

**The Executive  
2003***on 16 September***Report title:** Highgate Controlled Parking Zone**Report of:** The Director of Environmental Services**Ward(s) affected:** Highgate**1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to summarise the feedback from the public consultation carried out in June 2003 and to seek approval to authorise statutory consultation on a CPZ scheme as detailed in Section 10.0 and shown in Appendix V of this report.

**2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Executive:

2.1.1 Note feedback from consultations set out in the report.

2.1.2 Authorise statutory consultation on a CPZ scheme as detailed in Section 10.0 and shown in Appendix V of this report.

2.1.3 If there are no valid objections, delegate the making of the Traffic Management Order and all necessary related action to the Director of Environmental Services.

2.1.4 If there are valid objections, refer the decision as to the making or modification of the Traffic Management Order to the Executive Member for Environment and request the Leader to agree this referral.

**Report authorised by:** .....  
Peter Norton, Director of Environmental Services

**Contact officer:** Tony Kennedy, Group Leader Traffic & Road Safety

**Telephone:** 020 8489 1765

### **3.0 Executive summary**

- 3.1 To consider implementation of a controlled parking zone in a number of core roads which border LB Camden and LB Islington, following various meetings with residents, businesses, schools and local councillors and the analysis of the feedback from the public consultation conducted in June/July 2003.

### **4.0 Access to information: Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

- 4.1 The following background papers have been used in the preparation of this report:
- Returned questionnaires
  - Executive committee July 2002 Borough Parking Plan
  - Correspondence via letter / email
- 4.2 For access to background papers or any further information, please contact  
Tony Kennedy on 020 8489 1765

## **5.0 Background**

- 5.1 In July 2002, The Executive considered the implementation programme for the Borough Parking Plan. This included the investigation for the possible implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone in the Highgate Area. Funding was made available from Transport for London (TfL) to investigate parking stress and consult the community within the area.
- 5.2 Public local consultation concerning the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Highgate Area (see Appendix I) was carried out in June 2003. Leaflets, containing detachable questionnaires, inviting public response were distributed to around 5750 households.

## **6.0 Pre-Consultation Activity**

- 6.1 Prior to the public consultation, three evening workshops were held at the Civic Centre, Wood Green in order to gauge the views of the community. They were held in the first quarter of 2003, the last was held 5 March 2003.

- 6.2 The aim of the workshops was to talk to representatives of local residents groups and the business community about their views on the parking and traffic pressures in the area and about how best to proceed with local consultation.
- 6.3 The first two workshops gave residents the opportunity to express their opinions and suggestions. The last workshop was aimed at the business community, and was attended by business representatives from Archway Road and Highgate Village areas. The results of these discussions were noted and circulated to all attendees.
- 6.4 One of the main suggestions made at all the workshops was that a Working Group be formed to work with the Council in drawing up the detailed proposals and finalise the consultation process. Subsequently, volunteers were invited from the workshop attendees and a Working Group was formed. The Working Group consisted of local councillors, representatives from the business community and schools, residents associations and council officers.
- 6.5 Two meetings were held 30 April and 7 May at the Highgate Society, 10a South Grove, Highgate. The Working Group helped shape the consultation boundary, the wording and the questions asked in the consultation materials, which were delivered to the community.
- 6.6 In parallel to the Working Group meetings, the Council attended three schools within the area namely, Highgate Primary School, Channing Girls' School, St. Michael's Church of England School in order to answer any questions they might have regarding the proposal. Highgate School for Boys was also contacted.

## **7.0 The Consultation Process**

- 7.1 The first stage of the full public consultation was the distribution of the consultation materials, which the Working Groups helped finalise (see Appendix II for leaflet). The area of distribution consists of most of the Highgate Ward especially around areas experiencing parking stress (see Appendix I).
- 7.2 Distribution of the consultation materials was completed on 10 June 2003. The return date stated 27 June 2003. A weeks grace (w/e 4 July 2003) was agreed for the return of questionnaires and pre-paid envelopes provided.
- 7.3 Subsequent deliveries, where the materials were delivered, but not received were made throughout the duration of the consultation, and

where evident the materials were not received, redelivery arrangements were made. On receiving communication from residents about failure to receive the consultation materials officers swiftly posted the materials to individuals where it was appropriate to do so.

- 7.4 Three exhibitions were held concurrently with the distribution of the consultation materials. The community was encouraged to attend and officers were available to answer queries the community might have. The exhibitions were held at the following venues:-

- St. Augustine's Church Crypt , Thursday 5 June 4pm-9pm
- Highgate Society Hall Thursday 12 June, 4pm-9pm
- Jackson's Lane Community Centre Friday 13 June, 10am-5pm

- 7.5 To make the community aware of the consultation, notifications were placed on lighting columns throughout the area consulted. A number of contact details, including telephone numbers the community could contact in order to request the consultation materials, should they not have received it, or for general enquiries was included.

- 7.6 Delivery checks were conducted 24 June 2003 on a sample number of roads in different sections of consultation area namely, Claremont Road, Jackson's Lane, Kingsley Place, Somerset Gardens, Storey Road, Gaskell Road, Yeatman Road. The delivery checks confirmed that deliveries were successful.

## **8.0 Consultation Feedback**

- 8.1 Of the 5750 households delivered to, 1953 returns were received, of which, 63 were declared invalid due to lack of any form of postal address. This represents a 34% return on the number of leaflets distributed. Detailed analysis of the consultation replies is shown in Appendix III.

- 8.2 Generally, the responses received indicated that the area as a whole was not in favour of the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone. Although a smaller area within the area consulted have concerns regarding forthcoming developments which the proposal in section 10.0 of this document addresses.

- 18% were in favour of the proposals
- 81% were against
- A negligible number of returns were undecided

- 8.3 The majority of respondents in the following 3 roads were in favour of the introduction of a CPZ: Bloomfield Rd, Cromwell Place and Somerset Gardens.

Road Name	In Favour of a CPZ	Not in favour of a CPZ	No. of responses from road	% In favour
Bloomfield Road	12	6	18	67%
Cromwell Place	9	0	9	100%
Somerset Gardens	3	2	5	60%

- 8.4 The majority of respondents in the following 63 roads were opposed to the introduction of a CPZ:-

Archway Rd, Bishop's Rd, Bramalea Close, Broadlands Rd, Broughton Grd, Castle Yard, Causton Rd, Cholmeley Crescent, Cholmeley Park, Chruch Road, Claremont Road, Cromwell Avenue, Gaskell Rd, Highgate Avenue, Highgate Close, Highgate High Street, Highgate Hill, Hillcrest, Hillside Gardens, Holmesdale Road, Hornsey Lane, Hornsey Lane Gardens, Jacksons Lane, Kenwood, Kingsley Place, Langden Park Road, Milton Avenue, Milton Park, Milton Road, Muswell Hill Road, North Grove, North Hill, North Road, Northhill Avenue, Northwood Road, Oldfield Mews, Onslow Gardens, Orchard Road, Parkwood Mews, Priory Gardens, Ridings Close, Shepherd's Close, Shepherds Hill, South Close, Southwood Avenue, Southwood Lawn Road, Stanhope Gardens, Stanhope Road, Storey Road, Summersby, Talbot Road, The Bank, The Park, Tile Kiln Lane, Toyne Way, Wembury Road, Winchester Place, Winchester Road, Wood Lane, Yeatman Road.

- 8.5 Of the roads opposed to the proposals, but only marginally (less than 10% difference between those in favour / against) two roads meet this criteria. They are summarised as follows:-

Road Name	In favour of CPZ	Not in favour of CPZ	% In favour	% Against	Margin
Cromwell Avenue	35	37	52	48	2%
Highgate Hill	5	7	42	58	8%

- 8.6 Hours of operation:-

The consultation document offered options regarding the hours of operation the scheme should run. The options were as follows:-

- 2 hours
- all day controls (8.30am-6.30pm)
- all day controls plus evenings (8.30am-10pm)
- twenty-four hour controls

- 8.7 In addition to the options, the community was given the opportunity to specify hours other than the options given. 869 (46%) responses indicated a preference regarding the hours of operation. The breakdown of these preferences is as follows:-

	<b>2 hours</b>	<b>8.30am-6.30pm</b>	<b>8.30-10pm</b>	<b>24 hours</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Responses</b>	576	212	43	25	13
<b>%</b>	66	24	5	3	2

- 8.8 Weekend operation:-

The consultation document offered options regarding operating the scheme during the weekend. The questions asked was as follows:-  
*'Do you think parking controls should also operate on Saturdays and/ or Sundays in the area ?'*

1289 (68%) responses indicated a preference regarding weekend operation. A breakdown of the preferences is as follows:-

	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Sunday</b>	<b>Not in favour of weekend operation</b>
<b>Responses</b>	148	71	1070
<b>%</b>	11	6	83

- 8.9 Comments were encouraged and included as a question on the questionnaire. The common themes of the comments are shown in Appendix IV.

## 9.0 Proposed Way Forward

- 9.1 It is important to acknowledge that the consultation area was an unusually large one due to the inclusion of roads around Highgate Underground Station as well as the roads due to be affected by the imminent CPZs from neighbouring boroughs; and although the overall response indicates that in the area as a whole current parking problems do not warrant a wholesale CPZ, the consultation did identify pockets of areas suffering from parking stress caused by commuters.
- 9.2 These responses from the pocketed areas have encouraged the Council to look at locally specific solutions rather than a blanket approach. It was also important that the genuine needs and problems of particular areas were not overlooked or cancelled by the broader figures.
- 9.3 From the feedback we have clearly identified the following areas as suffering from parking stress but we would not be able to include them within a zone at this time as they are isolated pockets and would not be able to be practically included within a zone:-

- 9.3.1 Bloomfield Road area:- has fears about the impact of a new retail development on the Archway Road and already suffers with problems from the Court House that functions at the northern end of the Bloomfield Road. However, businesses fear that there is not enough available kerbside space in the area at present as TfL currently controls parking along Archway Rd, and for a distance on a number of side roads within this area.
- 9.3.2 Priory Gardens:- although not in favour of the scheme have made representations that indicate support for a scheme with specific hours of operation to address their localised needs. The comments received indicate this and residents of Priory Gardens feel their road is most heavily affected by commuters, however they feel a separate sub zone is necessary as the road can barely accommodate residents from Priory Gardens, let alone the parking stress caused by commuters.
- 9.3.3 Somerset Gardens have shown support for the scheme:- however the road is accessed via Kingsley Place, which are opposed to the scheme. As the road is isolated we would advise against implementing a scheme in this road at this time. However, a common concern amongst residents of Kingsley Place was that parking space was not fully utilised in the preliminary design of the scheme, which we would hope to readdress come any further consultation or review.
- 9.4 The other area identified as having parking stress, but is not isolated and therefore could be included within a zone, is the area around Highgate Hill/ High Street and Cromwell Road areas. These areas will be most adversely affected by the imminent CPZ development in LB Camden and the existing CPZ in LB Islington
- 9.5 In addition to the questionnaires, there has been over 50 letters received from Cromwell Road, Cromwell Place, Winchester Road and Winchester Place strongly requesting some form of controlled parking in their area. It is clear from this that the residents in this area acknowledge that they are the most likely area to experience displaced parking from LB Islington and LB Camden's CPZ developments. On this basis this report recommends that Highgate High Street, The Bank, Cromwell Avenue, Cromwell Place, Winchester Road and Winchester Place be considered for a CPZ. (Appendix V)
- 9.6 The introduction of a significantly smaller zone has firm justification in transport planning terms and is in line with Government transport policies as well as the Mayor's overall transport strategy to protect areas where there is likelihood of further parking stress as a result of congestion charging.

- 9.7 Further, it should be noted that in order to address the concerns of those residents currently suffering parking stress as described in paras 9.3 localised proposals could be sought for these areas on an individual basis, i.e. road by road.

## **10.0 Description Of The Proposed Scheme**

- 10.1 Roads to be included within the proposals for statutory consultation:- Cromwell Avenue, Cromwell Place, Highgate High Street, The Bank, Winchester Place and Winchester Road.

A plan of which can be seen in Appendix V.

- 10.2 The following basic principles have been adopted in the design of the scheme:

- To maximise the amount of kerbside space available for parking consistent with maintaining adequate accessibility and freedom from obstruction – especially for the emergency services and other essential services such as refuse collection vehicles.
- To give the highest priority to the parking needs of residents.
- To provide as far as possible for short-term parking needs.
- To provide for the parking needs of residents' visitors.
- To provide for the legitimate parking requirements of local businesses.
- To minimise sign clutter.
- Weight has been added to the figures that followed the public consultation, bearing in mind LB Camden's plans to implement their CPZ, and requests of residents not to split the high street via the introduction of a CPZ on LB Camden's side of the high street.

- 10.3 Type and Distribution of Parking Bays:-

- It is proposed that short-stay parking needs be met by pay and display machines.
- It is proposed that Visitors' parking permits are valid in all bays available for residents' permit holders.

- 10.4 In order to achieve flexibility in the use of parking spaces, three different classes of bays have been defined. The usage of which will be assessed after a review of scheme.



- Residents' bays located throughout the area. All bays to be available to their visitors.
- Pay and display bays, located on Highgate High Street available for up to 2 hours parking.
- Business bays, located close to local business areas, where there is less pressure from residents.
- Existing disabled doctors' bays, loading / waiting restrictions would remain as they are at present.

## 10.5 Hours of Operation

Following the analysis of the responses, the preferred CPZ control period is the two hour period between 10am-12noon, Monday - Friday. These hours of operation coincide with LB Camden's plans to implement a CPZ operating during the same hours on the southwestern side of the High Street.

## 10.6 Pay and Display Tariffs and Permit charges

Short-term pay and display parking will be provided, similar to CPZs operating within the borough, at present. Note LB Haringey's tariffs are comparatively cheaper than LB Camden's tariffs, which will be in operation on the LB Camden's side of Highgate High Street. The maximum duration of two hours will be: £0.60 per 30 mins - as from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003

Resident, Visitors and Business permits are proposed to be in line with all other existing CPZ's in the Borough:

£25 per annum for Residents Permits.

£225 per annum for Business Permits.

£0.30p per 2 hours for Visitors' Permits. As from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003.

## 11.0 Financial Implications

- 11.1 The implementation of the proposed Controlled Parking, will be funded by Congestion Charging funding support from Transport for London.

## 12.0 Conclusion

- 12.1 The introduction of parking controls, as proposed in section 10.0, is in line with Haringey Council's overall transport and parking practices as well as the Mayor's Transport and Government Policies.

- 12.2 In view of the overall consultation feedback where some roads have shown favour for parking controls whilst some others are against, the proposed scheme clearly reflects this and indicates that the Council has taken the residents' and business' views into consideration.
- 12.3 Also, in considering the boundary it is important to note that necessary steps may need to be taken to assess the impact of displaced parking particularly in the area that has been excluded from the proposals.

### **13.0 Recommendations**

- 13.1 It is recommended that the Executive:
- 13.1.1 Note feedback from consultations set out in the report.
  - 13.1.2 Authorise statutory consultation on a CPZ scheme as detailed in Section 10.0 and shown in Appendix V of this report.
  - 13.1.3 If there are no valid objections, delegate the making of the Traffic Management Order and all necessary related action to the Director of Environmental Services.
  - 13.1.4 If there are valid objections refer the decision as to the making or modification of the Traffic Management Order to the Executive Member for Environment and request the Leader to agree this referral.

### **14.0 Comments of the Director of Finance**

- 14.1 The implementation costs will be met from TfL grant allocation for Congestion Charging CPZs. The scheme when fully operational will make a contribution to the achievement of the parking account income target.

### **15.0 Environmental Implications**

- 15.1 The implementation of the proposals will improve the local environment by:
- Reducing the amount of commuter parking in the area.
  - Making the area safer for pedestrians and cyclists.
  - Controls and regulates the problems of abandoned /dumped vehicles.

### **16.0 Comments of the Acting Head of Legal Services**

- 16.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement a CPZ scheme, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act ("RTRA") 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Any objections received would have to be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles and the relevant statutory powers.
- 16.2 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise under sections 6, 45, 46 and 122 of the RTRA 1984. Councils must exercise these powers to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic and pedestrians and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
  - (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation of heavy vehicular traffic.
  - (c) the national air quality strategy.
  - (d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.
  - (e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

## **17.0 Equalities Implications**

- 17.1 Controlled parking is an effective form of deterring commuters from entering into the area. It also promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling and benefits the people who do not have access to a car.
- 17.2 The special needs of orange (blue) badge holders are specifically catered for in the provision of on Street parking spaces and specific areas, which will have no loading restrictions.

## **APPENDIX I**

### Area Map

## **APPENDIX II**

### Consultation Document

## **APPENDIX III**

### Consultation Analysis

## PROPOSED HIGHGATE CPZ: CONSULTATION RESPONSES

**Table 1: The following responses have been received: -**

Number of questionnaires distributed	5750	100%
Number of questionnaires returned (total)	1953	34%
Number of questionnaires returned (valid)*	1890	33%

*\* A valid questionnaire was considered to be a questionnaire received by 4<sup>th</sup> July 2003 (this includes a week's grace given to residents) and was indicated with a road name and a preference.*

**Table 2: Break down by address:**

	IN FAVOUR OF PROPOSAL	AGAINST PROPOSAL	TOTAL	% IN FAVOUR	% AGAINST
Archway Rd	10	73	83	12	88
Bishop's Rd	5	11	16	31	69
Bloomfield	12	6	18	67	33
Bramalea Close	0	5	5	0	100
Broadlands Rd	0	2	2	0	100
Broughton Grd	0	7	7	0	100
Castle Yard	0	5	5	0	100
Causton Rd	3	11	14	21	79
Cholmeley Crescent	17	39	56	30	70
Cholmeley Park	13	43	56	23	77
Chruch Road	2	7	9	22	78
Claremont Road	0	78	78	0	100
Cromwell Avenue	35	37	72	49	51
Cromwell Place	9	0	9	100	0
Gaskell Rd	1	14	15	7	93
Highgate Avenue	6	17	23	26	74
Highgate Close	1	12	13	8	92
Highgate High Street	4	26	30	13	87
Highgate Hill	5	7	12	42	58
Hillcrest	4	16	20	20	80
Hillside Gardens	2	19	21	10	90
Holmesdale Road	5	27	32	16	84
Hornsey Lane	5	13	18	28	72
Hornsey Lane Gardens	0	64	64	0	100
Jacksons Lane	13	28	41	32	68
Kenwood	1	12	13	8	92
Kingsley Place	3	24	27	11	89
Langden Park Road	2	29	31	6	94
Milton Avenue	2	31	33	6	94
Milton Park	5	47	52	10	90
Milton Road	4	31	35	11	89
Muswell Hill Road	8	27	35	23	77
North Grove	3	18	21	14	86
North Hill	10	78	88	11	89
North Road	8	29	37	22	78
Northhill Avenue	0	9	9	0	100

Northwood Road	2	44	46	4	96
	IN FAVOUR OF PROPOSAL	AGAINST PROPOSAL	TOTAL	% IN FAVOUR	% AGAINST
Oldfield Mews	5	8	13	38	62
Onslow Gardens	3	19	22	14	86
Orchard Road	1	20	21	5	95
Parkwood Mews	0	2	2	0	100
Priory Gardens	8	66	74	11	89
Ridings Close	1	2	3	33	67
Shepherd's Close	2	14	16	13	88
Shepherds Hill	36	109	145	25	75
Somerset Gardens	3	2	5	60	40
South Close	5	9	14	36	64
Southwood Avenue	21	80	101	21	79
Southwood Lawn Road	12	38	50	24	76
Stanhope Gardens	2	49	51	4	96
Stanhope Road	3	38	41	7	93
Storey Road	1	2	3	33	67
Summersby	2	6	8	25	75
Talbot Road	23	51	74	31	69
The Bank	0	1	1	0	100
The Park	1	5	6	17	83
Tile Kiln Lane	1	4	5	20	80
Toyne Way	0	10	10	0	100
Wembury Road	1	4	5	20	80
Winchester Place	1	2	3	33	67
Winchester Road	2	11	13	15	85
Wood Lane	8	22	30	27	73
Yeatman Road	0	14	14	0	100
Total	342	1534	1876		

Note:

% in favour of proposals:- **18**

% against proposals:- **82**

**Table 3: Hours of operation**

ROAD	HOURS OF OPERATION			
	2h (10am-12 Noon)	All day (8.30am-6.30pm)	All Day Plus evening (8.30am -10pm)	24h Controls
Archway Rd	13	11	1	0
Bishop's Rd	6	7	0	0
Bloomfield	6	5	0	2
Bramalea Close	1	1	0	0
Broadlands Rd	0	0	0	0
Broughton Grd	2	0	0	0
Castle Yard	1	1	0	0
Causton Rd	1	2	0	0
Cholmeley Crescent	18	6	0	1
Cholmeley Park	18	5	0	0
Chruch Road	3	0	0	0
Claremont Road	16	1	0	2
Cromwell Avenue	26	18	4	2
Cromwell Place	3	5	1	0
Gaskell Rd	6	2	0	0
Highgate Avenue	8	3	1	0
Highgate Close	3	0	0	0
Highgate High Street	5	2	0	0
Highgate Hill	5	2	0	0
Hillcrest	6	3	1	1
Hillside Gardens	8	3	0	0



Holmesdale Road	8	4	1	0
Hornsey Lane	9	3	1	0
ROAD	HOURS OF OPERATION			
	2h (10am-12 Noon)	Allday (8.30am-6.30pm)	All Day Plus evening (8.30am -10pm)	24h Controls
Hornsey Lane Gardens	16	2	1	0
Jacksons Lane	10	7	4	0
Kenwood	5	1	1	0
Kingsley Place	10	5	0	0
Langden Park Road	10	1	0	0
Milton Avenue	7	2	1	0
Milton Park	5	1	3	1
Milton Road	9	4	0	1
Muswell Hill Road	12	8	1	0
North Grove	10	2	1	0
North Hill	34	8	1	1
North Road	10	2	4	1
Northhill Avenue	7	0	0	0
Northwood Road	13	1	0	0
Oldfield Mews	6	2	1	0
Onslow Gardens	5	1	0	0
Orchard Road	6	1	2	1
Parkwood Mews	0	0	0	0
Priory Gardens	27	7	1	1
Ridings Close	2	1	0	0
Shepherd's Close	2	0	1	0
Shepherds Hill	45	25	4	0
Somerset Gardens	2	1	0	0
South Close	2	2	1	1
Southwood Avenue	28	16	1	3
Southwood Lawn Road	35	1	0	0
Stanhope Gardens	13	1	0	1
Stanhope Road	14	1	0	0
Storey Road	1	0	1	0
Summersby	3	1	0	2
Talbot Road	26	13	4	2
The Bank	0	0	0	0
The Park	5	0	0	0
Tile Kiln Lane	2	0	0	0
Toyne Way	4	0	0	1
Wembury Road	2	0	0	1
Winchester Place	1	1	0	0
Winchester Road	2	2	0	0
Wood Lane	11	8	0	0
Yeatman Road	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	576	212	43	25
100%=856 (total no. of responses that showed a preference regarding the hours of operation )	67%	25%	5%	3%

#### NOTE:

The majority of respondents (67%) who showed an interest in the hours of operation indicated a preference for 2 hours of operation.

**Table 4: Weekend Controls**

NO OF RESPONSES	IN FAVOUR OF SAT. CONTROLS	IN FAVOUR OF SUNDAY CONTROLS	NOT IN FAVOUR OF WEEKEND CONTROLS
Archway Rd	4	0	45
Bishop's Rd	3	0	9
Bloomfield	2	1	9
Bramalea Close	0	0	1
Broadlands Rd	0	0	1
Broughton Grd	0	0	7
Castle Yard	0	0	2
Causton Rd	1	1	4
Cholmeley Crescent	3	2	39
Cholmeley Park	1	0	33

Chruch Road	0	0	3
Claremont Road	1	1	43
Cromwell Avenue	9	5	35
NO OF RESPONSES	IN FAVOUR OF SAT. CONTROLS	IN FAVOUR OF SUNDAY CONTROLS	NOT IN FAVOUR OF WEEKEND CONTROLS
Cromwell Place	1	0	1
Gaskell Rd	1	1	5
Highgate Avenue	2	0	16
Highgate Close	0	0	10
Highgate High Street	1	1	19
Highgate Hill	1	0	8
Hillcrest	4	3	6
Hillside Gardens	2	1	11
Holmesdale Road	1	1	18
Hornsey Lane	2	1	13
Hornsey Lane Gardens	0	0	41
Jacksons Lane	10	4	22
Kenwood	1	1	3
Kingsley Place	2	0	16
Langden Park Road	0	0	21
Milton Avenue	1	0	23
Milton Park	3	2	29
Milton Road	1	1	26
Muswell Hill Road	9	9	19
North Grove	6	3	12
North Hill	5	3	53
North Road	5	5	22
Northhill Avenue	0	0	5
Northwood Road	3	0	23
Oldfield Mews	1	0	7
Onslow Gardens	1	1	15
Orchard Road	1	1	14
Parkwood Mews	0	0	1
Priory Gardens	11	2	35
Ridings Close	1	1	2
Shepherd's Close	1	1	8
Shepherds Hill	12	5	78
Somerset Gardens	0	0	2
South Close	5	3	5
Southwood Avenue	6	2	59
Southwood Lawn Road	0	0	34
Stanhope Gardens	1	0	39
Stanhope Road	0	0	26
Storey Road	1	1	1
Summersby	3	2	2
Talbot Road	11	4	45
The Bank	0	0	1
The Park	1	0	5
Tile Kiln Lane	0	0	2
Toyne Way	0	0	6
Wembury Road	1	1	2
Winchester Place	0	0	2
Winchester Road	0	0	6
Wood Lane	6	1	14
Yeatman Road	0	0	6
TOTALS	148	71	1070
(100%=(1289)	11%	6%	83%

**Note:**

83 % respondents were not in favour of a CPZ with weekend restrictions

11% of respondents were in favour of a CPZ operating on Saturday

6% of respondents were in favour of a CPZ operating on Sunday

## **Appendix IV**

### Summary of Comments received by the community

**The most common comments are listed below:**

Just another form of Council tax

Money making scheme for the Council

Removal of all untaxed vehicles

**Too few permits available for businesses.**

**Any alteration to the current parking situation would have a knock on effect the current balance achieved to the detriment of everybody.**

**Worried about hikes in the price of permits.**

**Business rate for a permit of £225 is too high.**

**Congestion Charging has made the problem worse**

**Worried about hikes in the price of permits.**

**Street too full already – scheme will not change this.**

**Teaching staff at local schools should be given more consideration.**

**Cross borough enforcement required should any scheme be implemented.**

**Wait and see the effect of Camden's controls**

**Discrete signage and narrow yellow lines requested.**

**The available on street parking could be better utilised.**

**An early review of any scheme introduced requested.**

**Resident do not feel there is a problem.**

**No day-time parking demand for parking therefore of no benefit to residents.**

**Permits need to be purchased easily and should be inexpensive.**

**No. of permits per household needs to be capped.**

**Delay decision until Camden implement**

**A Resident is concerned about parking for teachers of the schools.**

**Households with 2-3 cars are the real problem.**

**Requests have been made for reciprocal bay use (Camden / Haringey)**

**Reciprocal parking permit area requested by residents on the high street to park on the LB Camden side roads.**

**Fears of parking problems would discourage people coming to the area to shop and use local services.**

**The community feels that if the scheme is implemented, it needs to be done at the same time as LB Camden's implementation.**

**One consultation document per household is questioned.**

**No problem during the day, only at night when all residents return home.**

**Converted houses are the problem (too many residents, not too many commuters)**

**Residents concerned about a reduction in parking.**

**Residents are keen to have sub zones implemented, this was often the case in cul de sacs.**

**Residents have expressed an opinion that the consultation process was not conducted such that residents could formulate an informed opinion as to the proposals.**

**Lack of enforcement is problematic, especially during school runs.**

**A £25 permit will do nothing to discourage 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> car ownership.**

**Residents are interested in removing commuters NOT local workers from the area.**

**A number of residents requested a sub zone for Shepherd's Close**

**A number of residents requested a sub zone for Priory Gardens.**

## **Appendix V**

Plan of proposed scheme