

## **Appendix B**

### **Summary of comments and objections received in statutory consultation period**

#### **Area 1 – The Vale area**

- 23 items were received from residents
- 2 items were received from businesses
- 1 item was received from a local school

A summary of the feedback is as follows:

- 15 representations were received from residents of The Vale stated they were in favour of the CPZ proposals.
- 11 of these 15 expressed a desire to be included in the Golders Green 'H' CPZ rather than the Cricklewood 'C1' CPZ as The Vale is NW11 rather than NW2, and is closer to Golders Green rather than Cricklewood.
- 3 representations were received from residents of Hamlet Square. 2 were in favour of the controls, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> stated that residents of Hamlet Square park on The Vale as there is not enough space in their own road to park and should therefore be made eligible for permits.
- In Pentland Close, 1 was in favour of the CPZ and 1 was against the CPZ proposals as they did not want to have to pay to park.
- Of those who were against the CPZ proposal, the majority considered the proposals to be a money making scheme or do not want to pay to park outside their homes. It was also mentioned that the proposals would likely cause displaced parking into nearby uncontrolled roads.
- The local school outlined concerns that the introduction of a CPZ in this area would make it difficult for teachers and support staff to attend the school as they currently utilise these uncontrolled roads for parking.
- The two items of correspondence received from businesses on The Vale stated they are against the introduction of the CPZ as it will have a detrimental effect on their business. They consider CPZs to be unfair on businesses, the business permit costs being too high and employees and customers being unable to park. They suggest a better option would be to reassess the existing boundary of the existing C1 CPZ as they believe the roads to be underutilised.

Comments were also received relating to the proposed parking layout, as follows:

- Request for yellow lines near the width restriction in The Vale as vehicles should not be able to be parked close to them
- That longer lengths of double yellow lines than what was proposed on Mendip Drive are needed in order to sufficiently improve the safety and traffic flow.
- That double yellow lines are also needed on the junction of Mendip Drive and Cheviot Gardens
- That double yellow lines should be introduced on all junctions within the Golders Green Estate.

## **Area 2 – Granville Road and Mortimer Close**

9 representations were received.

- 2 items were from businesses operating from Granville Road,
- 5 items were from residents of Granville Road
- 1 item was from an employee of a local school

A summary of the feedback is as follows:

- 1 item was against the CPZ in its entirety.
- 5 were in favour and emphasised the need for a CPZ.

A relatively low number of general comments and concerns were raised, including:

- that Granville Road is unsuitable for large vehicles as it is not wide enough, and that it would benefit from a 5tonne weight restriction rather than introducing waiting restrictions along certain lengths.
- the businesses' concerns related to them potentially losing customers should the controls be introduced and cost of permits being too high.

### **Area 3 – Garth Road and Cloister Road**

12 representations were received:

- 9 items were received from residents
- 1 item was received from the Childs Hill Clinic
- 1 item was received from the Palm Court Hotel

A summary of the feedback is as follows:

- The majority of respondents were to be in favour of the proposals although, for a number of these their main cause of concern related to whether the Palm Court Hotel would be made eligible for permits, as they consider the hotel to be the significant cause of the parking problems.
- that there was concern about residents of Hendon Way being eligible for permits, the perception of which would reduce the parking provision for residents of Garth Road and Cloister Road.
- That the proposed hours of operation would not cover functions held at the hotel as these can start after 8pm, which is when the worst of the parking problems occur.

#### Clinic-related parking

The correspondence received from the Childs Hill Clinic informed that the clinic runs many essential services, groups and clinics from this centre and therefore, the concern is that as the centre does not have any off street parking, these services will be compromised, staff and users of the clinic will not be able to attend should the proposals be introduced as they are. The clinic would need more parking provision to operate.

#### Hotel-related parking

The Palm Court Hotel commissioned a parking survey of Garth Road and Cloister Road and submitted this survey to the council along with a letter of objection. Their main cause of concern being the proposed CPZ would impact on business operation. Comments and objections received from the hotel are as follows:

- The low response rate of the informal consultation indicates a significant majority of residents are not concerned about the existing parking situation
- The majority of respondents of Cloister Road said 'no' to CPZ controls during the informal consultation
- There is no survey evidence to support the CPZ proposal. Hotel requests a full and proper consultation process with a survey and local residents to be fully informed of implications.
- The hotel pays significant business rates and therefore should share the same entitlement as residents.
- Request all bays to be shared use to incorporate pay by phone parking provision.

#### **Area 4 – Excluded roads and general**

16 items of correspondence was received

A summary of the feedback is as follows:

- that there would be an adverse effect on the uncontrolled roads of the Golders Green Estate should the proposed measures be introduced in that there would be increased number of parked vehicles and congestion in these roads
- that the proposals are a money making exercise which would inevitably result in the CPZ being extended

Other comments made were as follows:

- that CPZ's are unfair, benefit some residents more than others, i.e. those not included.
- that signs and lines associated with CPZs are not aesthetically pleasing
- that the existing CPZ boundary should be reassessed rather than extend controls
- that extending CPZ would make it harder for school employees.