessary to write in formally with objections. Many people may just tick "NO"	By legislation formal objects to a Statutory Consultation must be submitted in writing and must contain the wording 'object' or 'objection'
SUMNER ROAD 893	I suspect that the motivation to extend the CPZ is financially driven	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
SUMNER ROAD 893	Many people in this area do not have English as their language. Your leaflet includes the standard invitation to ask for translations in their own Language, but don't realise importance of completing form	Language translation is available but not practical or cost effective to include this for the rest of the document and which languages would be chosen?
SUMNER ROAD 892	Objected at both consultations, but the officious officials just ignored the majority who objected to this CPZ.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The areas that showed a majority of support from those that responded were progressed. Sumner Road has always showed a majority against any CPZ so they have not been included in any proposals for such
SUMNER ROAD 346	The reason Labour won overall majority at the last council election, was because the last conservative would not listen to the large majority of us.	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The areas that showed a majority of support from those that responded were progressed.
SUMNER ROAD 703	In the West Harrow Parking Review of 2011, the majority of residents not already in the CPZ in Bouverie Road and Vaughan Road voted against having the CPZ. Why, then, has it been extended in these areas?	The council was taking a consistent approach to the proposals. The areas that showed a majority of support from those that responded were progressed.
SUMNER ROAD 703	The only reason I can see for the scheme is for the council to raise revenue	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
SUMNER ROAD 703	Despite the comments about double yellow lines on the leaflet, there are still areas in West Harrow where the double yellow lines could be reduced slightly without causing problems to the Emergency services or refuse collectors.	Following the fire service test and TARSAP report there was no plan for consulting on the DYL although some short sections are being altered. Double yellow lines remove parking following the well established rules of the Highway Code that forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles.
SUMNER ROAD 107	This part of West Harrow seems to have far too many cars all contribute to the difficulties experienced in a mainly Edwardian development with short front gardens and small narrow roads.	The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
THE GARDENS 889	It is an excellent plan to introduce an additional afternoon Monday to Friday between 2-3 p.m. in the CPZ W as this would deter a local business for using the existing Resident Parking places as soon as the clock strikes 11 a.m.	Low response to this portion of the statutory consultation but majority object to the additional afternoon hour and is recommended that this not progress
THE GARDENS 367	We are very glad to see that the council recognises the need of the residents and sent through this consultation.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
THE GARDENS 965	I agree with the proposals as far as they go but would ideally like to see the hours extended to include Saturday	Does not form part of this consultation which was based on responses received during the consultation in July 2011
THE GARDENS 110, 622	I only object to the 2 - 3 pm restriction	Low response to this portion of the statutory consultation but majority object to the additional afternoon hour and is recommended that this not progress
THE GARDENS 109	Vaughan School is to be extended therefore the immediate area needs all the help available in the way of parking controls.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
TREVE AVENUE 113	I welcome a CPZ for Treve Avenue, but a clear road means traffic tends to speed up, therefore a pedestrian crossing or traffic island would be helpful for the old folk in Treve Ave.	Not part of the remit for this consultation. Has been forwarded to the road safety team for their consideration
TREVE AVENUE 349, 882	Permit bays in Treve Avenue will cause accidents as have been witnessed over the years in road.	Personal injury collisions are reported to the council by the Police.  Location of parking bays will be adjusted on site when detailed design is drawn up to ensure the necessary clearances and sightlines are maintained.
TREVE AVENUE 932	Wants short term parking on north side of Whitmore Road opposite park	CPZ parking was to be on park (south) side of road to reduce street clutter because of signing regulations and the number of driveway on the north side. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
TREVE AVENUE 955	There is rarely any issue with parking causing serious obstruction or increased risk on Treve Avenue. Another attempt to introduce measures aimed at income generation.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
TREVE AVENUE 859	Proposed single yellow line - any day 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. is unreasonable and excessively detracts from the amenity that residents of the area have enjoyed hereto.	As with all public highway there is no right or guarantee that any resident or business will be able to park in front of their own property The 7-7 restriction has been proposed to assist the 24hour bus route that uses Treve Ave and Lascelles Ave
TREVE AVENUE 859	The free parking bay on Whitmore Road. This free parking bay should be extended to run from Capers Mead to No. 71 Whitmore Road. This will provide an amenity to the residents of the area without inconveniencing any residents.	The parking bays have been proposed to provide a mixture of solutions for the various requirements in this area of few properties. It is also de[pendant on the Whitmore area CPZ going ahead.
VAUGHAN ROAD 120	Period should be extended to 6.00pm in the evening.	Not all residents agree with this statement and not part of this consultation which was based on previous consultation in July 2011
VAUGHAN ROAD 881	Concerned displaced parking into private area	Enforcement of these private areas is outside of the control of the highway authority

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
VAUGHAN ROAD 722, 809	Standard objection paragraphs used	This response contains some of the text objecting to the proposals that was circulated in the area by persons unknown, claiming the residents were not given all the information particularly concerning the Whitmore area consultations. The West Harrow Residents' Group (WHRG) was aware that other consultations had taken place as it was made clear to them that the council was waiting for them to review the initial West Harrow consultation results and that then both consultations would be conducted at the same time.
VAUGHAN ROAD 809	The proposed pay and display parking on Vaughan Road, which will worsen parking congestion	The pay and display bays were proposed to provide some short term parking near the shops which operate during the day and currently seem to be occupied by long term parkers. These are available to any resident to park in the evening.
VAUGHAN ROAD 809	The proposed extension of Zone W parking controls to the rest of Vaughan Road, which will have no positive impact on the parking situation in the area	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
VAUGHAN ROAD 121, 139, 771, 809, 894	Will be an added cost to residents	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
VAUGHAN ROAD 122, 771	The main problem on our stretch of road is parking in the evening. There are too many flat conversions without parking facilities allowed by the Council	The number of parking spaces for developments are controlled by national guidelines. The council cannot control the number of vehicle residents choose to own or choose to park on the public highway regardless of the number of properties in a road.
VAUGHAN ROAD 771, 894, 935, 940, 1005	The situation has also been made worse by the elongated double yellow lines on every corner, which has reduced the number of parking spaces available. Should be reassessed	Following the Fire Service test, that was organised by the WHRG, the Police and Fire Service both submitted written responses to the effect that the yellow lines in the majority of locations tested could not be removed so for constancy they recommended that the situation remain unchanged and this was reported to TARSAP. Representatives of the WHRG were present during the test. The well established rules of the Highway Code forbids parking within 10 metres of junctions, narrowings or where likely to cause obstruction for emergency vehicles. These are the areas the WHRG claim the council have removed the residents parking from.
VAUGHAN ROAD 354, 884, 973, 977, 978, 980, 1003	Business will suffer	The pay and display bays were proposed to provide some short term parking near the shops which operate during the day and currently seem to be occupied by long term parkers. These are available to any resident to park in the evening
VAUGHAN ROAD 354	An additional control period of 2pm - 3pm is pointless it should be in the evening.	Low response to this portion of the statutory consultation but majority object to the additional afternoon hour and is recommended that this not progress



## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
VAUGHAN ROAD 117	We are within the existing West Harrow CPZ and as far as I can see, there is no proposed change at our location. For this reason I have selected the "NO OPINION" box as it would be unfair to select a Yes or No when it relates to people effected elsewhere.	No response required
VAUGHAN ROAD 942	Neighbour in consistently parks encroaching space directly adjacent to our property effectively taking up 2 spaces. If your parking proposals would help to solve this then we're for it. Otherwise whether these proposals go forward or not is not so important for us. Thank you for providing this consultation facility.	No response required
VAUGHAN ROAD 884, 894	The Village is against the whole concept of the CPZ and the overbearing use of double yellow lines	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
VAUGHAN ROAD 114	Vaughan Road from Bessborough Road to Butler Road is very narrow . It is meant to be a one way street but this is often ignored. There should be more signs to indicate it is a ONE WAY ROAD.	Has point No Entry which does not make it one way. Motorists can travel either way along road as long as they have not entered off Bessborough Road
VAUGHAN ROAD 126	There is an urgent need to extend the control period in CPZ W to include 2pm - 3pm to discourage part time workers & shoppers who park here to travel into central London.	Low response to this portion of the statutory consultation but majority object to the additional afternoon hour and is recommended that this not progress
VAUGHAN ROAD 138, 143	It was a great pity that the original plan for the West Harrow CPZ was not implemented in it's entirety when the scheme was introduced. It would certainly have saved the council money and meant that all residents in area would have benefitted from CPZ.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
VAUGHAN ROAD 1003	Since the CPZ was implemented crime has risen as have the number of traffic accidents locally, which is the opposite of what we were told would happen	It is difficult to link crime, and what sort of crime with the introduction of a CPZ. Claim that traffic accidents have increased locally can be verified by the statistics that are provided to the council from the Police detailing the number of Reported Personal Injury Collisions (PIC). In the previous three years prior to the introduction of the CPZ there were 9 PIC. Since the introduction of the CPZ to the end of Dec 2011, the last date we have data available, there has been 3 PIC.
VAUGHAN ROAD 981	Formal Objection	No reasons given so no response required
VAUGHAN ROAD 1001	Introduce a free parking for 30 Mins Loading Bay for loading & unloading 8-00am - 6-30pm Extend parking restriction whole of Vaughan Road 10-11am and 2-3pm	Free parking is outside the remit of this consultation as it is a corporate policy decision
VAUGHAN ROAD 020	Very impressed with existing CPZ. New proposals developed sooner the better	No response required
VAUGHAN ROAD 1004	Will affect deliveries to vulnerable people	Unfortunately there will be some people inconvenienced by the introduction of any parking restriction. As residents of the area the parents would be able to purchase visitor permits at a reduced costs for those that visit them during the proposed control times. Outside of the control times anyone can park in the road without any permits. No extension of CPZ proposed for uncontrolled section of Vaughan Road

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
WHITMORE ROAD 631, 877, 879, 880, 991	Would like the double yellow lines at Bessborough / Whitmore Rd. junction to be extended as it is a dangerous corner.	This can be accommodated at time of implementation
WHITMORE ROAD 631	Number of free parking bays to be decreased and replaced with permit parking bays	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 631	Permit parking bays times to be designated between 10-11 am and 2-3pm	Not considered as part of the statutory consultation due to previous responses to September 2010 consultation. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 268	This road is one of the very few roads available for day-long parking for commuters, and the proposed extension of the CPZ denies them anywhere to park in this part of Harrow.	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 022, 023, 155, 157, 160, 163, 166, 358, 632, 666, 673, 707, 710, 815, 843, 870, 891, 1007	Whitmore Road has no problem with parking on the road / No problem since school construction finished.	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 632, 877, 879, 880, 991	Shorten the double yellow lines outside at junction of Whitmore / Porlock Avenue	This can be accommodated at time of implementation
WHITMORE ROAD 999	Wants to be in Whitmore CPZ not Bessborough CPZ	Whitmore Road CPZ and Bessborough Road not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 943	Wants CPZ on both side of Whitmore Road adjacent to park	Consultation conducted in September 2010 indicated that there was support for installing a CPZ as the residents considered there was a problem with the amount of commuter and construction parking in the area. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 363	Please put double yellow line near Shaftesbury Avenue.	Double yellow lines have been installed as part of the mini roundabout works. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses so no other double yellow lines proposed at this location.
WHITMORE ROAD 022, 155	I do not want to be forced to pay money in the form of resident parking in order to park my car on the road which I reside.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
WHITMORE ROAD 853, 944	Extend double yellow lines Whitmore Rd at Treve Avenue	This can be considered at time of implementation
WHITMORE ROAD 700, 838	Response requesting clarification of scheme	Contacted resident by phone to discuss - no further correspondence received after this
WHITMORE ROAD 165	I fail to see why my part, and perhaps any part, of Whitmore Road needs yellow lines. Parking is not an issue, certainly at this end of the street and only at the midpoint area during the morning rush hour. This smacks of "change for change's sake". Where do I find out why you are doing this? Also submitted separate email response Could somebody there please explain to me the reasoning behind the idea of putting of yellow lines on the high-numbered end of Whitmore Road, albeit for only one hour. It is presumably to stop all-day parking but, as I write on Wednesday at 10.15, there are only about twelve vehicles parked on this entire 400 metre section. I repeat, why do we need yellow lines here?	The consultation material provided a clear and concise explanation for the scheme objectives.
WHITMORE ROAD 164, 870, 873	Speed checks, traffic calming	Forwarded to road safety team for their consideration
WHITMORE ROAD 156	Concerned free parking bay may cause accidents and cause congestion	Location of bay on site will be determined by site conditions and road width
WHITMORE ROAD 146, 150	I hope this will make the road safer for motorists, cyclists and emergency response vehicles by reducing parking by those who are currently using Whitmore Road for free all day parking and then walking to nearby public transport.	Agreed but not all residents agree with proposals hence Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 805, 873	Does not want cars parked outside house in bays	CPZ parking areas are designed to allow parking where it is safe to do so and does not reduce emergency vehicle access. Out of hours single yellow lines allow residents to park in these areas overnight and at weekends if no restrictions in place. Parking bays need to be provided and unfortunately they have to go outside someones house. The parking bays are to be positioned on the road and no grass verge will be taken. The grass verge forms part of the public highway and no resident has a claim of ownership of such. Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WHITMORE ROAD 861	Glad getting rid of all day parking but still wants to park outside own house	Whitmore Road CPZ is not being progressed due to statutory consultation responses.
WILSON GARDENS 167	Total waste of rate payers money. No extra restriction one required. This is a money grabbing exercise.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
WILSON GARDENS 669	Objects to CPZ and objects to removal of CPZ in Butler Road	Objects to proposals but does not submit any reasons to back up objection. Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.

## APPENDIX C

### Summary of comments submitted

Road (Consultation response ref no.)	Comments	Engineer Response
WILSON GARDENS 366, 936, 984	The extension of the scheme to include the hour in the afternoon makes no sense.	Representation was received after the July 2011 consultation requesting an additional hour restriction in part of CPZ W. It is not possible to have split restriction zones within the one CPZ. This was reported to TARSAP and it was decided to consult on this as part of the Statutory Consultation process. Additional afternoon hour not being progressed
WILSON GARDENS 856	Does not support any expansion of the current CPZ It is simply another revenue stream for the council.	All CPZ, by national legislation, must be self financing and must cover all costs from initial conception to implementation, enforcement and maintenance. It should not come out of general council tax funds as residents in other parts of the borough should not have to pay for the amenity of some residents who request or live in a CPZ
WOOD CLOSE 173	I don't mind double lines on Lascelles Ave. but I am very much against in Honeybun Estate. It is bad in Harrow if family comes to visit.	Not all residents agree with this statement as borne out by previous requests from local residents for the initial and the expansion of the CPZ.
ROXBOROUGH PARK 1124	Request that you reconsider the proposed arrangements. This is an area where the parents of St. Anselm's Primary School currently park legally, to drop off and pick up their children.	Considered and along with other responses from statutory consultation Whitmore Road CPZ and Bessborough Road CPZ are not being progressed
HIGH STREET 1125	There is currently adequate parking on the roads and the schemes proposed are simply unnecessary.	Considered and along with other responses from statutory consultation Whitmore Road CPZ and Bessborough Road CPZ are not being progressed
OUT OF BOROUGH 1052, 1053, 1054	Employees from local business complex objecting to loss of employee parking nearby if Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ went ahead.	Business already located within existing CPZ. Bessborough Road and Whitmore Road CPZ not progressing.
OUT OF BOROUGH 1051	Displaced parking into road that they visit to help disabled friend	Road not currently in CPZ or extension so their current situation will remain unchanged.