

APPENDIX 2

Summary of objections/representations received

	Address		R, B or O	Response to	Representation
1	Ward member	P	O	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free parking should continue • needed to support shopping area • non-compliance not a problem
2	Ward member	P	O	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free parking should continue • needed to support shopping area • rationale behind proposals is flawed
3	Ward member	P	O	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with proposals • Provision should be given to parents using the station
4	Burn Way	B	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals unnecessary • Revenue driven • P & D charges too high • Will adversely impact on vitality of Bridge Road
5	Ennerdale Gardens	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free parking should continue • Will adversely impact on shops • Existing arrangements works well
6	Not given	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to proposals • Will adversely impact on shops • Standardising is unnecessary
7	Montpelier Rise	B	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will transform appearance of area(s) • Will adversely impact on shops • Will be counter –productive in overall income terms
8	Carlton Avenue East	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate consultation – will impact beyond those directly consulted • Will displace parking onto residential streets • Will adversely impact on shops • Standardisation is a flawed rationale
9	Preston Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambivalent to proposals but need to address congestion between The Avenue and Woodcock Hill
10	Not given	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed charges exorbitant • Will adversely impact on residents and shops • Existing arrangement works well
11	Mount Stewart Avenue	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate consultation • Will adversely impact on residents and shops • Revenue driven • Predicted income will be offset by costs
12	Preston Road	P	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our staff need the free bays • Will adversely impact on shops • Other Boroughs have better arrangements in shopping areas • P & D charges are exorbitant
13	Preston Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents (of Preston Road) who already have to compete for parking space • Will adversely impact on shops
14	Preston Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents (of Preston Road) who will be displaced to

					nearby residential streets
15	South Kenton & Preston Park Residents' Association	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on shops • Not justified in small shopping areas such as Preston Road • P & D charges too high
16	Allonby Gardens	P	R	G & S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on shops • Existing arrangement works well • Will not impact on potential commuters
17	Not given	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on shops • Will displace parking onto residential streets • P & D charges to high
18	Preston Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents of Preston Road as parking is displaced onto residential streets • Existing arrangement works well • Rationale behind proposals flawed • Will adversely impact on local shops
19	Coniston Gardens	P	R	G & S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents needing to use services in Preston Road
20	Coniston Gardens	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will reverse recent improvements in Preston Road (since existing arrangements were introduced) • Existing arrangement works well
21	Not given	P	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on businesses
22	Windermere Avenue	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents, particularly the elderly, needing to access services in Preston Road • Will adversely impact on local shops and community
23	Ebrington Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on local community • Standardisation is a flawed rationale
24	Coniston Gardens	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on residents seeking to use local shops and services • Will enable motorists to park for longer – Making it harder to find a space • Existing arrangement works well
25	Preston Road	P	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on our customers and hence on our business – a similar situation already exists in Kingsbury Road
26	Kenton Homeowners Association	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on shops and residents • Existing arrangements work well • Will, be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rate income)
27	Preston & Mall Community Centre	P	O	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on local businesses • Existing arrangements work well • Will be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rates)
28	Preston Road	P	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on customers, visitors and staff to my business
29	Preston Road	B	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals will disproportionately impact on the elderly with low income and those with mobility problems
30	Carlton Avenue East	P	R	G & S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will adversely impact on shops • Will be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rates)
31	Elmstead Avenue Residents'	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale behind proposals flawed and

	Association				<p>not substantiated by evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income predictions overly optimistic Will adversely impact on shops (hasten current decline) Proposals contrary to UDP strategy Inconsistency in proposals re longer stay arrangements
32	Preston Road	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on residents of Preston Road – particularly as motorists will be displaced into adjacent residential streets Will adversely impact on shops No apparent benefit for residents Standardisation is unnecessary
33	Preston Amenities Protection Association (see also petition)	P	R	G & S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing arrangements work well Rationale behind proposals flawed will adversely impact on businesses, residents and community well being. Better to properly enforce current arrangements Revenue driven Standardisation is unnecessary Inadequate business case presented
34	Ward Member	B	O	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal will adversely impact on shops – should provide cheaper P & D arrangements as in other Boroughs
35	Carlton Avenue East	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate consultation Will adversely impact on shops Disingenuous attempt to support Wembley re-gen area Will increase pollution & congestion (as motorists go elsewhere) Will be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rates)
36	Preston Road	P	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing arrangements work well – no compelling case for change Resources should be invested in other initiatives Revenue driven but business case flawed Make savings elsewhere Will adversely impact on businesses and the community Will be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rates) Contrary to messages from Central Government (around supporting local businesses)
37	Carlton Avenue East	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on local businesses and local employment Flawed business case A better proposal would be a "free first half hour" scheme
38	Corringham Road	B	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on local businesses and their customers P & D charges are penal Operational (start) time is absurd Irresponsible to introduce scheme at time of financial hardship Will be counter-productive in overall income terms (business rates) Existing arrangements adequate deter

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> commuters Other means of raising income (such as charging for Town Hall car park) should be pursued Inadequate consultation
39	Bridge Road	B	B	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to plans – contrary to proposals rejected recently
40	Preston Way	B	R	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on businesses Revenue driven Fails to reflect the Councils role to listen and effect local needs Existing arrangements work well Flawed rationale – standardisation not justified Proposals outside scope of standardisation – since bays are not currently pays and display Insufficient analysis of rationale and impact Flawed financial business case
41	Not Provided	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on businesses Contrary to trend of supporting local businesses Savings should be generated from other areas/initiatives
42	Ravenscroft Avenue	P	R	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will adversely impact on shops Public transport links to area inadequate Flawed rationale Will increase emissions and congestion (as motorists go elsewhere) Free/subsidised parking arrangement, according to local spend should be introduced
43	QARA Group of Associations	B	R	G&S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human rights issues (not specified) – traders. Their customers & local residents Erroneous information within report to Executive (December 2010) in relation to the rationale for charges, comparative charges in other Boroughs & rationale for reviewing charges at Preston Rd & Bridge Rd Erroneous/misleading data and biase and overly simplistic business case within report to Highways committee (March 2011) Proposals not considered in context of Council Strategies & Policies – LDF, LIP, Corporate Strategy, PPS 12. EQIA,SEA & MTS Fiduciary duty of Executive & Highways Committte not carried out Material issues not addressed by Highways Committee (March 2011) – wider financial implications not considered, no impact assessment, flawed rationale for proposals, failure to enforce restrictions resulting in manipulating of reporting and decision making Inadequate consultation Proposals go beyond original scope

					<p>agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of consultation has been pre-determined (ref Planning Application June 2011 item 13)
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Notes:

Column 2 - representation relates to:

P – Preston Road proposals only

Br – Bridge Road proposals only

B – Proposals at both locations

Column 3 - representation received from:

R – Resident or organisation primarily representing residents

B – Business or organisation primarily representing businesses

O – Other (eg ward members)

Column 4 – representation in response (where known) to:

G – General (open) consultation

S – Statutory consultation