

APPENDIX C

Public Consultation Themes		
These comments were made through the public consultation and via the Citizens' Panel as well as informal comments. The figures show the number of respondents, the percentage that did not comment and the percentage of similar comments		
On line comments		
Q2 Why disagree and comments re Parking Policy aims (or) anything missed		
		Total
Base		148
	No comment	77.70%
	Have designated cycle ways / Promote cycling	3.40%
	Disagree that air pollution is a relevant consideration in this context	3.40%
	Consider number of parking places when applications received to turn large houses into flats	0.70%
	Provide more off street parking / Car parks / Make parking easier	0.70%
	Consult local resident about proposals affecting their own roads	0.70%
	More spaces for disabled people	0.70%
	This is a revenue making scheme	2.00%
	Keeping traffic moving - encourages car use / counter-productive	0.70%
	Actively support High Street shops	6.80%
	Encourage use of public transport	2.70%
	More disabled bays	0.70%
	Ensure footpaths are safe and not blocked by vehicles	0.70%
	Visitors should be able to visit private houses more easily	2.70%
	Wish to be able to park near own homes at all times	5.40%
		0.70%
Q4 Why disagree and comments re Policy objectives (or) anything missed		
		Total

Base		148
	No comment	86.50%
	All areas should have same charges / policy	0.70%
	Is there a financial incentive to the council to support Mayor's plan / What is the Mayor's plan?	1.40%
	It's all too vague / Worthy plans but how will it actually be achieved / Does not go far enough	6.80%
	Keep vehicles off footpaths	0.70%
	Hope there is no extra cost to car owners	0.70%
	Better / More useful public transport	0.70%
	Support local business	2.00%
	This is simply revenue gathering	3.40%
	This does not help us	0.70%
Q6 Why disagree with statements re Supporting business and the high street		
		Total
Base		36
	No comment	30.60%
	I want to know I will find a space / 15% not enough to be sure	22.20%
	Lower charges would be better incentive	16.70%
	Restore the option to be able to pay by cash/ mobile phone too difficult / Not everyone uses a mobile phone	13.90%
	Council should be encouraging use of public transport	19.40%
	I walk there anyway / Encourage more people to walk there	22.20%
	Do not have overzealous wardens	5.60%
Q7 Do you have any further ideas on how the council can support local businesses through parking policy		
		Total
Base		148

	No comment	54.10%
	Free for first 30 minutes	14.90%
	Free for first 60 minutes	4.70%
	More parking spaces	3.40%
	More coin meters / Cash machines	8.80%
	Two hour time limit	3.40%
	Free parking	4.10%
	More off street parking	2.00%
	Allow vehicles more time to unload / deliver to businesses	1.40%
	Free permits for owners/ managers of High Street businesses / Adequate parking for employees away from public spaces	0.70%
	Free parking on Sunday	0.70%
	Incentives / Parking discounts for Hybrid/Electric cars	0.70%
	Make it easier to pay / More choice without using a mobile	5.40%
	Allow parking on High Street for longer than 1 hour	1.40%
	Reduce charges / Make charges more reasonable	8.80%
	Have outlets refund the cost of the parking if you use their outlet / Loyalty scheme	1.40%
	Make all side streets free parking zones / Cheaper	0.70%
	Encourage people to use shops in off peak hours	1.40%
	Introduce Park and Ride	0.70%
	Curb vindictive traffic wardens	3.40%
	More disabled parking bays	0.70%
	Charge small amount (50p) for parking at Brent Cross and spread income across Borough	0.70%
	Organise / Encourage car clubs	0.70%
	More cycle parking	0.70%

Q9 Why disagree with introduction of CCTV around schools

		Total
Base		47
	No comment	21.30%
	Educate / Encourage parents to travel to schools in other ways	8.50%
	Drive to a point near the school and walk the remainder	4.30%
	Parking control officers present at the schools / Traffic wardens present	21.30%
	No more CCTV is needed in the borough / Dislike CCTV per se / Dislike CCTV near schools	21.30%
	Provide school buses	4.30%
	Encourage older children to use public transport	4.30%
	Double yellow lines all around schools	2.10%
	Would not be effective	25.50%
	Parents will feel bullied / Cause parents stress / Give parents a chance / No need to make life more difficult	8.50%
	CCTV would be a deterrent to safety / Would not improve safety	2.10%
	Bring back lollipop ladies / men	2.10%
	Need evidence to support that there would be a benefit	2.10%
	Would just push the problem to a wider area	2.10%
	Give parents better / more parking options	12.80%
Q11 Further ideas on how charges could be set		
		Total
Base		148
	No comment	74.30%
	Charge by size of engine	
	Flat rate is fairest / Fairest	6.10%
	Limit flat rate to two cars per household	0.70%
	Visitor parking charge is too high / Visitors are deterred from calling	0.70%

	First permit per household should be free	2.00%
	Residents should not pay to park outside their own houses	6.80%
	Limit the number of vehicles one household can park	1.40%
	Council is milking situation to make revenue / CPZ should not be a means of raising money	6.10%
	All vehicles registered at a properties address should be charged	0.70%
	Increase the charge for every car after the first one	1.40%
	It is a fair system / Makes good sense	1.40%
	Have a Borough permit allowing parking anywhere in the borough	0.70%
Q14 Why disagree re CPZ Parking permits		
		Total
Base		47
	No comment	27.70%
	Irresponsible to add extra costs to households/ unfair / people cannot afford	8.50%
	Extra required permits often unavoidable in households	31.90%
	Not acceptable to have to pay to park outside your own house	12.80%
	Why should car owners be taxed further / It just council increasing their revenue	4.30%
	Allow only up to 4 permits	2.10%
	Increase after 2nd permit	6.40%
	There is no room for parking and so extra permits do not make sense	4.30%
	Charge at £40 per car / All to cost the same	2.10%
	Unreasonable to charge for visitors to your home	2.10%
	This encourages people to cement over front gardens/ do not allow / water flooding and environment	2.10%
	Should be a one off cost per household	4.30%
Why disagree Moving Traffic Contraventions		

		Total
Base		32
	No comment	50.00%
	Need 20mph policy	3.10%
	Just an income generating idea for the council / Lack of confidence in council	9.40%
	Severe fines are needed / Stronger enforcement	6.30%
	Better markings at junctions and blind spots / Clearer signage	9.40%
	There is too much legislation / Insensitive enforcement	6.30%
	Main aim should be to keep travel flowing	not looking for small infringements
	More	not fewer
	A reduction of cars on the roads is required / Traffic not lowing causes frustration	3.10%
Q18 Why disagree Footway Parking		
		Total
Base		22
	No comment	27.30%
	Some roads are too narrow to avoid doing this /It should be allowed	9.10%
	To allow it impedes access for disabled, wheelchairs, pushchairs	13.60%
	Cars should never be on footways / Footways are for pedestrians	36.40%
	Allow it anywhere and drivers will assume it is allowed everywhere	9.10%
	Permissible if clearly marked where it is allowed	4.50%
Q20 Why disagree Enforcement methods		
		Total
Base		7
	Clamping can cause more congestion / Obstruction / Takes up a parking	71.40%

	space	
	Too hard to put right if a mistake has been made / Vehicle could have been removed in error	28.60%
	It only achieves anger and revenue	14.30%
Q22 What other enforcement methods		
		Total
Base		32
	No comment	18.80%
	Put points on licence / Fine with points	3.10%
	Frequent warden Patrols	6.30%
	Remove car to car pound / Seize vehicle	15.60%
	Name and shame in press and / or social media	12.50%
	Use debt collection agencies to collect unpaid fines / Bailiffs	6.30%
	Rising scale of penalty fines for persistent offenders / Higher fines	6.30%
	Take them to court / Stricter enforcement	28.10%
	Use their car to pay off debt	6.30%
	Warning notices on cars	3.10%
	Crush the car	3.10%
	Remove their licence / Ban from driving	9.40%
	Attend an appropriate course	3.10%
	Inform their motor insurance firms	3.10%
Q26 Please tell us about anything else that matters to you about parking in the borough		
		Total
Base		147
	No comment	52.40%
	Control abuse of Blue Badge use	1.40%
	More meters needed / more pay points / Pay points closer to parking	0.70%

	spaces	
	Promote awareness of registering payment by phone / Tell people how to do it more easily	1.40%
	More Cash machines / Ability to pay by cash or card rather than home	8.80%
	Control abuse of parking regulations around Schools	4.80%
	Encourage cycling in the Borough	2.70%
	More Blue Badge parking available / Better provision or disabled	1.40%
	Extend permit times and days	0.70%
	Extend yellow lines on narrow roads where cars park both sides / More double yellow lines	2.00%
	Control parking on corners or near corners / at crossing points	3.40%
	Control parking across dropped kerbs / Across drives	2.00%
	Ban parking of large vehicles in residential roads	1.40%
	Don't use motorists as an easy target for income generating	4.10%
	Have higher presence of wardens	0.70%
	Have a short term parking policy / Allow parking for a short time for free	0.70%
	More places to park generally	1.40%
	Supporting the High Streets is vital	0.70%
	20mph limit in roads where there is parking allowed / More areas with a 20mph limit	0.70%
	Remove some unnecessary double yellow lines / single yellow lines	0.70%
	Make paying by telephone quicker and easier	6.10%
	Ban parking on footpaths	0.70%
	New developments must provide sufficient parking to obtain planning consent / Change of use applications	4.10%
	Encourage use of public transport	3.40%
	Allow 5 minutes grace to pay for parking / Not be so quick to issue a ticket / Train wardens better	1.40%

	Enable/help residents to put in own driveway / Remove trees on roadside for instance	1.40%
	Help resident living near High Street and transport hubs to park near their homes	8.80%
	Listen to residents / Petitions / Consult	4.10%
	More CCTV	0.70%
	Extend coverage of CPZ / Drivers just move to neighbouring areas	3.40%
	Easier / Cheaper parking for visitors to the home	1.40%
	Review need or CPZ in some roads / Often not used	2.70%
	Control number if Zip cars	0.70%
	Encourage car sharing	0.70%
	Tall kerbside marking poles unsightly / Street clutter	0.70%

Citizens Panel Themes		
Q1 Why disagree and comments re Parking Policy aims (or) anything missed		
		Total
Base		770
	No comment	90.40%
	Have designated cycle ways / Promote cycling	0.80%
	All areas should have the same policy / Should be a Central Government policy	0.60%
	Disagree that air pollution is a relevant consideration in this context	0.80%
	Consider number of parking places when applications received to turn large houses into flats	0.30%
	Address the number of large vehicles delivering in High Streets	0.20%
	Provide more off street parking / Car parks / Make parking easier	1.20%
	Residents should park on their own property, not on the road	0.10%

	Ban parking within half a mile of school	0.10%
	Keeping traffic moving might be at the expense of safety	0.50%
	Consult local resident about proposals affecting their own roads	0.20%
	More spaces for disabled people	0.20%
	Need a policy to reduce car ownership and traffic volume	0.20%
	Disagree with CCTV per se	0.20%
	This is a revenue making scheme	0.90%
	Keeping traffic moving is not always possible - volume	0.10%
	Keeping traffic moving - encourages car use / counter-productive	0.40%
	Actively support High Street shops	1.40%
	Encourage use of public transport	0.80%
	More disabled bays	0.30%
	A higher charge for households with more than one car	0.20%
	Ensure footpaths are safe and not blocked by vehicles	0.10%
	Have Park and Ride	0.10%
	Should be more free/cheaper parking near public transport links	1.10%
	Address the abuse of Blue Badge use	0.10%
Q2 Why disagree and comments re Policy objectives (or) anything missed		
		Total
Base		770
	No comment	94.60%
	More parking notices / Signs more visible / Clearer	0.50%
	Control abuse of use of Blue Badges	0.20%
	All areas should have same charges / policy	0.20%
	Is there a financial incentive to the council to support Mayor's plan / What is the Mayor's plan?	0.40%
	Disagree with outsourcing	0.10%

	It's all too vague / Worthy plans but how will it actually be achieved	1.10%
	Keep vehicles off footpaths	0.10%
	Hope there is no extra cost to car owners	0.30%
	Better / More useful public transport	0.40%
	Encourage eco-friendly vehicles	0.10%
	Why only 4 town centres mentioned?	0.10%
	Support local business	1.10%
	This is simply revenue gathering	0.20%
	Need more free parking near shops and amenities	1.10%
	This does not help us	0.40%
Q3 Why disagree with statements re Supporting business and the high street		
		Total
Base		75
	No comment	31.90%
	I want to know I will find a space / 15% not enough to be sure	13.70%
	Lower charges would be better incentive	19.70%
	All shopping areas / High Streets should have same rules / policies	1.40%
	Restore the option to be able to pay by cash/ mobile phone too difficult / Not everyone uses a mobile phone	12.40%
	No point is there are no shops left there to visit / Need higher occupancy of shopping areas	2.80%
	Council should be encouraging use of public transport	18.00%
	I walk there anyway / Encourage more people to walk there	14.40%
	Do not have overzealous wardens	0.90%
Q4 Do you have any further ideas on how the council can support local businesses through parking policy		

		Total
Base		770
	No comment	53.90%
	Free for first 30 minutes	11.30%
	Free for first 60 minutes	4.90%
	More parking spaces	5.20%
	More coin meters / Cash machines	5.90%
	Do not increase charges / keep them reasonable	1.20%
	Two hour time limit	1.60%
	Free parking	6.40%
	More off street parking	2.90%
	Allow vehicles more time to unload / deliver to businesses	0.20%
	Free permits for owners/ managers of High Street businesses / Adequate parking for employees away from public spaces	0.50%
	Free parking on Sunday	0.30%
	Free parking after 7pm	0.10%
	Have drop off points at shops / Pick up points	0.30%
	Incentives / Parking discounts for Hybrid/Electric cars	0.20%
	Better parking would bring more traffic and create other problems	0.30%
	Stop changing the policy	0.40%
	Allow people to buy tickets or tokens in advance	0.40%
	Give a free park - i.e. pay for 4 and get 5th free	0.20%
	Make it easier to pay / More choice without using a mobile	5.40%
	Allow courtesy time to acquire tickets by mobile - it takes time	0.10%

	Allow parking on High Street for longer than 1 hour	0.10%
	Reduce charges / Make charges more reasonable	10.50%
	Have outlets refund the cost of the parking if you use their outlet	2.00%
	Make all side streets free parking zones / Cheaper	0.40%
	Stricter enforcement / More wardens	0.80%
	Have parking bays for delivery vehicles	0.30%
	Fewer parking permits for local businesses / Encourage employees to park further away	0.60%
	Use CCTV to monitor and record	0.20%
	Encourage people to use shops in off peak hours	0.80%
	Introduce Park and Ride	0.10%
	Curb vindictive traffic wardens	0.20%
	More disabled parking bays	0.20%
	Better signage / Information	0.10%
Q5 Why disagree with introduction of CCTV around schools		
		Total
Base		101
	No comment	15.30%
	Educate / Encourage parents to travel to schools in other ways	4.30%
	Drive to a point near the school and walk the remainder	3.70%
	Parking control officers present at the schools / Traffic wardens present	17.90%
	No more CCTV is needed in the borough / Dislike CCTV per se / Dislike CCTV near schools	7.80%
	Provide school buses	2.60%
	Encourage older children to use public transport	0.50%

	Encourage parents to car share / Have a rota	0.50%
	Double yellow lines all around schools	1.10%
	Inevitable to have to stop on zig zags etc. when dropping children off / Car usage is inevitable	9.40%
	Would not be effective	33.70%
	Parents will feel bullied	10.20%
	CCTV would be a deterrent to safety / Would not improve safety	5.50%
	CCTV must result in fines to be effective / Must be enforced	3.40%
	Give parents a chance / No need to make life more difficult	0.70%
	Just increases revenue for the council	6.90%
	Bring back lollipop ladies / men	2.10%
Q6 Further ideas on how charges could be set		
		Total
Base		727
	No comment	80.30%
	Charge by size of engine, not CO2 / Older cars though small cannot comply	2.40%
	Visitors should pay by the hour	0.20%
	CO2 issue is a hidden tax and is unfair	0.50%
	Should not have to pay to drop a child off at school	0.10%
	More disabled parking close to shops and stations	0.20%
	Reduce cost of parking at hospitals	0.60%
	Flat rate is fairest / Fairest	2.50%
	Limit flat rate to two cars per household	0.20%
	All day restrictions in residential roads to discourage commuters using	0.40%
	Visitor parking charge is too high / Visitors are deterred from calling	0.70%

	First permit per household should be free	1.50%
	Residents should not pay to park outside their own houses	6.80%
	Limit the number of vehicles one household can park	0.30%
	Council is milking situation to make revenue / CPZ should not be a means of raising money	1.80%
	Allowing more parking will make roads snarl up	0.20%
	Increase cost of car use and force people on to public transport	0.10%
	Would penalise those living near shops and transport	0.40%
	All vehicles registered at a properties address should be charged	0.10%
	Charge should take in all elements:CO2, proximity to a town centre / times and duration allowed	0.20%
	Increase the charge for every car after the first one	1.40%
	Link charge tariff to council tax band	0.70%
	Free permits should be issued to each house in the road in proportion to number of parking places in that road	0.10%
	It is a fair system / Makes good sense	0.40%
	Pensioners should have reduced charges	0.10%
	Have a Borough permit allowing parking anywhere in the borough	0.40%
	People are paving over front gardens and helping to cause flooding	0.10%
Q8 Why disagree re CPZ Parking permits		
		Total
Base		243
	No comment	24.80%
	Irresponsible to add extra costs to households/ unfair / people cannot afford	7.50%
	Extra required permits often unavoidable in households	27.10%

	Not acceptable to have to pay to park outside your own house	12.10%
	Why should car owners be taxed further / It just council increasing their revenue	13.50%
	Allow only up to 4 permits	1.30%
	This discriminates against disabled people	0.50%
	If household had fewer permits would encourage use of public transport	1.10%
	Households should get at least one permit free	2.10%
	Increase after 3rd permit	4.10%
	Increase after 2nd permit	0.70%
	There is no room for parking and so extra permits do not make sense	1.50%
	Charge at £40 per car / All to cost the same	19.80%
	Unreasonable to charge for visitors to your home	3.00%
	Make households turn their front gardens into parking spaces	1.60%
	This encourages people to cement over front gardens/ do not allow / water flooding and environment	1.20%
	Should be a one off cost per household	0.20%
Q9 Why disagree Moving Traffic Contraventions		
		Total
Base		57
	No comment	13.30%
	Need 20mph policy	11.00%
	Just an income generating idea for the council / Lack of confidence in council	20.80%
	Severe fines are needed / Stronger enforcement	12.40%
	Better markings at junctions and blind spots / Clearer signage	4.40%
	There is too much legislation / Insensitive enforcement	10.00%

	Deal with accident black spots	1.20%
	More safe for cycling and pedestrians	2.70%
	Deal with people reversing onto main roads	3.00%
	CCTV is after the event/ Circumstances are not able to be taken into account/ No discretion	17.20%
	CCTV is intrusive/ Dislike CCTV/ Too many cameras	4.10%
	Main aim should be to keep travel flowing, not looking for small infringements	1.50%
	CCTV distracts drivers. Not safe	2.70%
	More, not fewer, traffic calming measures	13.40%
	Too many signs / Confusion	1.10%
	A reduction of cars on the roads is required / Traffic not lowing causes frustration	3.60%
Q10 Why disagree Footway Parking		
		Total
Base		89
	No comment	40.60%
	Some roads are too narrow to avoid doing this /It should be allowed	20.50%
	Make it permissible to park on footway one side of the road only	4.10%
	To allow it impedes access for disabled, wheelchair, pushchair users	9.60%
	Cars should never be on footways / Footways are for pedestrians	29.70%
	Pavements would become more damaged	6.00%
	Allow it anywhere and drivers will assume it is allowed everywhere	4.50%
	Should be encouraging cycling and walking, not making it easier to park	6.70%
	Permissible if clearly marked where it is allowed	0.90%
Q11 Why disagree Enforcement methods		

		Total
Base		197
	No comment	38.00%
	Vehicles need to be moved away quickly / better to remove car than to clamp it	6.50%
	Clamping can cause more congestion / Obstruction / Takes up a parking space	20.10%
	Unfair to clamp a car / Disagree altogether with clamping / Inconvenience to offender/ cannot fetch children etc.	9.90%
	Unfair to remove a car / inconvenience to offender/ cannot fetch children etc.	9.00%
	Warn the driver before removing	2.60%
	Cancelling permit is not strict enough	6.60%
	Difficult to monitor	0.80%
	Use of car pounds is expensive for the council	3.90%
	Too hard to put right if a mistake has been made / Vehicle could have been removed in error	7.10%
	It only achieves anger and revenue	7.30%
	Never renew the permit	0.60%
	Fining is enough / Teaches them a lesson	5.10%
	If people cannot pay a fine then gives them more expense, just compounds the problem	2.40%
Q12 What other enforcement methods		
		Total
Base		193
	No comment	6.40%
	Put points on licence / Fine with points	14.40%
	Control abuse of Blue Badge use/ Using another person's Blue Badge	3.20%
	Frequent warden Patrols	1.40%

	Wardens to enforce violations more rigorously / Show no discretion	1.50%
	Remove car to car pound / Seize vehicle	9.80%
	Name and shame in press and / or social media	6.80%
	Keep car impounded for a set length of time even if fine paid	0.40%
	Use debt collection agencies to collect unpaid fines / Bailiffs	4.90%
	Make roads where speeding occurs narrower	0.40%
	Rising scale of penalty fines for persistent offenders / Higher fines	15.50%
	Take them to court / Stricter enforcement	19.70%
	Use their car to pay off debt	3.00%
	Make it easier for drivers to contact council to sort these things out	1.60%
	Increase their council tax for one year / Add fines to Council Tax	4.50%
	Warning notices on cars	2.90%
	Revoke permit without refund /	2.40%
	Crush the car	3.60%
	Remove their licence / Ban from driving	8.70%
	Make sure enforces act fairly / Are not over enthusiastic	0.60%
	There should be a tie up between police records and persistent offenders	1.00%
	Community service	2.00%
	Attend an appropriate course	1.60%
	Inform their motor insurance firms	2.40%
Q16 Please tell us about anything else that matters to you about parking in the borough		
		Total
Base		770
	No comment	63.80%

	Give incentives to shops to sell scratch cards	0.10%
	Widen availability of scratch cards / Widen scope of scratch cards	0.70%
	Control abuse of Blue Badge use	1.20%
	More meters needed / more pay points / Pay points closer to parking spaces	0.30%
	More advertising of scratch cards	0.30%
	Promote awareness of off street parking places	0.40%
	Promote awareness of registering payment by phone / Tell people how to do it more easily	0.60%
	Give builders temporary permits / Traffic wardens hand them out	0.40%
	More Cash machines / Ability to pay by cash or card rather than home	5.50%
	Control abuse of parking regulations around Schools	4.40%
	Relax restrictions near green spaces	0.10%
	Allow footpath parking outside own home	0.60%
	Help the elderly/ mobility and sensory impaired	0.30%
	Better / Cleaner signage re parking	1.20%
	More designated spaces for scooters and motorcycles	0.10%
	Ban parking facing oncoming traffic / On wrong side of road	0.20%
	Encourage cycling in the Borough	0.50%
	Those who live near high demand areas should not be penalised / Not have to pay more	0.60%
	More Blue Badge parking available / Better provision for disabled	1.10%
	Allow Blue badge holders to park on standard bays (free) if designated spaces full	0.10%
	Extend permit times and days	0.40%
	Extend yellow lines on narrow roads where cars park both sides / More double yellow lines	1.00%
	Control parking on corners or near corners / at crossing points	1.30%

	Control parking across dropped kerbs / Across drives	1.80%
	Ban parking of large vehicles in residential roads	0.90%
	Don't use motorists as an easy target for income generating	0.80%
	Have higher presence of wardens	0.90%
	Have a short term parking policy / Allow parking for a short time for free	2.00%
	More places to park generally	1.90%
	Supporting the High Streets is vital	2.20%
	Ensure cars parked in drives do not stick out onto pavement causing hazard	0.30%
	Clear instructions on machines re what kind of payment it takes and how to do that	0.90%
	Better administration required / Implements payments and refunds more quickly	0.40%
	Do not encourage heavier use of some roads by making parking easier	0.40%
	20mph limit in roads where there is parking allowed / More areas with a 20mph limit	0.50%
	Ban parking on both sides of narrow roads	1.70%
	Remove some unnecessary double yellow lines	0.50%
	Monitor disabled bays and change where not being used	0.20%
	Make paying by telephone quicker and easier	1.40%
	Ban parking on footpaths	1.00%
	Limit number of skips allowed	0.10%
	Check for abandoned vehicles	0.20%
	5 permits per household impractical / Leaves no room for other households	0.30%
	Allow parking on High Street for a longer period of time	0.10%
	New developments must provide sufficient parking to obtain planning consent	1.50%

	Encourage use of public transport	1.50%
	Large queues at car park exits increase the charge if pay on exit	0.10%
	Allow 5 minutes grace to pay for parking / Not be so quick to issue a ticket / Train wardens better	0.80%
	Enable/help residents to put in own driveway / Remove trees on roadside for instance	0.30%
	Help resident living near High Street and transport hubs to park near their homes	1.40%
	Lollipop crossing people not to stop traffic until a minimum number of people have gathered	0.10%
	Permits for tenants in council rented flats with parking areas to protect those spaces	0.10%
	Listen to residents / Petitions / Consult	0.70%
	Lower the cost of parking and permits / Do not increase	3.70%
	More CCTV	0.40%
	Reduce hospital car park fees	0.10%
	Enable on-line purchase of permits	0.20%
	Extend coverage of CPZ	0.50%
	Easier / Cheaper parking for visitors to the home	0.30%
	The turning of front gardens into parking areas is unattractive and detrimental to the environment	0.10%
	Review need or CPZ in some roads / Often not used	0.20%
	Better / More / Free parking at doctors surgeries	0.40%

Informal Comments Received Outside of Formal Consultation

Preamble.

The purpose of penalty charges is to dissuade motorists from breaking parking restrictions. The objective is 100% compliance, with no penalty charges. Source: *Secretary of State for Transport*.

My policy suggestions are divided, as far as they can be, into stages of the process.

Before any PCN is issued

Have a choice of payment methods to provide for the needs of all customers. PayByPhone, cash at a meter, vouchers, credit card at a meter (insert and contactless), PayPoint, Oyster and/or Barnet Payment card (a Barnet Payment Card could take the place of cash completely provided it was flexible enough i.e. it must not have a cost to provide and can be charged up with any payment amount, is widely available and the nearest stockist is signposted at every bay where payment is required).

Don't issue PCN on Bank Holidays except for on crossing zig-zags and dropped kerbs on request by a resident.

Reduce the hours during which PCN are issued. Traffic wardens should not be roaming the streets from 7am to 11pm.

Stop treating the Special Parking Account (SPA) as a target i.e. if quarterly projections show it will be missed, don't take steps to generate missed income from elsewhere.

Don't issue Visitor Vouchers with a 3 year life. The money paid for them didn't expire.

Issue all correctly applied for permits and blue badges in 24 hours.

Organise courses on how to park legally in order to help people to comply with what is a complex parking regime.

Remove the CPZ entry signs (except the Saracens ED zone) and put signs on all single yellow lines. Only 10% of the borough has a CPZ and they are widely misunderstood or the entry signs are missed.

Reduce the vast size of the Saracens ED zone and change the time of it to one hour at the usual kick-off time.

Make a note of vehicles parked that would be in contravention if still there when the suspension sign is erected so that any PCN issued to them can be cancelled. Put up clearer suspension signs as ones that say 2 bays outside numbers x and y of a street will not be clear if three cars could park outside those two residences.

Publish the list of pavement parking locations which are not enforced even though the pavement is not marked out for them. This was promised to me in the Environment Committee meeting of 24 July 2014.

Use some of the SPA surplus to educate drivers about the most common parking errors. How many motorists, for example, know that you can't park on the pavement, except where marked out, anywhere in London? Not enough given the number of PCN which are issued for this contravention.

Traffic wardens (CEO)

Don't issue a PCN for a missing registration mark off a parking voucher (especially if it is only for 1 hour as it isn't very likely to be re-used) and remove the requirement from the next print run.

Don't issue a PCN for a Visitor Voucher that is out of date and remove the expiry date (3 years) from the next print run.

Make less use of Regulation 10 (drive-away) PCN as inadequate observation time is being given as to what the motorist was doing.

Allow 14 days grace for an expired resident permit. Give the car a leaflet that the permit has expired.

Give 10 minutes grace for all offences (except on crossing zig-zags and genuinely dangerous parking).

Issue a warning for minor contraventions if the driver returns. (Para 40 Sec of State Guidance).

Don't issue a PCN for being outside the bay marking when the two halves of the car are both in bays which the car is entitled to be in.

Don't let traffic wardens park their car or scooter in any manner other than legally (although without payment is OK)

Don't issue code 24 PCN (not parked correctly within the markings of the bay or space) unless one wheel is wholly outside the parking bay (London Councils CEO handbook)

Don't issue PCN in the first or last 2 minutes of a restriction (London Councils CEO handbook).

Don't issue PCN for being parked on the footway unless a complete wheel is on the footway, not just partially on the kerb.

Provide offices at which cash payments of PCN can be made.

Don't issue a PCN where the signs or lines are clearly defective - report them instead.

Back office

Cancel a PCN if it turns out that a valid permit exists but wasn't on display for some reason. If the traffic warden has this information about there being a permit he should not issue a PCN in the first place.

Cancel the PCN if there is a delay in processing at any stage of 6 months (this is the law for a Notice to Owner to be issued) i.e.

- 1 between the Notice to Owner and the Charge Certificate
- 2 between the Charge Certificate and the Notice of Recovery

3 between the Notice of Recovery and instructing the bailiff

Accept reasonable instalments if offered up to say 6 months. These motorists would not qualify for the 50% prompt payment discount.

Write a policy about how vulnerable individuals should be treated.

Cancel PCN where the wrong vehicle or wrong location has been paid for.

Cancel all permit issue delay PCN.

Cancel PCN if a permit reminder was not sent.

Cancel a PCN issued within the Saracens ED zone to any motorist who is resident within it and issue a permit to them and tell them about visitor vouchers.

Inform all medical workers who challenge a PCN on the grounds that they were attending to a sick patient about the Health Emergency badge scheme in case they may qualify for it.

Do a DVLA address check at both the Charge Certificate and Order for Recovery stages as people move a lot and otherwise may not receive these vital documents. I think the cost is about 20p per application.

Tell motorists if their formal representations are being disregarded as being outside the 28 day time limit from service of the Notice to Owner.

Make the decision about all challenges in-house as the law requires (even if NSL then issue the decision)

Put the email address on the PCN (para 70 of Sec of State guidance) and provide a telephone number for the use of the disabled who may not be able to communicate in writing.

Produce an Annual Report (Para 114 Sec of State guidance).

If the council get it wrong, apologise sincerely and compensate the motorist.

Find out why regular offenders are regular and offer them help and advice to avoid parking wrongly rather than clamping and/or removing the vehicle and negotiate settlement of their outstanding PCN by agreement if possible. Your power should be wielded with discretion.

If a motorist tells the council that the Charge Certificate is the first notice received the council should offer the opportunity to pay the PCN at the full rate (not +/- 50%) (para 224 London Councils Code of Practice)

Update the cancellation policy that was used prior to NSL being contracted (copy attached).

Traffic Enforcement Centre (TEC) - Northampton County Court

Don't oppose out of time witness statements where the customer says they have not received documents and are not clearly lying.

The council is allowed nearly a month to decide upon these. During this time the motorist may have been deprived of his car. The policy should be to decide upon them within 48 hours.

A council officer should decide on these, not a contractor.

Bailiffs

Don't send bailiffs to Old Age Pensioners, Blue Badge Holders or Motability car drivers as they are a vulnerable section of society and other methods would be better i.e. phone them up if they don't pay to see what the problem is. A bailiff is not meant to take a car of a blue badge holder and certainly can't touch a Motability car as it doesn't belong to the debtor so avoid error and put temptation out of the bailiff's way.

Parking management, not NSL, should monitor the activities and charges of bailiffs to make sure they behave in a proper manner and do not overcharge.

Cases should be sent to bailiffs every month and without delay once the process of challenge has been exhausted.

Before instructing a bailiff in a case where the motorist has not engaged in the process at all make telephone, postal (Signed For service) or even personal contact with the motorist to find out why they have not responded. They may have moved away, had an accident or died.

Management should monitor the success rate of each firm of bailiffs. A success rate of 17% as in Enfield (Barnet's not known but likely to be equally dire) is no success at all. Either the bailiff is cherry picking the cases they are pursuing or the quality of what they are being given is too low.

Do not allow a parking enforcement contractor to use a bailiff that they own or a sister company as there is an inherent conflict of interest if the parking enforcement contractor makes the decision as to whether or not a particular car can be removed. In addition it is not possible for the parking enforcement contractor to independently investigate a complaint about a bailiff. The council should in any case make the investigation, using an independent person to make a recommendation, as they owe a duty of care for the behaviour of their bailiff (the warrant is in the name of the council).

Bailiffs have to take care of goods in their possession. One that was impounded for more than 6 months was not washed, its tyres were allowed to deflate and the battery was discharged and had to be replaced. This requirement should be stipulated in bailiff contracts (even though it is a well known requirement).

If the council decides to release a vehicle that has been impounded without payment, the council should deliver the vehicle back rather than make the motorist collect it from Nazeing (where Newlyn send vehicles to be stored).

Response to Draft Parking Policy

We are aware of the Council's Parking Policy proposals as published to the Environment Committee on 24th July 2014 and we are anxious about the implications of these.

Our concerns take two forms;

- 1) The prospect of increased costs for Hampstead Garden Suburb residents living inside existing controlled parking zones or who may become CPZ residents as a result of future expansion
- 2) The inflexible nature of camera enforced moving traffic contraventions and the inherent injustices associated with retrospectively served penalty charge notices

Controlled Parking Zone permit charges

Since the inception of the CPZ scheme in Barnet it has been the case that permit charges have remained consistent throughout the borough and that permit costs have always been based upon residency alone rather than any variable factors. The Draft Parking Plan raises the prospect of future charges varying from area to area and for the cost of a particular parking permit to be set according to the size or type of car, on the length of the controlled period operating within the CPZ, on levels of congestion within a CPZ, on judged environmental impact and upon the number of cars belonging to a household. The scope of these proposals is so wide and the criteria for determining such matters as congestion or environmental impact are likely to be so nebulous and discretionary that affected residents would probably be unable effectively to challenge Council decisions about such matters. Given that once inside a CPZ there is no alternative to buying a permit residents may find themselves held hostage to a pricing regime they cannot influence and against which they will be unable to appeal.

We should add that our views here are informed in part by the Council's dismissal of our recent representations for an equalising of on-street parking charges following reductions elsewhere in Barnet. There is now a sense within Hampstead Garden Suburb that the Council views this locality as one which can afford to subsidise other parts of the borough. This opinion would likely become more widespread still in the event that HGS residents were to be subjected to higher CPZ costs than is the case in neighbouring districts.

Camera enforced moving traffic contraventions

We are extremely concerned to learn that the Council is considering using CCTV technology for the enforcement of these matters. We are particularly conscious that this is being proposed at a time when the Government is sponsoring legislation which seeks to reverse the trend towards CCTV enforcement of our roads.

The use of CCTV cameras in other parts of London has given rise to a sense of injustice among many law-abiding citizens. Many people find themselves facing the full force of the state's authority for alleged technical motoring infractions whilst serious crimes (often perpetrated against the same individuals) are dealt with far more casually. This tendency has almost certainly contributed to an erosion of trust between citizens and the political and other governing elements.

At our Open meeting on Tuesday 7th October with five councillors (Garden Suburb and East Finchley), the example was given of cyclists on the footway of Falloden Way, one of whom knocked down an old man who promptly had a stroke. That is a far more relevant matter to monitor by CCTV than are minor traffic offences. In criminal matters CCTV is used to supplement witness and other evidence; we are against it being the sole and impersonal factor which would be the case if it were used as the Council proposes.

At a more immediately discernible level there is a basic injustice in the service of a PCN many days or even weeks after the event as motorists are denied the opportunity of examining the location in question as it was at the relevant time. The principle of a camera operator making a decision in a remote office, insulated against the many dynamic factors about which motorists must make split-second decisions, is also deeply unsatisfactory.

Whether or not it is the case that other local authorities have used similar powers to create unnecessary restrictions for the purpose of raising revenue and whether or not this would be Barnet's intention, the fact remains that this is the common public perception. That being the case it seems inevitable that were the Council to adopt policies infused with higher costs and greater regulation it will only reinforce existing resentments and encourage new ones. We hope therefore that the Council will recognise it to be in the interest of all parties that these proposals be abandoned.

You will be aware that Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum's application for designation was officially agreed at Barnet Council's Planning meeting held on 17th September 2014.

We have reviewed the draft policy, in our committee of 30 Mill Hill residents, both generally and in the specific context of our designated area (Mill Hill ward and the NW7 post codes within Hale ward) and can comment as follows:

In general terms we do not think that the policy acknowledges the real need to provide more car parking spaces across the Borough to meet today's needs and then of course the expected considerable growth in the resident population going forward. We believe that the Council should acknowledge the current deficit in the supply of car parking, along with the very poor East-West access routes, and be encouraging alternative forms of transport, notably E-Bikes and "lite" rail/trams etc, to persuade people that the car is no longer the best form, for most journeys. Further you should revise upwards the recommendations for car park spaces in new developments, as the reality is that residents have more vehicles than said recommendations expect, which results in overspill onto public roads.

You state under the heading of "keeping the traffic moving" that one objective is "to deter long term commuter parking".

We would agree in part with this, if it was stated as "to deter long term commuter parking on public roads". We would actually suggest that the provision of parking for commuters should be significantly enhanced to actively encourage people to park & ride public transport. This will be covered further below, where we have made more detailed comments in line with the numbered paragraphs within your draft policy document:

3.5 Improving Bus Reliability: With the new residential developments in Mill Hill East and the desirability of improving the footfall in Mill Hill Broadway (without increasing the need for extra parking) it would be beneficial to have a shuttle bus running every 10 minutes between the Mill Hill Broadway and Mill Hill East Stations, via Devonshire Road.

3.7 Supporting Business and the High Street: We approve the introduction of free short stay parking bays in Mill Hill Broadway, we also think that there should be a 15-20 minute free parking period to actively encourage visitors. There should also be permits for businesses. Smart meters should record vehicle registration numbers on arrival to facilitate active parking management.

4.1 Allocation of On and Off-Street Parking Spaces: There is a car park at Bunns Lane for Mill Hill Broadway Station and at Finchley Central Station but only a very small one at Mill Hill East Station. This does not make sense especially with the increase in population with the new developments in Millbrook Park. The parking facility at the Mill Hill Broadway station should be increased (a multi-storey facility provided) and made more efficient to encourage the use of public transport and encourage shoppers and workers in Mill Hill Broadway to park there. There should be differential pricing for Commuters, Shoppers and businesses based in the Broadway. The under-croft at Mill Hill Broadway Station should be developed for retail purposes.

The restricted parking times around Mill Hill Broadway should be split 50% 11.00am to Noon and 50% 3.00pm to 4.00pm.

The Car Park in Daws Lane should remain free of any charges. Hopefully with a multi-storey car park at Bunns Lane, Mill Hill Broadway station, those business users who currently park in Daws Lane, will move, freeing up spaces at Daws Lane for users of the Park. If a charge was introduced at Daws Lane car park, it would simply push the cars out onto the surrounding streets, making this area difficult for residents to park near their properties. We can then see that a solution to such a chain of events would cause the Council to suggest a CPZ which would be totally unacceptable in this area.

The car park at Finchley Central tube station could be made multi-storey with relative ease and low cost. Smart technology could tell potential users that a space was available and this could be booked through a smart phone App, using open-data. Registration numbers could be taken on arrival to the car park by camera, matched to the earlier booking and charging perhaps done on a differential basis on exit depending on the car's registered address. Barnet residents could receive a lower fee than those originating outside the Borough.

The Council will shortly vacate their depot at Mill Hill East, and again a large car park should be developed to encourage people to park and ride public transport.

4.2 & 6.9 The Setting of Fees and Charges: We approve of the reduction of parking charges in Mill Hill Broadway but we think that it was a mistake to remove the cash payment meters as for some this is the most convenient method of payment. It is not clear notably to occasional users that a transaction charge is levied on top of the parking fee for payments by phone. If this method costs the Council more, then we would encourage the use of debit cards, notably contactless cards with no additional

fee charged. Cash is no longer taken by TFL, so increasingly people will become familiar in using alternative methods. It was unfortunate that the ability to make a cash payment was arbitrarily taken away by the Council, but we do understand that the collection of cash is now a more expensive option.

6.2 Controlled Parking Zones: We do not approve of any further extensions in NW7. We regard to the Saracens CPZ, the Council should issue all residents of Mill Hill parking permits based on DVLA records. Under the current arrangements those Mill Hill residents living outside the CPZ cannot park in Mill Hill on Match days, thus reducing trade. Indeed with modern technology it should be possible to stop issuing permits and rely on the accuracy of the DVLA registration data. People would have the added incentive when changing vehicles to ensure that the DVLA data was updated promptly.

8.9 Car Parks: As stated above we believe that there is potential to open multi-story car parks in locations such as Mill Hill Broadway with the much needed re-design of the station. Any developments on surface car parks (such as in Hartley Avenue) should be refused unless this is replaced by a larger parking facility to service the medical centre and other users.

8.11/8.12 Footway Parking and on Dropped Kerbs : We believe that this should be extended in areas like Hammers Lane/Daws Lane where the pavement is wide and it is difficult for buses to pass and where a school is nearby. We note that, for example in Brookfield Avenue, residents regularly park on the pavements and this should be regularised with bays clearly marked or if not deemed appropriate, then enforcement action taken to discontinue the practice.

Appendix 3-NO2 Air Quality: We believe that air quality and noise pollution in Mill Hill Broadway, would be reduced if there were high level (2-3 metres) screens installed along the railway and M1 (these could include solar panels thus providing power generation as is now happening alongside the M40 near High Wycombe and is widely adopted in Europe).

Further Comments:

Electric Vehicle Charging Points: A quantity of these should be provided in suitable locations and notably in Mill Hill Broadway.

Car Club/Car Sharing: Parking spaces in the highway should be provided to encourage this use within the borough thereby reducing the necessity for outright car ownership.

Daws Lane: In order to improve the movement of buses we believe it would be beneficial to restrict parking along one side of this road, perhaps proving a 1 hour maximum stay.

The Ridgeway near the Adam & Eve: The current restriction from 8am-midnight should be changed to 8am-6pm Monday to Friday only.

Cycle Lanes: We believe that there is potential to install these in Mill Hill Park as currently exist in Dollis Park. We would welcome a similar E-Bike scheme as in Muswell Hill/Haringey. More orbital routes should be explored and cycle racks installed at key location near shops.

Lay by for Buses: Where at all possible these should be installed to improve traffic flow.

Intelligent Traffic Light Timing: There is potential for this to be carried out at Mill Hill Circus, and elsewhere. Vehicles should also be able to turn left on a red light (as works so effectively in USA) giving way to any pedestrians or vehicles.

Bus Timetable/Train Timetable: There does not appear to be any coordination between the arrival of buses and the departure of trains. Again using open data bus drivers should know when a train is arriving and wait for passengers to transfer to the bus. This should also work in reverse.

Parking Infringements: Enforcement really needs to be improved and notably to stop parking on pavements (outside specifically marked bays) and on verges.

Bittacy Roundabout & Holders Hill Road Shopping Areas: Short term parking should be encouraged to free up the limited spaces for shoppers popping in by car (e.g. free 20 minute parking).

DualTrack Tramway/Light Railway: We believe that the current infrequent shuttle tube service between Finchley Central and Mill Hill East Stations should be replaced by a frequent dual Track Tramway/Light Railway service between Finchley Central-Mill Hill East-Mill Hill Broadway-Edgware. The majority of the route still exists from what was originally the Northern Railway and would provide a huge economic benefit to Mill Hill which will be necessary to compete with the development of Brent Cross and encourage the use of public transport (and interchange between the tube and surface rail networks) It is now possible to travel from Mill Hill Broadway by train to Westfield Shopping centre at White City, via West Hampstead and the Overground in 30-40 minutes. As this is so easy and quick, why would you go by car? Such orbital links are required if people are to find public transport more acceptable than using their car. We have now seen the plans for the new Thameslink station at Brent Cross, but it is on the south side of the North Circular Road rather than on the North Side where it could be viable for shoppers visiting the expanded shopping centre. Nobody will use this station in the proposed position, and people will continue to travel by car. In fact it would probably be as quick for Mill Hill residents to get to Westfield by public transport as it would be to get 1/3rd of the distance to Brent Cross shopping centre via the new station. Shoppers coming from further on towards Bedford will simply not bother with Brent Cross either. By connecting Mill Hill East with Mill Hill Broadway residents will be able to easily travel to Gatwick or Luton airports and to St Pancras for Central London and Eurostar. If the lite rail solution

also visited Brent Cross, perhaps it could continue to the new developments at Old Oak, with access to Crossrail (and onwards to Heathrow) and to HS2.

In conclusion, we strongly recommend that your Parking Policy encourages the use of alternative forms of transport and recognises the real need to provide many more parking spaces across the Borough.

We would be pleased to discuss any of the above points with you at any time. We would like to extend an open invitation to you to attend one of our regular committee meetings by arrangement, to engage in further discussions around parking, as we see this topic as a fundamental ingredient of the future economic viability of our neighbourhood.

Cars come off the Watford Way into my road and continue at the speed they were driving at - so they are often speeding at 40/50 mph. There is a sharp bend in my road, and it is only a miracle that has prevented any serious accidents.

Putting bumps in the road is not the answer, but a lit up SLOW DOWN sign would be most helpful.

In someone's infinite wisdom, white lined parking bays have been painted in various locations in Mowbray Road. However, instead of these being painted for safety reasons, they have been painted on BOTH sides of Mowbray Road, right next to the exit from Mowbray Road into Edgwarebury Lane. This means that cars either entering or leaving the road have only one central lane, and motorists cannot see when driving into or out of the road.

These bays need to be removed, as parking just near a corner is dangerous.

I have written to various relevant Departments in Barnet and have had no replies over a long time. I did receive a letter once stating 'they were looking into this', but one can look into a black hole without achieving any results. I did write to the Chief Executive of Barnet, but did not even receive a reply from him.

While a considerable amount of money has been spent on trying to make Station Road, round Edgware Station, look a little brighter with the use of 'window boxes' with flowers in, the state of the shops in the area is getting worse every year. We have too many estate agents and cafes, and of course Charity Shops. Edgware used to be a very pleasant area, but has become a Third World Slum, and is a very sad place now.

With regard to all the parking restrictions and charges, surely it would be better and fairer to all, if we could have machines where we took a ticket, were given at least the first hour free, and then only be charged at the end for the actual time used.

The parking at Edgware Shopping Centre works on this system and I think everyone feels it is fair.

I do object totally to people being charged to use hospital car parks, especially when one does not know how long one is going to be, and we have to pay a lot of money to park.

People visiting hospitals are either sick or visiting relatives who are sick, and should not be charged for this - or only at the end rather than the beginning of the visit, if at all, and at no more than £1 per hour.

It is also quite disgraceful that the staff working in the hospitals are also charged for parking. I suppose patients will soon be charged for being sick!

There are many misleading parking signs in the area. In some places motorists are told to park half on and half off the pavement, often when it is quite safe to park whole on the road, whereas in other places, where it is not safe to park wholly on the road, people have been given parking fines for wishing not to cause obstructions.

There are so many different types of signs, many of which are very small, and difficult to see, especially during the winter months, when it gets dark early. There are also anomalies where parking is restricted in one street and permitted in the next, when both streets are very similar.

Signs should be much more carefully considered both in location and in the way they are written. Many people are fined purely because of the non-understanding of the meaning of signs.

In Mowbray Road, there is no reason whatsoever for people to have to pay for Residents Parking Vouchers. As long as motorists understand and respect that parking in front of someone's driveway is wrong, then there is no reason why people should have to pay for parking in side roads, or have restricted parking. However, there should be no parking permitted on Edgwarebury Lane, as this has buses and cars trying to get through a very busy road. This restriction should only relate to the part of Edgwarebury Lane from the Watford Way down to Station Road.

I am sure you will be too busy to read this, but if you do, I really hope that you will not only take note but actually act on my suggestions and observations.

Unfortunately my 'internet explorer could not display the webpage' on several attempts. I would just like to say the improvements to parking charges in High Barnet are appreciated - especially not HAVING TO USE A MOBILE 'PHONE and struggle (often in the rain) to find a credit card and its details. I particularly applaud the Moxon Street scheme of a 1 hour free parking ticket. I would like to see this repeated at the Hadley Green end of the High Street where 2 hours free parking is offered (WITHOUT A TICKET) - but who is going to trust a parking warden?! There is no proof of arrival time and for that reason I have not used this parking area. I would like to see free tickets available for half an hour minimum everywhere, especially the High Street shopping areas. It might be necessary, for example, to collect medicine or post an urgent letter, needing only a brief parking opportunity. There are lots of other examples, such as dropping items into a charity shop, dry cleaning and so on.

I would like to see a hopper bus facility at High Barnet tube station. I have struggled up that hill a great number of times during my 43 years of living in High Barnet and it is increasingly challenging with age. Even once in the main road there is still further climbing in order to get to a bus stop. The car park is a must for me if I am going to be carrying heavy items and this has been severely reduced in size over the years until now there is very little chance of finding a space. I have never seen

anyone using the enormously expensive extended platforms to facilitate level access to the trains ONCE THE STATION HAS BEEN ACCESSED. Is that because a disabled person cannot easily actually get to the station itself?

London buses have become more frequent, which was always the point I made in general conversation or at meetings as a slow, unreliable service is not going to tempt anyone out of a car. However, it still seems to be very time consuming to travel by public transport from north to west of the borough, eg a visit to 'Barnet' town hall in 'Hendon' is a very time consuming task by public transport, especially if a bus is needed from home to access the bus to Hendon.

Regarding parents taking children to school, this was a problem in the 1970s and still continues. The Council's attitude is a bit blinkered though. It must be remembered that the majority of parents drive to school because they are continuing that journey on to their place of work - and would not have time available to accompany the child to school by public transport/on foot, then return home the same way to begin their own journey to work. It must be remembered that being a working parent is extremely challenging and getting a child to school on time (and collecting) is a stressful challenge. Please don't make it even worse.

- Issue all correctly applied for permits and blue badges within 24 hours of receipt of the application.
 - Refrain from issuing PCNs for parking vouchers which do not bear the vehicle registration number but which are otherwise properly completed/scratched off.
 - Issue warnings for minor contraventions as the default position and only issue PCNs where a motorist has received two warning notices within the previous 12 months.
 - Insist on CEOs adhering to the same rules that motorists are required to follow – i.e. they should park any vehicle they use in the course of their duties in a safe and legal manner, clearly displaying a permit from the council making it clear that their vehicle has permission to park without payment.
 - Do not issue PCN's for infringements that occur after the event has finished for which a time-limited parking restriction has been put in place.
 - Publish regular reviews of the impact of parking enforcement on those with disabilities or who are otherwise vulnerable such as the elderly.
 - Make all decisions about challenges to PCNs (both at the informal challenge and formal appeal stage) by Council officers and not allow NSL to take any part in such processes other than to provide evidence (if required by a Council officer) and to dispatch the correspondence.
 - Publish all TMOs online within 7 days of their approval but in any event before they come into effect.
 - Issue a written apology and pay the appellant 50% of the amount of the disputed PCN when the appellant is successful at PATAS and deduct the costs of so doing from the fees of the contractor which incorrectly issued the PCN in the first place, or, if the error is related to an act or omission of the council, donate that share of the fee to a panel of local charities and charge it against the budget for official travel.
 - Ensure that no bailiff used in recovery has any connection whatsoever, direct or indirect, whether by shares or contracts, with NSL or Capita or any individual who provides services to the council whether personally or through a service company or as an elected member or council officer.
-

I believe there is a consultation taking place now to prevent footway parking.

You may be aware of the recent history of issues in Sellwood Drive, in which I spent 3 months receiving value less parking tickets and arguing with the council to revoke them. I also arranged a petition with all of the residents, to request that our road was again made exempt to the law as it had been previously. We did have a previous incident 3 years earlier, with random ticketing which again the council backed down on and revoked all tickets. However, after I again spent a ridiculous amount of time.

The upshot of the more recent issue was the road was painted with half a dozen parking bays, for guidance only and that no more tickets would be issued. These bays are badly marked random only on one side of the street, and about the size of two smart cars.

I've lived at 29 Sellwood Drive for over 14 years, and the residents have always parked on the footway due to the narrowness of the road. There is no other solution, and it is dangerous to not do this as emergency services can not freely gain access to the road. In addition the refuse collection vehicles, which is already challenging and several incidents have occurred even with cars on both pavements.

Please can some common sense be applied, myself and the residents have been put through enough stress. We live in a quiet culdesac and are respectful of each others parking needs, and also the needs of disabled and pedestrians who use the footway.

I look forward to hearing from you, and do not expect the first thing I know of the consultation outcome is a parking ticket or further marked bays.

Since the parking system was introduced my visitors and I have been patronised and made to feel like:

liars - 'have you REALLY used up all your visitor vouchers? If you want more you'll have to POLITELY write in to ask very nicely for more' - so you're controlling how many friends, visitors and builders I'm allowed(?!)

cheats - visitors have incorrectly scratched the wrong day or date on their visitor voucher resulting in a fine

criminals - the carpenter who attended my house for many days once put the visitor voucher upside down on the stack of vouchers that he had law-abidingly used throughout his time working for us. Or the incident where the voucher for another builder fell on the floor of his car.

Not to mention the time when my mother stood on my doorstep to hand something to me saying 'no dear, I won't come in as I'm

In a hurry' then turned around to see the parking attendant tapping into his machine. When I called the parking office and spoke to Christine I was told 'oh what a shame, why didn't your mother call you to tell you that she was coming, you could then have been standing on the roadside waiting with a ticket to hand over'!!!! I'm sure you will agree that this suggestion is quite ridiculous. I see that in your proposal there still is zero minute wait time before issuing the ticket. Surely a few minutes grace is more realistic.

As a resident living near to Barnet hospital, who charged huge amounts for their visitors to use their

car park, we could hardly ever park outside our own house. This was particularly difficult when returning home with bags of food shopping and 2 young children in tow. Since the hospital was not going to remove or reduce their charges we agreed to having parking restrictions put outside our house. This has resolved the problem, however now we live in fear of getting a parking ticket if we make one of the above errors. My friends and family can no longer call in for a couple of minutes to drop something off without needing a visitor voucher. Is this really how the system is supposed to work? For who's benefit - I would suggest that this is not really putting the community first.

You may also wish to know that after waiting nearly 2 months for my parking permit to come through and chasing up the parking team several times, it turned out that my permit was sent to a random address in zone H (I'm in zone C). Justine was very helpful in eventually sorting this out (after others before failed). During this time my husband had received his permit straight away but after approx. 2 months received a PCN(!) It turned out that his permit was also printed with zone H on it although his one managed to be sent to our house. My husband spoke to the parking office who said that they'd resolve the problem and cancelled the PCN but when Justine phoned me back, the same day, in relation to my problem, I was told that both our vehicles were still registered against zone H(!). We have now both received the correct parking permits - Twice(!).

Finally, last week, I received a letter notifying me that a payment for visitor vouchers failed to go through due to a problem with your system. I am going to query whether this was a legitimate letter from yourselves as it suggested to make a bank transfer to a co-op bank account? With IP fraud around us I am concerned that possibly this was a scam letter as something did not feel right about the quality and style of the letter.

So there's a brief summary of some of the problems I've had with your scheme and that I'd like you to take into consideration when visiting your new parking policy.

I do not tend to complain about anything however the headaches and trouble that this parking scheme has caused since it's introduction is, quite frankly, time consuming, stressful and a nightmare! ...but one that can easily be improved upon by genuinely "Putting the Community First".

I understand that the issue of parking on the footway is rearing it's ugly head again, this is getting beyond a joke. As you may not know this whole issue has cost me a couple of thousand pounds. I was so fed up with the whole thing I have had a driveway laid and paid the council a £1000 to drop the kerb. I feel that the residents are being harassed by Barnet council with this matter. It has only taken one person to complain about the parking in Sellwood Drive and the council have done everything in their control to sort it out without ever consulting the residents. The thing that gets me is the person who has complained is not even a resident of Sellwood Drive they use it as a cut through. They do not use the new dropped kerb to get to the alley way and do not even use the foot ways, they continue to come up the middle of the road causing their own log jam.

Points

1. Parking pays are too small for an average car.
2. Not on both sides of the road
3. No one uses the new dropped walk way.
4. We still have issues with large vehicles trying to get through.

5. Footway becomes smaller on a Tuesday as it is bin day.

I would like to take this opportunity to add my thoughts on the below, and believe I speak on behalf of the residents;

1. It looks like the Council will no longer exempt roads, to allow parking on the footway.
2. The parking bays are being introduced, so the residents park in an appropriate manner.

My concerns are;

- (a) There will not be enough parking bays to fullfill the needs of the residents.
- (b) This then opens up the residents to parking tickets.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that the plans are going to be shared with the residents before any further work is physically done in the street. The last lot of plans that were executed were a complete waste of time and money, and showed the lack of common sense / courtesy applied to the situation.

I would be very pleased if we could keep in touch to keep a sensible communication going, the last saga was very unsatisfactory. You can probably understand my frustration when attending a Council meeting, the advice I was given was to park elsewhere. Not to mention my 7 tickets, and several reminders all for £0 - I'm sure you would agree a waste of the Council's and residents money.
