

Question number	Item number	Raised by	Question	Answer
1	11	Sam Benson	Please can you clarify the point on page 44 sections 2.100 not to proceed with the proposed introduction of an amended CPZ in Area 5 at this time? Does it mean that this is only a temporary decision and can be overturned in the future?	<p>The recommendation is as specified in paragraph 2.100.</p> <p>It should be noted that any decision made at committee is permanent, unless specifically stated. However any issue can be revisited in the future if considered appropriate.</p>
2	11 1.2 'Due to the scale of regeneration careful consideration is required to safeguard the parking needs of local residents, businesses and visitors to the area.'	Terri Penman	<i>In the above point you make very clear reference to the fact that careful consideration has to be given to safeguard the parking needs of the local residents but you have not taken this into account with regard to the residents here at Gervase Road. We have taken it upon ourselves to undertake a Petition which was submitted to you with regard to why we</i>	<p>Careful consideration is needed to safeguard the parking needs of local residents, businesses and visitors to the area.</p> <p>The petition that was submitted by the residents of Gervase Road has been noted by officers and the Council does acknowledge that the petition indicates that there are parking</p>

		<p><i>request the boundary line to be extended but you have chosen not to action this. Why have you chosen not to consider us under this point?</i></p>	<p>pressures in the road which are affecting residents' parking needs.</p> <p>Officers' observations and knowledge of the area, suggest that the pressures encountered in Gervase Road may also exist in other local roads such as Thirleby Road, Gilbert Grove and surrounding roads and although the residents of these roads did not respond to the consultation and make their views about the parking in the area.</p> <p>Officers are concerned that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment to the whole area.</p>
--	--	---	---

				<p>In short, to introduce a CPZ into one single road within a network of roads is not recommended as the parking problems would simply move onto the uncontrolled neighbouring roads.</p> <p>There appears to be a wider commuter parking issue in the burnt Oak Area which Officers expect - particularly after the representation received from Gervase Road - should be investigated further as part of the future review of the CPZ, if agreed.</p>
3	11 2.7 Feedback was also welcome from residents who lived outside the area or who visited the area, even if they did not	Terri Penman	<i>In the above point you make reference to the fact that you welcomed feedback from residents</i>	Although every effort is made to directly consult every property, The Council does not always receive a

	<p>have access to a vehicle or were a non-driver via a separate online questionnaire.</p>		<p><i>who lived outside the areas and yet in your arguments as to why we cannot be included in the CPZ at this time you make reference that no one other Than Gervase Road made any comments with regard to the problem with parking. NO ONE outside the areas involved in the CPZ knew anything of what was going to happen with regard to the consultation, as you did not inform anyone outside of the Areas of your proposed actions. So why have you used this as an argument against us to not extend the boundary line?</i></p>	<p>response from everyone consulted; Details of the Colindale parking consultation and proposals were published on the Council's website for the wider public to view.</p> <p>Feedback to consultations is always welcome as it gives a greater understanding of the potential impact of any proposal.</p> <p>In the case of Gervase Road, this is the only road where residents made parking related representations in the consultation period and therefore there are no recent comments from residents of other roads to suggest how they feel about the parking in the area, which could supplement the Gervase Road residents'</p>
--	---	--	---	--

				<p>request.</p> <p>The concern Officers have is that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
4	<p>11</p> <p>2.19 It is apparent that in some streets parking pressure is already at an unacceptable level and introduction of parking controls in the form of a CPZ are supported.</p>	<p>Terri Penman</p>	<p><i>This above point clearly shows that you know there is already a unacceptable level of parking pressure on residents and our petition</i></p>	<p>The petition that was submitted by the residents of Gervase Road has been noted and the Council does acknowledge that the petition indicates that there</p>

			<p><i>clearly supports this as residents of Gervase Road but you have not considered this, why?</i></p>	<p>are parking pressures in the road which are affecting residents' lives.</p> <p>The concern Officers have is that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
5	<p>11 Area 1 2.22 Of 64 responses 52 (81%) supported the introduction of a CPZ in their road.</p>	<p>Terri Penman</p>	<p><i>The above 3 points reference the fact that there is considerable problems with</i></p>	<p>During the preliminary design of the CPZ, it was considered appropriate to include the area bounded by Montrose Avenue to the</p>

	<p>Of the 14 roads consulted 8 roads supported the introduction of CPZ, more importantly this incorporated <i>Silkstream Road</i></p> <p>2.25 A number of parking issues, some already mentioned in previous correspondence, highlighting support for a CPZ included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Parking on both sides of narrow roads obscuring sightlines and blocking access for the emergency services and refuse collections. > Obstructive parking across driveways. > High levels of commuter parking associated with users of Burnt Oak Underground Station and staff from businesses on Edgware Road, 		<p><i>parking in Silkstream Road, you have accepted this to be valid and so have recommended the CPZ, however this road runs parallel with Gervase Road behind us and faces the same problems but yet you have not considered our letter and petition as valid even though we share the same distress and aggressive parking. Why ?</i></p>	<p>south, Watling Avenue to the north, A5 Burnt Oak Broadway to the west and the northern line tracks to the east in the proposals.</p> <p>The petition that was submitted by the residents of Gervase Road is noted and the Council does acknowledge that the petition indicates that there are parking pressures in the road which are affecting residents' lives.</p> <p>It is accepted that Gervase Road may be subject to similar issues to those encountered in Silk stream Road and neighbouring roads, and that there is a will for a CPZ to be introduced.</p> <p>The concern Officers have is that to seek to address the</p>
--	--	--	---	---

	<p>particularly car dealerships. Visitors to events at St Alphage Church Hall. Parents parking at school drop-off and pick-up times. Overnight commercial vehicles i.e lorries and vans overnight.</p> <p>2.31 It is therefore recommended that the committee note the results of the consultation and authorise to proceed with a statutory consultation on proposal to introduce a CPZ Monday to Friday between 8am and 6.30pm in Area 1.</p>			<p>issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
6	<p>11 Area 3 2.42 Of the 37 roads consulted, respondents from 11 roads supported a CPZ – of these 11 roads the most significant to us is</p>	Terri Penman	<i>The above 3 points reference the fact that there are considerable problems with</i>	In any CPZ design, the CPZ has to end at the boundary line and usually the geography of the area dictates that there will be a road immediately outside

	<p>2.46 <i>Montrose Avenue.</i> Many residents viewed the proposals as financially motivated and were opposed to the imposition of additional expense on families in a deprived area of the borough, ALTHOUGH THEY ACKNOWLEDGED THAT PARKING COULD BE A PROBLEM.</p> <p>2.47 Despite opposition to a CPZ, a number of parking issues were highlighted as needing attention. These issues included></p> <p>> Parking of both sides of narrow roads obscuring sightlines and blocking access for the emergency services and refuse collections. Obstructive Parking and congestion particularly on <i>Booth Road</i> Introduction of</p>		<p><i>parking In Montrose Avenue and Booth Road, to which you have accepted this to be valid and so have recommended the CPZ, However Booth Road runs into Gervase Road by crossing over Montrose Avenue but yet you have not considered our letter and petition as valid even though we share the same distress and aggressive parking. Why ?</i></p>	<p>the CP which lies adjacent to a road within the CPZ.</p> <p>In the case of the geography at the Booth Road/Montrose Avenue/Gervase Road junction, it is considered that, Montrose Avenue should serve as the CPZ boundary road, while omitting the network of roads north of that junction.</p> <p>The petition that was submitted by the residents of Gervase Road is noted and the Council does acknowledge that the petition indicates that there are parking pressures in the road which are affecting residents' lives.</p> <p>The concern Officers have is that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase</p>
--	---	--	---	--

	<p>controls in private housing owned parking areas to deter non-resident parking!</p>			<p>Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
7	<p>11 In addition a petition has been received from residents of Gervase Road requesting that the boundary of the Colindale CPZ consultation be extended to include Gervase Road to the Hendon Area Residents Forum on 23rd January 2018.</p>	<p>Terri Penman</p>	<p><i>With regard to the above 3 point please can I advise that the summary listed above is incorrect in what our concerns are or what our petition said. Our concerns were much more detailed</i></p>	<p>As previously stated, The report seeks to summarise the issues raised in the petition, however Officers apologise if you believe the summary does not fully cover what was said in the petition.</p> <p>Please be assured that the</p>

	<p>2.49 In support of their request, petitioners explained that they continued to suffer from high levels of non-residents parking associated with commuters using Burnt Oak Underground station.</p> <p>2.50 Due to the pressure on parking they found that they often could not park close to their home and sometimes had to park in adjacent streets such as Montrose Avenue. They expressed concern that if CPZ controls were introduced the situation would get worse as residents of the new CPZ who did not wish to purchase a permit would be displaced into their road.</p>		<p><i>than this and not that residents who do not wish to purchase a permit will be displaced into our road but the fact that non-residents who use all the roads surrounding our road will be displaced into Gervase Road and this is what my letter said which was posted through all the Residents Doors of Gervase Road plus this was also attached to the petition that was summited to yourselves. I think that perhaps wires have got crossed as our concerns are for non-residents who</i></p>	<p>petition that was submitted by the residents of Gervase Road has been noted and the Council does acknowledge that the petition indicates that there are parking pressures in the road which are affecting residents' lives.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

			<p><i>already use our road and all the surrounding roads as a free means of parking which will mean that once the CPZ comes into operation the only road not included in the CPZ is us. With the ongoing problem now i.e the shoppers who park in Gervase Road to go shopping up the high Street of Burnt Oak, the commuters who park their cars in Gervase Road and then disappear until they have finished work and do not return to collect their cars until 7pm onwards, the parents that park and leave there</i></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>cars to take their children to the 2 schools in the adjacent street, the industrial work vans that are parked and left overnight and the abandoned and dumped motor vehicles. These are the problems that we already face and yet you do not consider this to be a problem to be considered when the CPZ is implemented. This was the main argument of our petition so please why have you chosen not to consider this as you have already reference the same problems</i></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>throughout this paper and granted the CPZ on the same grounds?</i></p>	
8	<p>11 Officers are aware of the current levels of parking stress in roads around Burnt Oak Underground station but with the exception of Gervase Road have received no similar requests for the introduction of parking controls.</p>	<p>Terri Penman</p>	<p><i>Firstly in response to the above point no one outside of the consulted CPZ areas even knew that such a consultation was occurring. I only investigated because I have a friend who works for Barnet Council and they were discussing that when they move to their new offices</i></p>	<p>Feedback to consultations is always welcome as it gives a greater understanding of the potential impact of any proposal.</p> <p>We could not directly consult every property about each proposal and the extent of consultation area has to end somewhere.</p> <p>Details of the Colindale parking consultation and proposals were published on</p>

			<p><i>there would be heavy parking restrictions. This was no more than a general conversation until I saw a very small article in the Barnet First Magazine which referenced the CPZ Consultation to which I then googled and found the listed consultations papers with Maps and so forth. I then took it upon myself to inform all the residents of Gervase Road as to what was the proposed plan and formulate their responses which lead to the petition.</i></p>	<p>the Council's website for the wider public to view.</p> <p>There have been discussions with a Burnt Oak Ward Councillor about these issues, however the number of representations he had received or the geographic origination of those representations was not detailed to justify a one-road or area-wide CPZ.</p> <p>In considering whether Gervase Road should have a CPZ now, the concern Officers have is that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>I feel that it is a very unfair comment to make in point 2.52 that no similar requests have been made as to my knowledge no one outside of the CPZ areas even Knew this was happening so how can you use that as an excuse as to exclude us?</i></p> <p><i>And secondly if you review Ward Councillor Comments: 2.121 At a meeting on 8th February 2018, Councillor C O'Macauley (Burnt Oak ward) expressed particular concern over the current parking situation in roads</i></p>	<p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

***surrounding the
Burnt Oak
Underground
Station and the
implications for the
residents of the
introduction of
additional CPZ's in
Colindale.***

***2.122He advised
that in addition to
representations
from Gervase Road,
he was often
approached by
residents from other
roads on similar
parking issues.***

***Councillor C
OMacauley clearly
states in the Ward
Councillor
comments that he
has personally
spoken with***

			<p>residents of Burnt Oak about the current unacceptable levels of parking stress, so again why have you made the point 2.52 against us as to exclude us from the CPZ consultation? As the answer to point 2.52 is clearly more detailed in answering and your conclusion is technically wrong.</p>	
9	11	Mrs M. Nunn	<p><i>I have non-residents parking over my drive and leaving it there for hours and sometimes in extreme cases it has been left until they come back from work in the evening. I have spoken with Barnet Council on numerous occasions in fact as</i></p>	<p>If a motorist has parked in a way where your vehicle crossover (dropped kerb) is being obstructed, then you could contact the Parking Enforcement Team on 020 8359 7446 to arrange for enforcement action to take place against the contravening vehicle.</p>

			<p><i>recently as 2 weeks ago. I already have a dropped kerb but this this does not deter non-residents from parking there. Other roads in our area have residents parking only, why can't we be the same?</i></p>	<p>In addition, the Council, upon receipt of a completed application form and the requisite charge, can consider the introduction of a white line across the dropped kerb, which may act as a further indicator that an access is in situ.</p> <p>Currently, other public roads in the Burnt Oak area currently do not have residents parking only.</p> <p>Furthermore in considering whether Gervase Road should have a CPZ now, the concern Officers have is that to seek to address the issues raised by Gervase Road residents in isolation at this time without any consideration to the neighbouring roads may be</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>of overall detriment as outlined in the response to item 2.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that parking in the area should be revisited, if agreed, as part of the review of the CPZ, again as outlined in the response to item 2.</p>
10	11	Patrica Sharp	<p><i>I have been a resident for 30 years in Gervase Road and have watched the parking not only in Gervase Road but the adjacent roads become more and more congested. We are all for the residents parking here which would push all the non-residents into the Burnt Oak station car park. It would stop all the aggressive parking that we have to witness on a</i></p>	<p>Same Response as Item 2</p>

			<i>daily basis. Why are you not listening to us?</i>	
11	11	Deirdre McCaul	<i>As a resident of Gervase Road with a special needs child I understand that your recommendation is for the CPZ not to be extended to include us here in Gervase Road. With the CPZ being implemented in all the surrounding roads to us, ie, Silkstream Road, Booth Road and Montrose Avenue all the cars in these roads will move to Gervase Road even though we already face desperate problems with parking. What options do you leave for me? 1) I cannot get a space, 2) I cannot get a blue badge, 3) I cannot get a dropped kerb?</i>	Officers would be happy to talk to this resident to discuss their particular circumstances with a view to proposing short term options and identifying a possible solution.

12	11	Sarah Middleton-Johnson	<i>I leave home every morning at 5.30am. I see cars parking and catching the tube with me! When I try to park I cannot get a bay and have to park in Montrose Avenue. How will that affect me? I live on Gervase Road but will be pushed to park on a road with restrictions, when there is parking at the tube station for only 2 pound per day. As a resident I am willing to</i>	Same Response as item 2

			<i>pay the council for resident parking, why is this so difficult for you to understand and accept?</i>	
--	--	--	--	--

Item number	Raised by	Comment
11	Helen Brown on behalf of residents	For the reasons set out in the replies to Consultation Questionnaire, the corresponding Petition where almost 100 signatures against a Controlled Parking Zone was submitted and further assertions from residents during the meeting on the 23 January, we the residents of Colin Crescent and Colin Gardens strongly urge Barnet to ardently hear the reasons, the voices of residents, the voices of the elderly, the families, the singles and also the young who live day-to-day on the above Roads. We residents know what it's really like on these quiet roads and strongly believe a CPZ is not at necessary. We finally urge the decision makers to pay close attention to our respective submissions which represent our wishes.
11	Sama Mohammadi-Amlashi	I am a resident of 1 Brancaster Drive, NW7 2SQ and on behalf of the members of this property, I would like to please appeal the extension of the proposed parking restrictions of both sides of Longfield Avenue extending into Brancaster Drive. The parking restrictions would cause great inconvenience to my family and I. I am not in favour of these parking restrictions.

11	Christine Butt	<p>Regarding Area 4 and the CPZ suggestion I would reiterate our request on behalf of the residents of Wardell Close that the CPZ is not introduced in our road as it's just not needed.</p> <p>We are a cul de sac and not near any large place of employment or a tube/train station. Many residents have garages (thou few actually use them to keep their cars), there are also various areas of hard standing.</p> <p>I sincerely hope the council take our wishes into account when coming to their decision.</p>
11	Emma Halai	<p>I do not see the need to make Longfield Avenue restricted parking. I have lived here for nearly 6 years and have not encountered problems parking on the road.</p> <p>During the week the road is fairly empty so I don't see the benefit of making this a controlled parking zone, other than the money it would make for the council!</p> <p>I would have to pay for a permit and visitor vouchers when there is no need for it!</p>