

Results of February 2019 Statutory Consultation for Bowes Park CPZ

Summary: Submissions represented 123 households. The 9 of these from outside the zone boundary were objections. From the remaining 114 inside the zone boundary 97 (85%) were in support, 17 (15%) were opposed. Overall, therefore, good levels of support were maintained. The most mixed response was from Whittington Road but even here only 4 out of 10 opposed the parking controls. (One of the 6 in support objects explicitly to the cycle hangar near the home so is counted below in the 'opposed' group.) The original proposals were amended in light of concerns from Spencer Avenue and this time the street returned only 2 objections.

Homes Inside Zone Consulted in Feb 2019		Responses		In Support		Opposed	
		Nr	Rate	Nr	%	Nr	%
Marlborough Rd	71	9	13%	9	100%	0	0%
Sidney Avenue	122	2	2%	2	100%	0	0%
Kelvin Avenue	100	16	16%	15	94%	1	6%
Russell / G'ville Rd	183	33	18%	30	91%	3	9%
Melbourne Avenue	84	19	23%	17	89%	2	11%
Belsize Avenue	83	8	10%	7	88%	1	13%
Spencer Avenue	81	7	9%	5	71%	2	29%
Palmerston Rd	250	10	4%	7	70%	3	30%
Whittington Rd	157	10	6%	5	50%	5	50%
COMBINED	1131	114	10%	97	85%	17	15%

Recurring Concerns (including from respondents who were, overall, in support of the proposals)	Number of Homes Expressing the Concern											
	Mar'boro Rd	Sidney Ave	Kelvin Ave	Russ/G'v Rd	Milbrne Ave	Belsize Ave	Spence Ave	Pim'stn Rd	Whitton Rd	G Lanes		COMBINED
Longer hours: best extended to evenings and/or weekends	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Not needed / mostly a money-making exercise	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	6
Cycle hangars: not needed, obstructive, take up space	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	6
Flats above shops: unfair if permits not sold to flats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Permit costs: should be free, cheaper, one-price-any-vehicle	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Yellow lines at driveways: unfair, reduce parking capacity	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	4
Bad for my street: new controls not helpful in my road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	4
Shorter hours: shorter hours would achieve same benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Customer parking: undue restriction on customer parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Restricts visitors: makes it harder to visit frail residents	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Remaining Concerns: The concern featuring most frequently across all responses (including from some supporting the scheme overall) is that the controlled hours should be longer. In Russell Road this mostly refers to evening parking of vehicles by households inside the adjacent Haringey zone. In Melbourne Avenue, this refers more to afternoon/evening parking associated with visitors to High Street premises near their section of the zone. The favoured hours have proven popular overall, however, across the two consultation exercises: compare in the latest 97 supporting the overall proposals, to only 10 who mention it as a concern. The report discusses the matter further.

A second key concern arises from residents of the flats above the stores on Green Lanes, who it seems had little prior knowledge of the proposals. The report authors have some sympathy with their wish to be eligible to buy permits, having limited parking options otherwise, but the proposals, as advertised, do not include these homes within the zone. Taking forward the scheme under experimental powers would allow the Council to redraw the boundary to include the flats ahead of re-advertising the proposals. It would also allow the Council to trial the favoured controlled hours but facilitate a later revision, should they prove ineffective.

A number of households expressing a dislike of the proposals overall, also submitted negative comments about the cycle hangars and/or offered the opinion that the proposals are aimed at generating revenue for the Council, not aiding residents. The hundreds of residents who signed petitions over previous years asking the Council to provide such zonal controls will know that the latter is a misrepresentation. The report sets out why the views expressed on both points are unreasonable.

Next Steps: A report has been drafted recommending proceeding with implementation. A decision is anticipated before the end of April 2019. If approved, works on site would be likely to follow in May/June 2019.