

Alma Terrace/Alma Grove Objections x 4

I wish to make a Formal Objection to the decision to approve the proposal to introduce a Residents' Priority Parking Zone to Alma Grove, Alma Terrace and Kilburn Road, to be identified as Zone R70.

My principal concern is the additional cost to residents at this time of unprecedented increases in the cost of living, namely Energy charges, Council Tax increases and the proposed increase in National Insurance payments.

Perhaps more formally, I note your decision to go ahead is contrary to the Consultation Results showing a number percentages well below the normal minimum required to show approval from residents, particularly that the 50% returns usually required was not achieved on the vast majority of streets.

Finally, from the papers supplied with your proposal, I note that the Recommended Option was Option 1, to proceed with Kilburn Road only, and I can find no record of where this decision was changed.

Now that I have received the details of the Residents' Priority Parking Scheme proposal for Alma Grove and looked at the current charges for permits I wish to object to the implementation of this proposal.

My main reason is that in order to park outside my own home I would be expected to pay an annual fee of approximately £100.

Secondly, every time we have a visitor even for one night, we would have the inconvenience of applying for a temporary permit.

Thirdly, after more than two years of ownership of this house I have never once not found a parking place somewhere in Alma Grove.

Fourthly, this scheme does not prevent non-residents from parking in Alma Grove and does not guarantee me a parking place.

In conclusion I would be paying £100 a year for no substantive benefit beyond what I now enjoy.

Annex G

I understand there are plans to introduce residential priority parking on Alma terrace. I am a resident on Alma Terrace and would like to understand what this will mean for myself.

I do not myself own a car, so I rely on family and friends who kindly visit on a regular basis and help me with my shopping and various other jobs around the house and garden. They require parking (as they are often bringing tools/shopping etc) often only for a few hours, or even less. I also have a cleaner who comes every two weeks and requires a parking space for 2 hours. This means I sometimes have multiple visits from different people on the same day, but only ever require parking for one car at any time, often for a very short period.

Will I be able to buy a permit for one car parking spot, but not registered to one specific car? As I have many different people visit it will be very expensive for me to buy full day visitor permits for each person who visits me when they are often only there for a few hours and I sometimes have multiple visitors in a day.

While I am not against the introduction of restrictions to allow residents to have priority parking I am concerned that I will be disadvantaged if I am unable to buy a permit for any one car that will cover the different people visiting me.

Annex G

Further to the letter of January 2022, I write to object to the proposal.

- Firstly I note that the consultation did not include Aurora House, which has access on to Alma Terrace. Accordingly, the consultation is flawed.
- I understand that the officer recommendation was to reject a scheme. The reasons given in your letter for the proposal include adequate parking management. However there is nothing in the documents listed on the website as available to the Executive Member which addresses parking management considerations. There are only comments which respond to residents' comments during the consultation. No reasoning is advanced about how a scheme will address those considerations or why a 9-5 scheme is the best option.
- The second reason stated is residents' preference. One can see from the results that 99 and 30 residents were consulted in Alma Terrace and Alma Grove respectively. Less than half replied and, further, the usual 50% was not met. That should have been sufficient to reject the scheme, as it will otherwise impose burdens on the majority.
- Looking at the minutes, it appears that the decision was based on the representations in a petition presented by Katherine Crocker, requesting residents parking be installed on Alma Terrace. There are 99 properties in Alma Terrace and the residents petition had only 18 responses with 13 in favour and 5 against. Even Katherine Crocker noted that the 50% threshold had not been met.
- The decision itself says "*Alma Terrace and Alma Grove were considered due to the high number of residents in favour of those that responded, but having missed out on the 50% threshold, was not recommended for inclusion. The Executive Member noted that due to the geography of both streets and the large number of responses, he requested that both streets be advertised to join the residents parking zone.*" What the 'Geography of both streets' refers to is wholly unclear and does not address the likely impact of introduction on neighbouring streets. Presumably that was why the whole area was canvassed. Further the response threshold for both streets cannot be described as 'large' even with 13 people repeating their support..

If the threshold (and therefore usual Council policy) had been reached, I would not need to write to you. As it is, the decision proposes a scheme for part of a discrete area based on limited residents' approval and creating a ripple effect, with any parking issues being relocated nearby. The decision reached appears fundamentally flawed.

My concerns refer to a piecemeal introduction of a scheme in a discrete area leading to the same difficulties as in R20 (where the scheme had to be extended several times because of the impact on neighbouring streets).