

RECORD OF DECISION TAKEN
UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

All requests for action to be taken in accordance with established delegated authority must be accompanied by an appropriate report setting out all relevant considerations, in particular legal and financial considerations, and with a clear recommendation[s] for action, in order for an appropriate decision to be taken in accordance with the provisions of current legislation.

Log No.

Title of Report: Proposed waiting restrictions 45 various locations through out the Borough

Reason for relevant paragraph for authority under scheme of delegation
To seek approval to proceed with the recommendations as set out in section 6.0 of this report.

Decision of Head of Sustainable Transport

I approve the recommendations set out in the attached report.

Signature *Joan Hancock* Date *14.01.10* *Joan Hancock*

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To report the representations received during statutory notification carried out in October/ November 2010 for the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) along lengths of roads listed below:

Boyton Close, N8; Boyton Road, N8; Brook Road, N8; Campsbourne Road, N8; Campsfield Road, N8; Chester Road, N8; Culvert Road, N15; Coppetts Road, N10; Dongola Road, N17; Eastfield Road, N8; Eastwood Road, N10; Ellington Road, N10; Fairbourne Road, N17; Field Road, N17; Gloucester Road, N17; Grange Road, N17; Grasmere Road, N10; Griffin Road, N17; Grosvenor Road, N10; Grove Road, N15; Hillside Road, N15; Ida Road, N15; Imperial Road, N22; Kitchener Road, N17; Page's Hill, N10; Pembroke Road, N8; Pembury Road, N17; Langdon Park Road, N6; Mount Pleasant Road, N17; Newland Road, N8; Nightingale Lane, N8; Nightingale Road, N22; Northumberland Park, N17; St. James's Lane, N10; Tetherdown Road, N10; Thirlmere Road, N10; Victoria Road, N8; Willan Road, N17; and Windermere Road, N10.

- 1.2 To seek approval to proceed with the recommendations as set out in section 6.0 of this report.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The restrictions have been requested by Environmental Resources following a review of the waste collection routes in the borough. The review identified a number of locations, particularly at junctions, where obstructive parking is impeding the service and on occasion resulting in the non-collection of waste.
- 2.2 A list of the identified locations provided by Environmental Resources is provided in Appendix I of this report.

3.0 PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Following detailed investigation of each site by officers from Transport Policy and Projects and Location plans were drafted for the purpose of Statutory Notification.
- 3.2 The location plans are provided in Appendix II of this report.

4.0 STATUTORY NOTIFICATION

- 4.1 Statutory Notification commenced on the 21 October 2010 with a closing date for representation on 18 November 2010. A Notice of Intention was published in the London Gazette, local press and erected on site on lamp columns in the affected streets on the 21 October 2010.
- 4.2 Statutory Notification letters, providing information regarding the statutory procedure and a location plan was posted to frontages where the restrictions were proposed on the 21 October 2010. See Appendix III for the Statutory Notification letter.
- 4.3 As part of the statutory process, the views of the following bodies are also sought: AA, London Transport, Police (local), Fire Brigade, London

Ambulance Service, Freight Transport Association, Road Haulage Association, RAC, Metropolitan Police (traffic), Haringey Cycling Campaign, neighbouring boroughs and Haringey Accord.

5.0 STATUTORY NOTIFICATION FEEDBACK

5.1 This section of the report is divided into two sections, consisting of:

- a) A summary of representations received during statutory notification period.
- b) A summary of the key objections received together with the council's considered response.

5.2 Before making the relevant Traffic Management Orders the council must consider all duly made objections submitted in response to the consultation.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

5.3 A total of 16 representations were received during the statutory notification period as listed below.

- 2 - Objections** to the proposed double yellow lines in St James Lane, N10.
- 3 - Objections** to the proposed double yellow lines in Thirlmere Road and Grosvenor Road, N10.
- 1 - Objection** to the extent of the proposed double yellow lines in Grasmere Road and Grosvenor Road, N10.
- 1 - Objection** to the proposed double yellow lines in Pages Hill, N10.
- 2 - Objection** to the proposed double yellow lines in Boyton Close, N10.
- 1 - Objection** to the proposed double yellow lines in Langdon Park Road, N6
- 1 - objection** in regards to proposed double yellow line in Eastwood & Tetherdown, N10.
- 1 - Support** in regards to proposed double yellow line in Eastwood & Tetherdown, N10.
- 1 - General support** in regards to proposed double yellow lines around Muswell Hill area from The Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association
- 1 - General comment** to the proposed double yellow lines in St James Lane.
- 1 - General comment** to the proposed double yellow lines in Pages Hill.
- 1 - General comment** to the proposed double yellow lines in Boyton Close.

5.4 A full list of all representations received during the statutory process is contained in Appendix IV of this report.

Views from Statutory Bodies and Other Organisations

5.5 **Statutory Bodies** – No representations were received from the statutory bodies during the statutory notification period.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED WITH COUNCIL RESPONSE

5.6 **Objection to the proposed double yellow line in St. James's Lane:**
The introduction of double yellow lines will remove 7-8 parking spaces vital to local residents in a locality that is already desperately short of parking spaces. Parking is already severely restricted due to high volume of cars

attending the North London School of Performing Arts between the hours of 3.30 - 7.30PM.

Council's response: The restrictions are essential to remove obstructive parking at the access to Valette Court. The restriction will assist our waste collection service as well as provide clear access for emergency services should the need arises. We do not therefore uphold the objection.

- 5.7 **Objection to the proposed double yellow lines in Pages Hill:** The proposed double yellow lines at the entrances to Barrington Court are not necessary. I am not aware of a dustcart not being able to get into Barrington court in the Fifteen years I have been living here.

Council's response: The restrictions are essential to remove obstructive parking at the access to Barrington Court. The restriction will assist our waste collection service as well as provide clear access for emergency services should the need arises. We do not therefore uphold the objection.

- 5.8 **Objection to the proposed double yellow lines in Boyton Close:** The extent of double yellow lines are excessive and only required on the corners. Placing the restrictions in the existing parking bays will only make parking harder.

Bar markings should be provided to alert motorists to the dropped crossing for waste collections.

It is however necessary to have some form restriction at the top of Boyton Close but the encroachment need not exceed more than 5m into the Close.

Council's response: The council is keen to reach a balance between the needs of residents and our aims of safety. We therefore propose to revise the extent of the restrictions proposed along the dropped kerbs. Although bar markings could be a consideration they do not provide any legal enforcement and therefore double yellow lines are seen as a more robust measure.

- 5.9 **Objection to the proposed double yellow lines in Langdon Park Road:** Your proposals will remove a minimum of two parking spaces from Langdon Park Road. Given that Tudor Close has been accessible by refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles for all the time that I have lived here I cannot see any sudden reason why any change at all is required.

Council's response: The proposals have been identified following a review of our waste collections services. We do not therefore uphold the objection.

- 5.10 **Objection to the proposed double yellow line in Eastwood & Tetherdown:** Refuse trucks that service Eastwood Road do not reverse into Eastwood Road from Coppetts Road but from Tetherdown. People rarely, if ever, park on this section of Coppetts Road anyway. Parking is already at a premium on Eastwood Road and your proposals mean the loss of 4 potential parking spaces on this road.

Council's response: Parking at junctions is undesirable as it reduces sight lines and raises safety implications for motorists and pedestrians alike. It is therefore the council's policy to introduce double yellow lines at all junctions in the borough on a rolling programme over the next few years. Furthermore the Highway Code state that vehicles should not park near or on a junction as they may cause obstruction and compromise safety for all road users. We do not therefore uphold this objection.

- 5.11 **Objection to the proposed double yellow lines in Thirlmere Road and Grosvenor Road:** I do not see that it is necessary to have double yellows lines as this would cause further parking congestion on these roads. I fail to see why a proposal for single yellow lines with timed parking restrictions is not being proposed. Indeed, I have not experienced difficulty getting round that corner as it is wide enough for cars and Lorries to pass one another without any accidents being caused.

Council's response: Parking at junctions is undesirable as it reduces sight lines and raises safety implications for motorists and pedestrians alike. It is therefore the council's policy to introduce double yellow lines at all junctions in the borough on a rolling programme over the next few years. Furthermore the Highway Code state that vehicles should not park near or on a junction as they may cause obstruction and compromise safety for all road users. These locations needs be clear of obstructive parking at all times. We do not therefore uphold this objection.

- 5.12 **Objection the proposed double yellow lines in Grasmere Road and Grosvenor Road:** The proposed restrictions of 7m at the junction is excessive. Half this length would be sufficient.

Council's response: Parking at junctions is undesirable as it reduces sight lines and raises safety implications for motorists and pedestrians alike. It is therefore the council's policy to introduce double yellow lines at all junctions in the borough on a rolling programme over the next few years. Furthermore the Highway Code state that vehicles should not park near or on a junction as they may cause obstruction and compromise safety for all road users.

The Department for Transport recommends restrictions to be 10m at junctions although we believe that 7m is appropriate due to parking pressures in London.

The lengths specified on the proposals are required to clear those locations from parked vehicles in order to allow for access for both motorists and pedestrians. We do not therefore uphold this objection.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Note the feedback of the Statutory Notification process and consider the representation submitted in response.
- 6.2 With the exception of Boyton Close, agree to the introduction of waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) as proposed and outlined in appendix II of this report.

- 6.3 Modify the restrictions proposed for Boyton Close as set out in Appendix IV of this report.
- 6.4 Approve that residents be informed of the Council's decision.

APPENDIX I

List of requests

List of Locations for Batch 4 double yellow lines

No.	Drawing No.	Road Name	Location	Post code	Problem	Solution
1	05,06,07	Boyton Close	Entrance to bin area outside Hillary house 1-6	N8	Cars parking in front of dropped kerb	Double Yellow lines 6metres Ref point lamppost BC40
2	05,06,07	Boyton Close	Entrance to bin area outside Fleming 1-6 next to 4	N8	Cars parking in front of dropped kerb	Double Yellow lines 6metres
3	05,06,07	Boyton Close	Entrance to bin area outside Elgar No10 7-14 in front of doors	N8	cars parking in front of Elgar No10 and cars parking outside 8 and 12 Boyton close blocking access to Elgar	Double Yellow lines outside entrance to Elgar 6metre and double yellow lines outside 8 and 12 boyton close 8 metre each
4	008	Boyton rd	Opposite Campsbourne Junior school Entrance to Rhine house car park	N8	cars parking too close to entrance	Double yellow lines 7metre each side of entrance
5	011	Brook Road	Entrance to bin area for Tivendale	N8	Cars park outside entrances to bin area 17-24 and 25-32 opposite lamppost BK6R New drop kerbs are being installed	Double yellow lines needed at each entrance 4metre
6	012 & 013, 014	Campsbourne Rd	outside Audrey house	N8	cars parking by entrance to bin stores	Existing double yellow lines in poor condition. Reinststate double yellow lines

No.	Drawing No.	Road Name	Location	Post code	Problem	Solution
7	012 & 013, 014	Campsbourne Rd	entrance to Harvey and Moore House	N8	Cars parking on either side of Campsbourne rd by entrance to Harvey and Moore House	Double yellow lines needed on one side of Campsbourne rd from Pembroke rd to entrance.
8	012 & 013, 014	Campsbourne Rd j/w Pembroke rd		N8	cars parking too close to corners	double yellow lines needed on both sides of junction
9	015 & 016	Campsfield Road	Entrance to bin chamber Goodwin Court	N8	Cars parking in front of bin chamber	Double Yellow lines needed 5 metre (note reference point 15 metre from lamppost CA1F)
10	015 & 016	Campsfield Road	Gillett House, Myddleton House and Honeymead	N8	Cars parked on both sides at entrance points to 3 blocks	Double Yellow lines needed opposite lamppost CA3F 10 Metres
11	017	Chester Road	Both sides of junction with Kitchener Road	N17	Double yellow lines needed on both sides	
12	018	Chester Road	Junction with Mount Pleasant Rd and outside 120-118 Mount View Road	N17	Double yellow lines needed on both sides	
13	019	Culvert Road	on corners and opposite j/w Victoria Crescent	N15		Double Yellow Lines
14	020	Field Road	Both sides of junction with Kitchener Road	N17		
15	021	Gloucester Road	Field Road	N17	WB3	
16	023 & 024	Gloucester Road	Gloucester Road, near Debden and Hawking	N17	previous lines and hatching faded	renew existing yellow lines and hatching.

No.	Drawing No.	Road Name	Location	Post code	Problem	Solution
17	023 &024	Gloucester Road	Hawking Gate, Gloucester Road leading to off licence side	N17	Cars parked on road and over gate access	double yellow lines to give clear access
18	026	Gloucester Rd	Both sides of junction with Chester Road	N17	Existing double yellow lines too short need to be extended	
19	027	Grange Road	Opposite 42 entrance to Woodmead Estate	N17	Car parking bays too close to entrance + cars not parking in bays	Reduce car parking bay and extend existing double yellow lines at entrance
20	028	Grasmere Road	Grosvenor Road	N10		
21	029	Griffin Road		N17		
22	030	Grove Road	Culvert Road	N15		
23	032	Langdon Park Road	Tudor Close, Langdon Park Road	N6	Access problems	Parking lines and enforcement
24	033	Dongola Road	Chester Road	N17		
25	034	Mount Pleasant rd	Junction with Fairbourne Rd	N17	Existing double yellow lines too short need to be extended	
26	035	Newland Road	Nightingale Road	N8		
27	037	Newland rd j/w Boyton Rd		N8	cars parking too close to corners	double yellow lines needed on both sides of junction
28	038	Northumberland Park	Entrance to Kenneth Robins House	N17	cars parked either side of entrance + at times across entrance	Extend double Yellow lines either side of entrance and across entrance
29	040	Pembury Road	Entrance to Millicent Fawcett House opposite 57+55 Pembury rd	N17	cars parked either side of entrance Existing double yellow lines not sufficient	Existing double yellow lines need to be extended and disabled parking bay needs to be moved along

No.	Drawing No.	Road Name	Location	Post code	Problem	Solution
30	041	Pembury Road	Entrance to Millicent Fawcett House opposite 31-35 Pembury rd	N17	cars parked either side of entrance Existing double yellow lines not sufficient	Existing double yellow lines need to be extended
31	042	Pembury Road	Millicent Fawcett Court	N17	Access problems from Pembury Road	Extend double yellow lines.
32	044	St James Lane	Entrance to Vallette Court	N10	Cars parking either side of entrance and opposite entrance	Double yellow lines needed 10 meters either side of entrance and 20 metres opposite entrance
33	045	Mayfield Road	Ridge Road	N8	Access problems	Double yellow lines needed at the junction
34	046	Thirlmere Road	Grosvenor Road	N10		
35	047	Windermere Road	Grosvenor Road	N10		
36	049	Eastwood Road		N10		
37	051	Hillside Road		N15		
38	052	Imperial Rd bottom end		N22		
39	053	Barrington Court	Page's Hill	N10		
40	054	Ida Road		N22		1-18 both sides of entrance and space opposite entrance to refuse storage area.
41	055	Nightingale Road	entrance to Almshouses	N22		
42	056	Portree Close	Nightingale Road	N22		

APPENDIX II

LOCATION PLANS

APPENDIX III

STATUTORY NOTIFICATION LETTER



21 October 2010

STATUTORY NOTIFICATION

Waiting Restrictions (double yellow lines) Proposals

Following a review of the waste collection routes in the borough, concerns have been raised about obstructive parking at various locations, particularly junctions. This parking practice reduces road safety for pedestrians and affects accessibility by the council's refuse collection vehicles and emergency vehicles.

This is to inform you that to address these safety and access issues, the Council is proposing to introduce double yellow lines (No waiting at any time – 24 hours a day) at the locations indicated on the attached plan to ensure these areas are kept free of obstructive parking for the benefit of all road users.

A legal Notice of Intention informing of our proposals will be published in the local press and on site on the **21 October 2010**. The Council will consider any written or e-mail representation regarding our proposals received by the **18 November 2010**.

If you have any comments or representation that you wish to make on the proposals, please send them to Transport Policy and Projects Group, River Park House 2nd Floor South, 225 High Road London N22 8HQ or via e-mail Frontline@haringey.gov.uk before **18 November 2010**.

Should you require any further information on the proposals, please contact Bethlehem Girma on 0208 489 1763 or email: Bethlehem.Girma@haringey.gov.uk


Yours faithfully,


Joan Hancox
Head of Sustainable Transport

APPENDIX IV

Representations received during the statutory process

Name	Address	Support/ Objection /Comment	Comment
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Support	The Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association have asked for, and got, double yellow lines on a number of corners in the Fortis Green area and so I think I can safely say that we are wholeheartedly in favour of the present proposals.
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Tetherdown, N10	Support	<p>Just to say that I am very happy about the proposal to put double yellow lines on the corners of Eastwood road and Tetherdown, in Muswell hill - it would also be good to put them on the corners of Burlington road and Tetherdown:</p> <p>People often park on both pairs of corners, blocking the foot path and making it dangerous for people in wheelchairs, with pushchairs, who are sight impaired or with young children to cross these roads when walking along Tetherdown.</p>
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] St James' Lane, N10 [REDACTED]	Objection	<p>As residents living near the proposed introduction of more double yellow lines on St James's Lane we write to strongly object to the proposal on a number of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of double yellow lines will remove 7-8 parking spaces vital to local residents in a locality that is already desperately short of parking spaces. I'd estimate that your proposals will reduce parking spaces for the local residents by 25%. • The existing parking shortage is underlined by the fact that there are 27 flats at Valette Court and at least 10 maisonettes who (if they are drivers) depend upon these spaces. • Many of these residents, including us, have very young families who require easy access to vehicles for safety reasons (young kids running about) and the physical

			<p>demands of pushing buggies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already, there is an existing shortage of parking, due to the double yellow lines already introduced and the local drama and music centre where parents taxi-ing children take parking spaces on St James's Lane throughout the week. • Due to the existing shortage of parking we frequently are unable to park near our property and often have to park at the far end of Ellington Road. This is a personal nightmare when we have to push a heavy buggy up a steep road and walk for 5 minutes to get to our car. • Additionally, car crime is a huge issue in Muswell Hill and having to park the car a long distance from our house is not only inconvenient but also means we cannot keep an eye on the car and check it's secure. <p>Given that this is an area without residents parking, as tax payers and local residents we object to what will cause far more damage to local residents wellbeing than the suggested advantages of introducing the double yellow lines.</p> <p>If the council is truly concerned about the safety of residents and pedestrians on St James' Lane it would better spend its time and energy stopping the heavy haulage vehicles using the lane as a rat-run between Muswell Hill Broadway and Muswell Hill; replacing the ancient and ineffective street lighting and introducing GRIT boxes for when the icy weather comes.</p>
		<p>Objection</p>	<p>Your letter of 21 October 2010 from Joan Hancox, Head of Sustainable Transport, about waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposals for Grasmere Road and Grosvenor Road refers.</p> <p>We are writing to object to the proposals set out in the above letter for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You propose to take up 7.0 metres on either side of both Grasmere Road and Grosvenor Road and we believe that 7.0 metres is unnecessary. Were you to introduce half that distance, 3.5 metres, your objective of ensuring pedestrian and

			<p>vehicle user safety would easily be met.</p> <p>2. Your proposal of taking up 7.0 metres of road on either side of Grasmere Road to double yellow lines means that four car parking spaces will disappear and the same for Grosvenor Road, a total of EIGHT spaces. Grasmere Road, especially, is difficult to park on and as we live near the corner of Grasmere Road and Grosvenor Road, we often have to find a space round the corner, on Grosvenor Road. Under your proposals, I wouldn't find a space on either my road, or round the corner. The fact that most houses on Grosvenor Road have their own drives means that parking is even further restricted as one cannot park across someone's drive. In fact, this proposal may well encourage more people to apply for a drive, making the situation even worse.</p> <p>I do agree that some drivers park irresponsibly at junctions and it is necessary to do something, therefore we would agree to a limit of 3.5 metres of yellow lines, rather than the proposed 7.0 metres, which is unnecessary and will mean some residents of Grasmere Road will be unable to park their cars.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement of this e-mail.</p>
	Langdon Park Road	Objection	<p>I refer to John Hancox's letter of 21 October about the proposed changes to the parking arrangements around Langdon Park Road near Tudor Close.</p> <p>Your proposals will remove a minimum of two parking spaces from Langdon Park Road. Given that Tudor Close has been accessible by refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles for all the time that I have lived here I cannot see any sudden reason why any change at all is required.</p> <p>In addition I would point out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For some reasons the council impose different parking restrictions on Tudor Close than the rest of the area. The result is many residents and visitors to Tudor Close Park in Landon Park Road/Hornsey Lane Gardens leading to an almost empty car park in Tudor Close and congestion is Landon Park Road. If all residents were


			<p>treated fairly and equally (surely a fair request in our democratic country) then I would not object to the changes you have suggested as there would be enough parking spaces in the area.</p> <p>By removing yet more parking space from an already congested area you just make matters worse.</p>
██████████	<p>████ Valette Court, St James Lane, N10 █████</p>	Objection	<p>I wish to make a strong representation AGAINST the proposed double yellow lines that Haringey want to introduce on a stretch of St James Lane opposite the entrance to Valette Court in Muswell Hill N10.</p> <p>Parking is already severely restricted especially due to the high volume of cars attending the North London School Of Performing Arts between the hours of 3.30 - 7.30PM.</p> <p>The residents of Valette Court do not have a car park and introducing these double yellow lines will make parking a near impossibility after the school run during the week.</p> <p>There are already double yellow lines on all the corners of Ellington Road/St James Lane as well as areas along St James Lane near the NLSPA (see above) to allow cars to pull in allowing others to pass.</p> <p>As St James Lane is already a rat-run with cars speeding up and down during peak periods I, and I speak for many of my neighbours, would like to see it made a dead end from the viaduct (as it was earlier this year for several weeks during works on the bridge) which resulted in a much safer road to cross as well as a quieter area to live in.</p>
██████████	Pages Hill	Objection	<p>I own █████ Pages Hill, N10 █████, directly opposite the proposed site for your double Yellow lines.</p> <p>In this regard I write to protest at your ill considered intention to place double yellow lines at the entrances to Barrington Court. Whilst I recognise that Dustcarts need access to the flats, I am dismayed at your proposal to place such Double yellow lines at these points directly opposite my property. In terms of road safety I believe they will do quite the opposite of your stated intent of reducing risk to pedestrians. Pedestrian</p>

			<p>'traffic' along Pages Hill is extremely light even at peak times <u>except</u> near the top of the road, where a large number of mothers park their cars to deliver their children to the nearby school. None of these 'school run' cars park anywhere near Barrington court. Your intended removal of effectively 4 parking spaces at the Barrington court area of Pages Hill will force the owners of cars that would otherwise park here to park further up the road thus creating a far greater hazard in an area where the pedestrian density, particularly of small children, in the mornings and evenings is far greater. The increased load on the available parking space near the top of the Pages Hill will result in a much more significant risk to these young children who will be getting in and out of cars and running to and from the nearby school. The higher density of parked cars will significantly reduce visibility of these children to other drivers and reduce visibility of moving cars to children who are much smaller than the parked cars. This in an area which is extremely busy at peak times of day.</p> <p>Frankly, such a move would be an act of madness – I wish to register a protest in the strongest of terms.</p> <p>This proposal should not go ahead unless you are prepared to risk death and injury to small children in order to make dustcart access to Barrington court marginally easier. I am not aware of a dustcart not being able to get into Barrington court in the Fifteen years I have been living here.</p>
<p>██████████</p>	<p>████ Boyton Close, Hornsey N8 ██████</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the plans to put Yellow Lines in Boyton Close .It is understandable to put yellow lines on the corners of the street but the plans to put yellow lines in the areas that are parking bays makes no sense at all. There is currently too little space to park in this street and putting these yellow lines will make things much worse as this will remove a number of parking bays forcing more people to park on the pavement and as this is a single lane road this can make it difficult to get vehicles past this would included Dustcarts and on occasion when they have tried to get down the road they have not been able to get all the way because of too many vehicles parked on the pavement. The location that is indicated for the proposed double yellow lines will not be of any help to the dustmen. Not least because where the bins are stored is at the</p>

			side of the flats some distance from the proposed yellow lines .In conclusion the proposal for putting Double yellow lines yellow lines in the parking area half way down Boyton Close will not improve things for refuse collection it will only make things worse.
█	█ Ellington Road	General comment	<p>In response to your letter asking for views on the above, I would simply add the following.</p> <p>There is considerable logic to the proposal because of the safety and accessibility reasons given.</p> <p>However, I am very concerned at the further restriction on spaces for residents' parking (some while ago, there were no double yellow lines at all on this road or the junction of Ellington and Linden). This problem is made far worse by the practice of the garages and workshops under the arches on St James's of leaving vehicles (sometimes old and almost abandoned looking) in the street for considerable periods, occasionally also untaxed. Perversely, this problem was highlighted when the police called at my door on Sunday night after they had had a report of a van sliding down Ellington Road and bumping into a parked vehicle - the van was from the garages (supposedly parked safely in the street) and the car was mine!</p> <p>In short the problem is two-fold: the general one of reduced parking places for residents; the more specific one of how this is affected by the lengthy parking of cars and vans (sometimes barely roadworthy) on the streets in this area.</p> <p>The solution could be residents' only parking, say from 12.00 - 2.00 pm. This would enable shoppers and visitors to use the streets but not indeterminate parking by the garages.</p>
█	█ Pages Hill	General comment	<p>I write in response to your letter of 21 Oct regarding proposals to introduce double yellow lines. In principle, I have no objection to this, but in practical terms, it is already extremely difficult to park on this road, and eating up further metres of parking will exacerbate this. The road seems to be used for parking through the week for the nearby schools, and by the residents and visitors to the flats in Barrington Court. There is also a GP parking bay, which takes up some space opposite, so trying to park near my property is impossible.</p> <p>Are there any proposals to introduce residents permits in this area to help with this matter?</p>

<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Boyton Close N8</p>	<p>General comment</p>	<p>Having looked at the proposal for double yellow lines I agree that on corners entering into Boyton Close this is a good idea, allowing easy access for big vehicles and emergency vehicles. With this it would be an idea to consider putting them opposite the turning to allow for a vehicle to swing in clearly without obstruction.</p> <p>My concern is however for the proposal to put two areas covering 5 Meters of double lines, those outside Hilary flats and Fleming flats. I would estimate that this will take away 4 car parking spaces in these parking bays alone, and as I'm sure you are aware there is very limited parking in this area as it is.</p> <p>On a personal level my husband is a Fire Officer who is a blue light responder, this means that 2 nights a week he is paged and despatched to fires from our home address. The result of fewer parking spaces in Boyton Close will be a big issue for him as he needs to have his vehicle close by for security. If he ends up having to park in another street away from our property there is more risk that his vehicle containing blue light, sirens and fire kit could be stolen as we would not be able to hear the alarm actuating.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead I would like to suggest that you put proper lines in to denote parking spaces in the current parking bays which may allow for better positioning of vehicles resulting in more vehicles fitting into the space left following implementation of Double yellow lines. Maybe even a space designated for Emergency use only so my husband could park in the close without incident.</p>
<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>[REDACTED] Grosvenor Road, London N10 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>I write to object to the proposals for Double Yellow Lines on the corner of Thirlemere Road and Grosvenor Road. I do not see that it is necessary to have double yellows lines as this would cause further parking congestion on these roads. I fail to see why a proposal for single yellow lines with timed parking restrictions is not being proposed. Indeed, I have not experienced difficulty getting round that corner as it is wide enough for cars and Lorries to pass one another without any accidents being caused. This is in contrast to the junctions of Victoria Road and Outram Road and even Harcourt Road where cars are parked on the corners and restrict space so much that it is sometimes impossible to move. Why aren't proposals being made for these roads?</p> <p>Furthermore, I should like to point out that a single yellow line could generate an income</p>

			for the cash-starved council as people would be more inclined to ignore parking restrictions and therefore incur fines than they would on double yellows.
██████████	████ Coppetts Road London N10 █████	Objection	<p>As the owner and resident of █████ Coppetts Road N10 █████ I would like to register my objection to the proposal of double yellow lines outside my property.</p> <p>Firstly, the 2 refuse trucks a week that service Eastwood Road do not reverse in to Eastwood Road from Coppetts Road but from Tetherdown. People rarely, if ever, park on this section of Coppetts Road anyway.</p> <p>Parking is already at a premium on Eastwood Road and your proposals mean the loss of 4 potential parking spaces on this road.</p> <p>My 2 youngest children are 3 and 1. The 3 year old is deaf and does not yet understand road safety. Your proposals mean I will not be able to park anywhere near my house and I am worried about the risks this presents to my young children.</p>
██████████	████ Grosvenor Rd █████	Objection	<p>We wish to lodge an objection to the proposal to put double yellow lines at the intersection of Grosvenor and Thirlmere Roads.</p> <p>There is already considerable pressure on parking in the area, those of us with legal dropped kerbs often find it difficult to access our off street parking because of vehicles parked across, or very close, to our access.</p> <p>Placing total of 28 metres of double yellow lines will further reduce parking and increase the likelihood of inconvenience to all residents and obstruction of those properties with off-street parking.</p> <p>After calling your offices to query the reason for this proposal we were told it was because refuse vehicles were having difficulty navigating the junction. We are often at home when refuse vehicles do their rounds and have not witnessed any such problem. Even if this is an issue it seems very undemocratic that the once-a-week convenience of your refuse department should over-ride the convenience and concerns of residents who live here 24/7.</p>

			<p>Despite living almost opposite this junction, we became only aware of this proposal through a neighbour. I note in the statutory notification which was sent to the properties immediately affected you state that a legal Notice of Intention informing residents of the proposal was published on site on October 21. Could you please tell us where, and for how long, this notice was allegedly in place - we frequently walk along this junction and at no time have seen a notice.</p> <p>Under your statutory obligations how long does this notice have to be in place? Can you provide evidence that it was, 1) ever in place and 2) if it were posted, remained for long enough to alert residents.</p>
	<p>on behalf of Boyton Close Residents</p>	<p>Objection/comment</p>	<p>We, the residents of Boyton Close, London N8, write to raise our concerns and objections regarding the council's recent double yellow line proposal within the Statutory Notification dated 21st October 2010..</p> <p>Obstructive Parking at various locations</p> <p>It has only recently been brought to our attention that there are areas, typically where the paving stones have been "dropped", which are assigned to facilitate easy transport of wheelie bins etc. Most of the road users of Boyton Close are oblivious to the location of these "dropped" pavement areas, consequently and inadvertently, obstruct these points. Haringey Council's plan to introduce double yellow lines in these areas and others is excessive and does not truly benefit the road users, which are principally the residents of this road.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is a simple and workable one. We suggest that you alert the residents and fellow road users of the "dropped" pavement by putting white line road markings in those areas. Most motorists are aware that they should not park on white lines because they are obstructing someone's pathway to their drive or garage. We would also suggest that these "dropped paving" areas are confined to the bottle neck areas (external corners only) of Boyton Close.</p> <p>Road Safety for Pedestrians</p>

We have noted that other local councils have introduced road calming measures such as road narrowing as a means of reducing speed and increasing safety for pedestrians.

Boyton Close already benefits from having a narrow road, and as a result has not experienced any deaths or serious injury to pedestrians in over 50 years, as witnessed by one of our long term residents. We believe Haringey's fears for pedestrians' safety to be overstated and misplaced for this road. We would therefore welcome Haringey Council to produce any evidence to the contrary.

Accessibility for Refuse Collection

The dimensions of the wheelie bins which are used to transport refuse bags are typically 4 feet long by 2 and half feet wide and just over 4 feet high. The handles on these bins are located on the narrow side to enable easy manoeuvrability in confined spaces.

It is interesting to note that the refuse collection service routinely have to transport these wheelie bins through gates and/or pathways which are less than 3 feet in width. We therefore find Haringey Councils proposal to allocate in excess of 15 feet (5 metres) for the movement of wheelie bins wholly unacceptable. This action demonstrates a lack of consideration for the residents who have to park their cars on this road.

Accessibility for Emergency Vehicles

We the residents of Boyton Close believe that the measures which we have suggested would be more than adequate to enable safe accessibility of the Emergency service.

The total ban of parking at the proposed locations as forwarded by Haringey Council would serve little or no additional impact on the emergency services ability to carry out their work on this road. However the impact of having double yellow lines right outside Flemming and Shelley Flats would have a severe impact on other road users ability to park on Boyton Close. We therefore wonder what provisions Haringey Council has

			<p>allocated for displaced cars on this road if their plan was to go ahead?.</p> <p>We do agree however that there is a need to have some form restriction at the top of Boyton Close but the encroachment need not exceed more than 5 m into the Close.</p> <p>A petition from local residents and road users on this road (including pedestrians) is being compiled about this matter and will be forwarded to your office in due course.. The appropriate local officials will also be notified. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter</p>
<p>██████████</p>	<p>████ Grosvenor Road, Muswell Hill ██████████</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>I object to the proposed waiting restrictions to accommodate waste collection.</p> <p>I live one house away from the junction and have not witnessed any dangers caused buy trucks, indeed they do not usually turn Grosvenor Road at this point, they drive straight past the junction.</p> <p>Parking is very limited in the road, with a large number of vehicle crossovers and family homes with more than one car. I have been prevented from having a crossover by the CATV hatch on the pavement outside my property.</p> <p>I live alone , am getting older and have some mobility restrictions, which are expected to worsen over time. Parking close to home is essential to maintain my independence. These proposal will make parking even more difficult . I have already unfairly discriminated against by the fact that road's CATV hatch is outside my property , preventing me from having a crossover. This will be compounded by reducing the parking apportunities in the road. For me, this will impair my independence. I bought this house with expectation of it meeting my needs as I grow older and if it becomes even more difficult to park outside it will no longer do so.</p> <p>I feel therefore that I must raise my unreserved objection to your proposals which are totally unnecessary and will only make parking in the vicinity worse and more congested.</p>

APPENDIX V

DRAWINGS BOYTON CLOSE