

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>MEETING</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">CHIPPING BARNET AREA COMMITTEE</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>DATE AND TIME</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">WEDNESDAY 23RD JANUARY, 2019</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AT 7.00 PM</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>VENUE</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">HENDON TOWN HALL. NW4 4BG</p>		

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	RASPER ROAD CONSULTATION – PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED	3 - 6

jan.natynczyk@barnet.gov.uk Tel: 0208 359 5129
GovernanceTeam@Barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

<p>Rasper Road Consultation</p>	<p>A written statement has been received as follows from Marcus Plows:</p> <p>I write regarding the chipping Barnet area committee due to meet on 23 January 2019, specifically item 10 the Rasper road consultation, in your capacity as a Totteridge Ward Councillor, and Vice Chairman of the committee. I am unable to attend the meeting but would like to raise my views on the consultation results. After reviewing the consultation, and my own personal experience living in Sherwood Street, the most predominant theme is the presence of multiple cars per household. The houses in all 4 of the effected roads are thin terraced houses which are roughly the width of one small family car (and much narrower than some of the SUV's owned), therefore there is roughly 1 parking space per house. The number of spaces per household would in fact be lower due to several houses having driveways with dropped curbs, reducing the on-road parking availability. Additionally, Rasper road includes several flats which means 2 households share the width and on street parking as one regular house.</p> <p>The consultation revealed the need for an average 1.2 permits per household in streets where the only parking available is in directly front of these houses. Although the Audi dealership and schools do impact the parking situation during the day, the Audi dealership locks all their cars in their secure forecourt during the night and the school traffic is limited to the school runs. Despite this, the parking situation is often worst in the late evening/night when everyone is home due to multiple car ownership. I therefore feel the Audi dealership and school run are incorrectly</p>
---------------------------------	---

	<p>being highlighted as the more visually obvious offenders rather than residents admitting they are the root cause of the issue.</p> <p>In relation to Sherwood Terrace, the residents which responded they are parking on the opposite side of the street are in fact parking across the pavement, blocking rear garden access for Sherwood Street and essentially parked illegally and blocking refuse collection on a weekly basis. This road is often overlooked by parking officers due to a somewhat hidden entrance, and they have been able to get away with this parking as a result, but their mistaken view should not be factored into any decisions made.</p> <p>With the consultation indicating a need for at least 20% more permits than houses, a CPZ under the current second car pricing strategy will do little to discourage second car ownership which is the core issue to parking in the area and I feel this is a thoroughly overlooked factor in peoples request for a CPZ. Although some people do require cars for work/disabilities, second car ownership is too often a luxury choice in an area so close to buses and the tube.</p> <p>I would request the potential for a materially stronger financial deterrent against second (or even third) car ownership in such a densely populated area be explored. If the cost of second car ownership is adequately increased to ensure the luxury of multiple cars is discouraged which would drastically improve the parking for residents. I feel this is this only correct measure to improve parking in the area and to otherwise implement a CPZ would be to the detriment to the average resident to blindly appease a vocal few.</p> <p>I hope for my viewpoints to be considered prior to the meeting and trust a sensible approach to address the core causes of this problem will be taken considering the</p>
--	---

	consultations results.
--	------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank