

## APPENDIX 1

Ref.	Comment/Reason for objection	Officer response	Uphold / Reject
1	Concerns it is a way of the council pushing through a controlled parking zone	A parking zone consultation took place in early 2017. It is unlikely that we will revisit the area in the next few years due to our resources being prioritised elsewhere in the borough. CPZ consultations usually take place as a result of resident demand.	Reject
2	There won't be enough space for residents to park	We are only reducing unsafe parking in the area.	Reject
3	Developments cause a parking problem	Developers are encouraged to provide adequate cycle parking facilities and should the area be in a controlled parking zone, planning conditions prevent residents from purchasing a permit.	Reject
4	Issue a free parking permit to every household	Controlled parking zones cost money to run and implement. Kerbside space is limited in central London and to allow residents to have permit parking we must charge a fee.	Reject
5	New council offices on Asylum Road will cause parking problems and council officers can park on DYLS	A number of permits are issued to staff and contractors to carry out official council tasks across the borough. This permit restricts parking to a maximum of two hours and parking is only permitted where safe to do so. Enforcement will be increased in the area once the new restrictions are implemented.	Reject
6	No evidence of pedestrian accidents in the area	We take a proactive approach to ensuring parking restrictions are safe. Only unsafe parking has been removed and this is mainly around junctions.	Reject
7	Objection to an RPZ	We are not proposing a restricted parking zone in the area.	Reject
8	Fear that church goers will no longer be able to attend	Those attending the church can still use the unrestricted roads in the area to park. We are not putting in parking restrictions. This is also a well connected area close to train stations and buses.	Reject
9	Retain free parking	We are not removing free parking.	Reject
10	Hidden agenda to frustrate the users of the church	We do not believe the small amount of double yellow lines proposed as part of this scheme will disproportionately affect any particular group.	Reject
11	Not much traffic on Belfort Road, parking restrictions will not improve traffic on St Mary's Road	There are only double yellow lines around the junction on Belfort Road. All other kerbside space will be left as it is.	Reject
12	Allocate parking on Belfort Road to the church	We do not allocate road space for any specific organisations. The kerbside in this area is unrestricted and thus can be used by those visiting the church.	Reject
13	Business centre has allocated parking on Godman Road	We do not allocate road space for any specific organisations. It may be that the allocated parking is on private land.	Reject
14	Parking needed for the church	We are retaining much of the kerbside space around the church.	Reject

15	Advertise the restrictions in a way that is easier to understand.	Our Traffic Management Orders are advertised in line with our statutory obligations. Maps and further information is provided online and by contacting the Project Manager.	Reject
16	Improve signage and enforcement on King's Grove	We will assess the signage on King's Grove. Enforcement of parking restrictions takes place regularly.	Reject
17	Environmental impact of double yellow lines	Unfortunately if residents continue to drive, we must regulate the kerbside space and this includes line marking. Residents can choose to use the available trains and buses or cycle.	Reject
18	Cost of putting in the scheme	All costs are covered within departmental revenue budgets	Reject
19	The ongoing costs of maintaining the lines	Lines need refreshing roughly every ten years at minimal cost	Reject
20	This is a blanket proposal	The proposal is mainly to remove unsafe parking around junctions	Reject