

Alexandra Palace West: Possible CPZ

Consultation on a possible CPZ was held from 1st December 2021 with an original closing date of 29 December. This was subsequently extended to 21 January 2022.

Data Analysis

| | | Count | % |
|---|-----------------------|-------|------|
| Are you a Resident, Business or Resident/Trader/Community. .. | Resident | 1669 | 97% |
| | Business | 31 | 2% |
| | Alexandra Park School | 16 | 1% |
| | Total | 1716 | 100% |

Respondents did not understand the definitions clearly and many assumed that group referred to number of persons in the household. Respondents identifying as a group consisted of schoolteachers and staff at Alexandra Park School

Q3. Is it difficult to park in your road?

| | | Count | % |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------|------|
| Is it difficult to park in your road? | Yes | 233 | 14% |
| | No | 1086 | 64% |
| | Sometimes | 389 | 23% |
| | Total | 1708 | 100% |

Q3a Difficult to park – by Road (NB percentages read across>>> in this table)

| | | Is it difficult to park in your road? | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|
| | | Yes | | No | | Sometimes | |
| Road name | | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % |
| Albert Rd | | 16 | 16% | 63 | 62% | 22 | 22% |
| Alexandra Park Rd | | 19 | 9% | 143 | 70% | 43 | 21% |
| Bidwell Gdns | | 1 | 5% | 16 | 80% | 3 | 15% |
| Cecil Rd | | 0 | 0% | 25 | 68% | 12 | 32% |
| Clifton Rd | | 0 | 0% | 24 | 89% | 3 | 11% |
| Clyde Rd | | 9 | 19% | 25 | 53% | 13 | 28% |
| Coniston Rd | | 8 | 14% | 34 | 59% | 16 | 28% |
| Crescent Rise | | 5 | 21% | 11 | 46% | 8 | 33% |
| Curzon Rd | | 7 | 18% | 28 | 72% | 4 | 10% |
| Cranbourne Rd | | 2 | 8% | 19 | 76% | 4 | 16% |
| Donovan Ave | | 1 | 5% | 15 | 68% | 6 | 27% |
| Dukes Ave | | 14 | 19% | 45 | 61% | 15 | 20% |
| Durnsford Rd | | 3 | 25% | 9 | 75% | 0 | 0% |
| Elgin Rd | | 0 | 0% | 16 | 94% | 1 | 6% |
| Elms Ave | | 2 | 14% | 6 | 43% | 6 | 43% |
| Grove Ave | | 3 | 4% | 61 | 90% | 4 | 6% |
| Harcourt Rd | | 2 | 6% | 27 | 84% | 3 | 9% |
| Lansdowne Rd | | 0 | 0% | 26 | 90% | 3 | 10% |
| Methuen Park | | 6 | 23% | 5 | 19% | 15 | 58% |
| Muswell Ave | | 12 | 20% | 22 | 37% | 26 | 43% |
| Grosvenor Rd | | 3 | 9% | 18 | 55% | 12 | 36% |
| Muswell Rd | | 17 | 24% | 39 | 54% | 16 | 22% |
| Outram Rd | | 13 | 42% | 9 | 29% | 9 | 29% |
| Palace Court Gdns | | 0 | 0% | 11 | 85% | 2 | 15% |
| Parham Way | | 0 | 0% | 2 | 67% | 1 | 33% |
| Princes Ave | | 11 | 25% | 12 | 27% | 21 | 48% |
| Rhodes Ave | | 2 | 8% | 12 | 50% | 10 | 42% |
| Rosebery Rd | | 7 | 8% | 63 | 72% | 17 | 20% |
| Sakura Drive | | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% |
| St Regis Close | | 1 | 17% | 5 | 83% | 0 | 0% |
| The Avenue | | 0 | 0% | 37 | 82% | 8 | 18% |
| Vallance Rd | | 0 | 0% | 55 | 100% | 0 | 0% |
| Victoria Rd | | 38 | 28% | 69 | 51% | 28 | 21% |
| Wellfield Ave | | 2 | 17% | 4 | 33% | 6 | 50% |
| Winton Ave | | 1 | 3% | 24 | 83% | 4 | 14% |
| Wroxham Gdns | | 0 | 0% | 5 | 100% | 0 | 0% |
| Outlying roads | | 8 | 12% | 48 | 74% | 9 | 14% |
| Grasmere Rd | | 4 | 27% | 4 | 27% | 7 | 47% |
| Thirlmere Rd | | 3 | 19% | 6 | 38% | 7 | 44% |
| Windermere Rd | | 6 | 20% | 13 | 43% | 11 | 37% |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | | 2 | 40% | 1 | 20% | 2 | 40% |
| Colney Hatch Lane | | 0 | 0% | 4 | 80% | 1 | 20% |
| Not stated | | 5 | 13% | 23 | 59% | 11 | 28% |
| Total | | 233 | 14% | 1086 | 64% | 389 | 23% |

Q4. Need CPZ controls?

| | | Count | % |
|--------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Need CPZ controls? | Yes | 242 | 14% |
| | No | 1468 | 86% |
| | Total | 1710 | 100% |

Q5. If 'No' to CPZ , but others said yes, would you then agree to a CPZ?

| | | Count | % |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| If 'No' to CPZ controls, but others said yes, would you support a CPZ?. | Yes | 294 | 20% |
| | No | 1209 | 80% |
| | Total | 1503 | 100% |

Q5 – by Road. If 'No' to CPZ , but others said yes, would you then agree to a CPZ?

| | | Need CPZ controls? | | If 'No' to CPZ controls, but others said yes, would you support a CPZ?. | |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|---|----------|
| | | Yes Count | No Count | Yes Count | No Count |
| Road name | Albert Rd | 19 | 82 | 13 | 71 |
| | Alexandra Park Rd | 22 | 183 | 21 | 162 |
| | Bidwell Gdns | 2 | 18 | 6 | 13 |
| | Cecil Rd | 2 | 37 | 6 | 31 |
| | Clifton Rd | 1 | 26 | 6 | 20 |
| | Clyde Rd | 10 | 37 | 5 | 34 |
| | Coniston Rd | 6 | 51 | 8 | 44 |
| | Crescent Rise | 6 | 18 | 3 | 17 |
| | Curzon Rd | 8 | 31 | 7 | 26 |
| | Cranbourne Rd | 3 | 22 | 8 | 13 |
| | Donovan Ave | 2 | 20 | 2 | 16 |
| | Dukes Ave | 15 | 60 | 18 | 45 |
| | Durnsford Rd | 3 | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| | Elgin Rd | 2 | 15 | 3 | 13 |
| | Elms Ave | 1 | 13 | 8 | 5 |
| | Grove Ave | 2 | 66 | 12 | 54 |
| | Harcourt Rd | 2 | 30 | 7 | 24 |
| | Lansdowne Rd | 1 | 28 | 5 | 22 |
| | Methuen Park | 11 | 15 | 5 | 12 |
| | Muswell Ave | 11 | 48 | 20 | 32 |
| | Grosvenor Rd | 2 | 31 | 14 | 19 |
| | Muswell Rd | 21 | 51 | 12 | 41 |
| | Outram Rd | 14 | 16 | 2 | 16 |
| | Palace Court Gdns | 0 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| | Parham Way | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | Princes Ave | 9 | 35 | 6 | 31 |
| | Rhodes Ave | 0 | 24 | 2 | 21 |
| | Rosebery Rd | 10 | 79 | 11 | 68 |
| | Sakura Drive | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | St Regis Close | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| | The Avenue | 2 | 43 | 9 | 35 |
| | Vallance Rd | 1 | 54 | 5 | 47 |
| | Victoria Rd | 39 | 96 | 28 | 81 |
| | Wellfield Ave | 1 | 11 | 3 | 8 |
| | Winton Ave | 1 | 28 | 2 | 26 |
| | Wroxham Gdns | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | Outlying roads | 3 | 62 | 8 | 53 |
| | Grasmere Rd | 0 | 15 | 4 | 11 |
| | Thirlmere Rd | 1 | 15 | 7 | 8 |
| | Windermere Rd | 3 | 27 | 7 | 21 |
| | Muswell Hill Bdy | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | Colney Hatch Lane | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| | Not stated | 3 | 36 | 3 | 34 |
| | Total | 242 | 1468 | 294 | 1209 |

Q6 & Q7 Operating times (if CPZ required)

| | | Count | % |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| If CPZ needed, what operating times? | Two hours 10am - 12noon | 533 | 59% |
| | All day e.g 8am - 6:30pm | 114 | 13% |
| | Four hours 10am - 2pm | 100 | 11% |
| | Other, please write below | 164 | 18% |
| | Total | 911 | 100% |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 hour 10am - 11am | 5 - 7pm weekends and 9am- 1pm on Sundays |
| 1 hour 11am - 12 noon if CPZ is imposed | 5:30- 6:30 |
| 1 hour during 2pm - 3pm | 5am-6am |
| 1 hour only | 5pm-6pm |
| 1 hour only | 6 pm -8am |
| 1 HOUR ONLY | 6-8pm |
| 1 hour10am | 6.00 pm-7.00 am |
| 1 or less hour per day | 6.30pm - 8pm when people come home from work |
| 10-11 | 6.30pm to Midnight |
| 10am - 11am is sufficient to deter commuters/dumped cars | 6pm - 8pm. All day at weekends |
| 10pm - Midnight | 6pm to 8pm |
| 10pm-6am | 7am-8am |
| 11 - 12noon | 7am-8am / 6pm-7pm |
| 11 - 12NOON | 7pm - 10pm |
| 12 - 2 or 12 - 1 | 8-10am to stop teachers from local schools parking |
| 12-2 | 9-10pm |
| 12noon - 2pm | 9-11pm |
| 12noon-2pm | 9-11pm |
| 17.30 - 18.30 | 9-11pm |
| 2pm - 3pm | 9am - 10am |
| 2pm - 3pm like LB Barnet to prevent all-day parking | 9am - Midnight |
| 2pm-4pm | Add chevron parking pattern one side |
| 3:30pm - 4:00pm | After 8pm |
| 3pm - 4pm | congestion is late evening and night, so any controls should be in the evening eg 6-10pm |
| 3pm - 5pm | Controls need to operate in the evenings |
| 3pm to 6pm if a CPZ is put in | CPZ should operate late evenings |
| 4:30-6:30 | Evenings are more congested |
| 4.30pm - 6.30pm | Evenings to 8pm |
| 4pm - 6pm | Evenings/Overnight |
| 4pm - 7pm on weekdays. 8am - 2pm at weekends | Overnight at weekends only. |
| | Q6 & Q7 are not applicable |

Support for CPZ controls – by Road

| | | Need CPZ controls? | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| | | Yes | | No | |
| Road name | | Count | Row % >>> | Count | Row % >>> |
| Albert Rd | | 19 | 19% | 82 | 81% |
| Alexandra Park Rd | | 22 | 11% | 183 | 89% |
| Bidwell Gdns | | 2 | 10% | 18 | 90% |
| Cecil Rd | | 2 | 5% | 37 | 95% |
| Clifton Rd | | 1 | 4% | 26 | 96% |
| Clyde Rd | | 10 | 21% | 37 | 79% |
| Coniston Rd | | 6 | 11% | 51 | 89% |
| Crescent Rise | | 6 | 25% | 18 | 75% |
| Curzon Rd | | 8 | 21% | 31 | 79% |
| Cranbourne Rd | | 3 | 12% | 22 | 88% |
| Donovan Ave | | 2 | 9% | 20 | 91% |
| Dukes Ave | | 15 | 20% | 60 | 80% |
| Durnsford Rd | | 3 | 25% | 9 | 75% |
| Elgin Rd | | 2 | 12% | 15 | 88% |
| Elms Ave | | 1 | 7% | 13 | 93% |
| Grove Ave | | 2 | 3% | 66 | 97% |
| Harcourt Rd | | 2 | 6% | 30 | 94% |
| Lansdowne Rd | | 1 | 3% | 28 | 97% |
| Methuen Park | | 11 | 42% | 15 | 58% |
| Muswell Ave | | 11 | 19% | 48 | 81% |
| Grosvenor Rd | | 2 | 6% | 31 | 94% |
| Muswell Rd | | 21 | 29% | 51 | 71% |
| Outram Rd | | 14 | 47% | 16 | 53% |
| Palace Court Gdns | | 0 | 0% | 13 | 100% |
| Parham Way | | 1 | 33% | 2 | 67% |
| Princes Ave | | 9 | 20% | 35 | 80% |
| Rhodes Ave | | 0 | 0% | 24 | 100% |
| Rosebery Rd | | 10 | 11% | 79 | 89% |
| Sakura Drive | | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% |
| St Regis Close | | 0 | 0% | 6 | 100% |
| The Avenue | | 2 | 4% | 43 | 96% |
| Vallance Rd | | 1 | 2% | 54 | 98% |
| Victoria Rd | | 39 | 29% | 96 | 71% |
| Wellfield Ave | | 1 | 8% | 11 | 92% |
| Winton Ave | | 1 | 3% | 28 | 97% |
| Wroxham Gdns | | 1 | 20% | 4 | 80% |
| Outlying roads | | 3 | 5% | 62 | 95% |
| Grasmere Rd | | 0 | 0% | 15 | 100% |
| Thirlmere Rd | | 1 | 6% | 15 | 94% |
| Windermere Rd | | 3 | 10% | 27 | 90% |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | | 1 | 20% | 4 | 80% |
| Colney Hatch Lane | | 0 | 0% | 5 | 100% |
| Not stated | | 3 | 8% | 36 | 92% |

Q8. Do you need short term visitor parking?

| | | Count | % |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Do you feel that your street requires short term visitor ... | Yes | 130 | 8% |
| | No | 1555 | 92% |
| | Total | 1685 | 100% |

Q9. Parking problems and issues

| | | Count | % |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| Causes of problems | Multicar households | 408 | 52% |
| | Overspill from other CPZs | 279 | 36% |
| | Commuters | 276 | 35% |
| | Other issues | 271 | 35% |
| | Use of bins to reserve space | 134 | 17% |
| | Temporary traffic schemes | 60 | 8% |
| | Total | 783 | 100% |

Other issues consist of

- Driveways (crossovers) which are seen as restricting off-street parking and are not environmentally friendly
- Trade vans, builders vans and skips
- Events at Alexandra Palace (occasional problem)
- Shoppers using the main shopping areas
- School pick-up and drop -off

EVCP Requests

109 Victoria Road, n22 7xg
 11 Rosebery Rd N10
 115 Dukes Avenue London N10 2QD
 12a Alexandra park road
 14 Grosvenor road
 144 Albert Road
 16 Cecil road
 16 Harcourt Rd N22
 17 Thirlmere Road, N10 2DL
 17 Winton Avenue
 2 Victoria road N22 7XA
 201 Albert Road N22 7AQ
 26 Crescent Rise, N22 7AW
 29 Windermere Rd, N10 2RD
 32 Vallance Road, Paul Wastell
 33 Princes Avenue
 39 Thirlmere rd
 50 Bolster Grove N22 7RY
 50 Windermere Road

61 Alexandra Park Road
 65 Victoria road n22 7xa
 70 The Avenue
 71 Clyde Road Steve Potts
 8 Elms Avenue N10 2JP
 93 Victoria Road
 A Ghafoor 230 b Alexandra Park Rd
 A Muggleston 9 St Regis Close N 10 2DE
 A Newson 60 Rosebery Rd
 A Sawczenho 169 Victoria Rd Please allow residents to charge cars using cables from their houses
 Adwoa Oduro-Yeboah 77 Dukes Avenue N10 2PY
 Ahmed Mohamed, 28 Coniston Road, N10 2BP
 Alastair Davidson 33 Muswell Rd N10 2BS
 Alessandro Manni, 41b Muswell rd
 Alex Arenson
 Alex Howden, 8 Vallance Road, N22 7UB
 Alex Rouse 26a Coniston Rd N10 2BP
 Alex Shirley-Smith, 50 Bidwell Gardens

Alexander Gabriel 2 Curzon rd N10 2RA
 Ali Ay Flat 1 86 Alexandra Park Rd N10
 Alice Beaven 21 Grove Avenue London N10 2AS
 Alison Abbey 78 Grosvenor Road N10 2DS
 All street lamps should have chargers on them
 Already got one!
 Amanda Jones 156 Victoria Rd N22 7XQ
 Amy Appleby, 65 Rosebery Road N10 2LE
 Amy Nicol Stewart 78 Victoria Rd N22 7XF
 Amy Ruddock 63 Etheldene Ave N10
 An EVCP would be useful to have on Winton Avenue as
 more people buy electric cars. We don't need one
 currently for our personal use.
 Ana Carolina Gigler, 41b Muswell rd
 Andrew Milton 79 Dukes Avenue N10
 Anna Kendall 76 Muswell Avenue
 Anton Ezer 8 Clyde Road N22 7AE
 Antonia Wade, 22 Elgin Road, N22 7UE
 Arturo Sala, 35 Clifton rd N22 7XN
 Asif Kapadia, 53 Grosvenor Road, London N10 2DR
 Audrey Cahill, Flat 4 103 Rosebery Rd N10 2LD
 Barbara Greenwood, 2 Elgin Rd, N22 7UE
 Barry Chu. 85 Dukes Ave N10 2QD
 Beatrice Hyams 29 Dukes Avenue London N10 2PX
 Ben Carroll 43 Muswell Rd N10 2BS
 Brownlow Road Haringey N112DE
 Bruce Goodison 28 Crescent Rise N22 7AW
 Bruce Shayler 15 Lansdowne Rd N10 2AX
 Cal McCrystal 12 Methuen Park N10 2JS
 Camilla Bolt 4 Vallance Road N22 7UB
 Can't afford an Electric Vehicle
 Cannot afford an electric car
 Carlos Sapochnik 106 Victoria Rd N22
 Carol Clarke, 22 Lansdowne Road, N10 2AU
 Carol Hansen-Jones 253 APR N22 7BJ
 Carolyn bodnar 47 Victoria road
 Celeste Michael 69 Victoria Rd N22 7XG
 Celeste Michael, 69 Victoria Rd, N22 7XG
 Cengiz Rifat 2 Cranbourne Road
 Charlie Kronictz 29 Harcourt Rd N22 7XWW
 Christian Bailey 53 Dukes Ave N10
 Christina Stoakes 78 Muswell Rd N10
 Christopher Price 271 Alexandra Park Road N22
 Ciaran Moran 3 Outram rd N22 7AB
 Claire Crill, 93 Victoria Road
 Claire Walsh 71 Outram Rd
 Clare Winstanley 178 Victoria Rd
 Colin Ettinger 72 Windermere Road N10 2RG
 D Ecklin 109 Rosebery Rd N10 2LD
 Daniel Cohen 14 Palace Ct Gdns N10 2LB
 Daniel Stevens 13 Harcourt Rd N22
 David Collins 4 Cecil rd N10 2BU
 David Corry, 4, Princes Avenue, N22 7SA
 David Lewis 75 Muswell Rd N10 2BS
 David Norman 27 Harcourt Rd N22 7XW. EVCP
 rollout would be useful
 David Oppenheimer 10 Wellfield Ave N10 2EA
 David Proctor 12 Lansdowne Rd N10
 Dawn Kemp flat 3 40 Methuen Park (main door on
 Dukes Ave)
 Debbie Sutherland 67a Muswell ave
 Deborah Ross, 5 Lansdowne Rd N10 2AX
 Denis Lonergan 83 Dukes Avenue N10 2QD
 Desara Bosnja 118 b avenue mansions grove road
 Dr G S J Rands 8 Lansdowne Road. [Please note ex-
 electoral register]

Dr S A Koplan 13 Elgin road N22 7UE
 Dr William Adams 39 Grove Avenue N10 2AS
 Duncan Rowden, 16 Clifton Road, N22 7XN
 Eleni Vasiliou, 144 Victoria Road, N22 7XQ
 Emily Tolens 180 Albert Rd N22
 Emma bloom 89 grove ave n102a
 Emma France 259 Alexandra Park road N22 7BJ
 Enrico Bergese 62 Coniston Rd
 Eri Maeda (Ms), 11A Grosvenor Road, N10 2DR
 Eveleen Riordan 78 Windermere road
 Eventually
 Eventually at 150 Albert Road but I can't afford an
 electric car at present
 Every house should have an EVCP if you want to phase
 out petrol and diesel
 Fiona Brown, 23 Rosebery Road N10 2LE
 Fiona Starr 17 Harcourt Rd
 For future, but not yet needed 32c Muswell Ave. Can
 we also have a bike store?
 For the future: Patricia Rubio 107 Dukes Avenue
 Gaelle Wandasiewicz 171 Alexandra Park rd N22 7UL
 Gail Hepburn 4 Muswell Ave, N10 2EE
 Gary Taylor 229a Alexandra Park Road
 Gill Piesold 58 Alexandra Park rd N10 2AD
 Giselle Easterling 39 Windermere Road
 Giselle Easterling 39 Windermere Road N10 2RD
 Gordon Carver 43 Curzon Rd N10 2RB
 Graeme Fisher 102 Dukes Avenue N10 2QA
 Greg Forde 96 Dukes avenue
 Gregor Macadem & Melanie Stokes 178 Alexandra
 Park Rd
 Gwyneth Hawkins 3 Albert Road N22 7AA
 Haroon Rashid, 3 Albert Road, London N22 7AA
 Helen Boatman Flat 4 Caversham Lodge, Grove
 Avenue N10. We don't yet have an electric car but there
 are 6 flats here
 Helen Pratt 191 Victoria Road N22 7XH
 Helen Stone 29 Elgin rd N22 7UE
 Helen Walsh 49 Coniston Rd N10 2BL
 I don't yet have an EV but will purchase one soon, so
 yes.
 I understand that EVCPs will be installed but if not, then
 yes please: J House, 32 Cecil Road N10 2BU
 I wish I could afford an electric car
 I would like to find out more. Mrs Dominique Frankel-
 Pollen, 3 St Saviours Ct, APR N22 7AZ
 I'd like an electric car but they are too expensive
 I'd not want an EVCP which limits parking availability
 near my home
 Ian Kaye 29 Cranbourne Rd N10 2BT
 If an EVCP is available, we will be more likely to buy an
 EV.
 In future. David Kay 92 Dukes Avenue
 In the future, hopefully
 Ioannis Toumpis 56 Grove Avenue
 J Mendelssohn 6 Crescent Rise
 Jackie Myles 76 Albert Road N22 7AH
 James Parfitt 29 Rhodes Ave N22 7UR
 James Tapper, 41a Muswell Avenue, London N10 2EH
 Janice O'Shea 54 Blake Road N112AZ
 Janice O'Shea. 54 Blake road N112AH
 Jennifer Griggs 83 Grove Ave
 Jeremy Summerfield 109 Victoria Rd N22 7XG
 J James Lowe 58 Bidwell Gdns
 Joanna O'Connor 23 Rhodes avenue

Joel Haspel 9 Princes Avenue - only if it would be dedicated for my use or even the use of people on Princes Avenue.

John Fynaut, 30, N10 2DJ. I don't have an electric car yet. But several neighbours already own electric cars.

Jonathan Alpert 59 Windermere Rd n10 2rd

Joseph Smith 39 Albert Rd N22 7AA

Josh Miles, 28 Elms Avenue N10 2 JP

Judit Szekeres 71 Alexandra Park Road

Judy Loren 30 Vallance Rd N22 7UB

Julia Arenson 24 Grosvenor Road.

Julia Arenson 24 Grosvenor Road.

Julian Wheatley Flat 2 Craigie Lea, 4 Muswell Ave

Julian Woodfield, 52 Rosebery Rd. N10 2LJ

Juliana Lurie 187 Albert Rd

Kamlesh Bava 113 Muswell Avenue, N10 2EJ

Kamran Khan 12 Thirlmere Road Muswell Hill London N10 2DN

Karen Ackerman 25 Grove Avenue

Karen Zamboni 259 Albert Rd N22 7XL

Karl Burns 49 Princes Ave. Need a dedicated spot outside our house. Happy to pay reasonable installation costs

Karolina Mocenda 19 Albert Rd N22 7AA

Kate Murphy, 47 Curzon Rd N10 2RB

Kent Valentine 4 Crescent Rise N22

Kerry Keays 71a Rosebery Rd N10 2LE

Kevin Byrne 158 Albert Rd N22

Kevin Dineen. 19 Grosvenor Road, London, N10 2DR

Korto. 126 Alexandra Park Rd N10 2AH

Laura Bava, 113 Muswell Avenue, N10 2EJ

Laura Mullarkey 173 Victoria Rd

Leila & Shad Forsythe 51 Winton Ave N11 2AR. We will be converting our cars in 2022 to EVs. Suggest locn at Jcn of Blake & Winton

Leila Achouri 11 The Avenue N10 2QE

Lillian Atkinson 23 Alexandra Park Rd N10 2DD

Lisa Jones 58 Grove Ave N10

Lisa Niklaus 26 Outram Road N227AF

Lucy Davies, 86A Coniston Rd N10 2BN

Luke Todd 47 Grosvenor road,

Manuel Harlan 4 Grove Avenue N10

Margo Wickens / Paul Wickens 48 Dukes Avenue N10 2PU

Maria ansbro

Maria Carla Ferrarello, 123 Durnsford Road

Maria Ross 101 The Avenue N10 2QG

Mark Austin, 56 Princes Avenue, London, N22 7SA

Mark Lall-Chopra Flat 1 No 2 Donovan Ave N102JX

Martin Calver 3 Crescent Rise N22

Mathilde Malmonte Gilson place coppetts road

Matt Gee 15 Clyde Rd N22

Matt Groshong, 55 Windermere Road.

Matt Kitching 48 Winton Avenue N11 2AT

Matthew Fenton 24 Cecil road. I suggest that all lamp posts are converted
meh

Melanie Johnson 48 Outram rd N22 7AF

Michael Charlton 72 Coniston road.

Michael Persaud 177 Alexandra Park Rd N22

Miranda McLachlan 67 Grove Avenue N1- 2AL

Mohanjeet Arora, 41 Harcourt Road, London. N22 7 XW

Mr & Mrs Duffy 8 Dukes Avenue N10

Mr Blake 26 Grove Avenue N10

Mr Bowley 10 The Avenue

Mr Haralambous, 15 Alexandra Park Road

Mr James Loftus. 27 Outram Rd, N22 7AB

Mr Kesner 24 Grove Avenue, Muswell Hill N10 2AR

Mr Nathan Dare, 96 Victoria Road N22 7XF

Mr T Anastasi 43 Grove Ave N10

Mrs Georgina Hasipapas 50 Grove Avenue N10

Mrs S Sharp 103 Victoria rd N22 7XG

Ms Elisabeth Smith, 145 Albert Road, N22 7AG

Mt Tann Mathias 9 Albert Road N22 7AA

Mustafa Chehabeddine 13 Coniston Rd N10 2BL

My next car will be electric

N. Croft. Suggest the bottom of Lansdowne Rd (Grove Avenue end) where there is plenty of space

Neal Matthews 185 Victoria Rd N22

need plenty of EVCPs before I will consider buying an electric car

Neil McAllister 14 Bidwell Gdns N11 2AX

Neil Swift, 104 Grosvenor Road

Neville Young 49 Muswell Avenue N10 2EH

Nick Charwood, 1 Rhodes Avenue, London N22 7UR

Nick Field 11 Victoria rd.

Nicola Blain, 10 Methuen Park, London N10 2JS

Nigel Whitney 45 Donovan Ave N10

No because we don't have a big enough front garden for a drive and you won't let charging cables be across the pavement

No electric cars in my road

No need at present. I would resist any CPZ-by-stealth where EVCPs take up residents parking spaces

No, I can't afford an electric car

No, my car is petrol

no, this would cause a parking problem as cars from other areas would park there to charge.

not now but in the future - Mark Benjamin 15 Elgin Road
Not one for myself, but a good idea to have these available

Not yet but soon we will all need access to these

Not yet but we will need it in future

not yet, but at some point yes as we are planning to get an electric car.

Oliver Hansard 6 Curzon rd N10

one is already being installed on corner of Cecil and Curzon - 100m from our house.

Only if I get my own allocated parking space outside my property. Reshma Sheridan 42 Curzon road N102ra

Patricia and Michael Hickey, 460 Muswell Hill Broadway, N10 1BS

Patricia Pitman, 29 Victoria Rd N22 7XA but please see comments below

Patricia WYNN DAVIES 30 Muswell Avenue London N10 2EG

Paul Bragman - 61 Alexandra Park Road

Paul Nicholson 261 Alexandra park road

Paul Robinson, 28 Wroxham gardens London n11 2ba

Paul Simpson, Bernadette Simpson 20 Rosebery Rd N10 2LH

Penny Sewell 4 Windermere Road N10

Pereira/Manni 76 Grove avenue

Peter and Roseann Arrowsmith, 261 Victoria Road N22 7XH

Peter Clarke 264 Alexandra Park Rd London N22 7BG

Peter Guest 63 Dukes Ave

Peter Newell, 254 Alexandra Park Road, London N22 7BG (but at the moment we have a hybrid, thinking of getting an all-electric vehicle

Peter Smith 95 Princes Avenue N22 7SB

Philip Edgar-Jones 43 The Avenue N10
Philip Jones 55 Curzon Rd
Possibly
Possibly - but need more information. Simon Rouse 72
Victoria Rd N22
Pratap Singh, 25 Curzon Road, London N10 2RB
Rachael North 21 Torrington Gardens
Rachel Norton 22 Grove Avenue N10 2AR
Rachel Platt, 14 Grosvenor Road, N10 2DS
Rachel Solomon Williams. 21 Elgin Rd (Suggest a
lamp post charger)
Rachel Yeomans, 51 Victoria Rd London N22 7XA
Ramon Ricard 1 Parham Way N10 2AT
Raquel Chicourel, 10 Lansdowne Road
Raymond Yau, 34 Clifton Road
Razvan Remsing 15A Muswell Road N10 2BJ
Renato Celani, 8 hillside gardens, London, n11 2NH
Richard Ackerman 44 Grove Avenue N10 2AR
Richard Barca 98 Dukes Avenue N10 2QA
Richard Hayes 43 Albert Road Yes, this is really
important.
Richard Kirby 6 Parham Way N10
Rob Smallwood, 64 Victoria Rd N22
Robert Aylett 81 Rosebery Rd N10
Robert Franks, 35 Harcourt Road, London N22 7XW
Robert Mead 15 Winton Ave N11 2AS
Robert Rosson, 31 Donovan Ave N10
Robin Brown 23 Rosebery Road
Robin Johnson 25 Thirlmere Road N10 2DL
Roll them out - outside every house.
Ruerin Connery 8 The Close, Muswell Ave N10 2ED
Sally cartwright 105 Rosebery Road n10 2LD
Sara Vandenberghe Flat 3, 64 Muswell Rd N10 2BE
Sarah Farmer 54 Muswell Rd N10
Sarah Hollis 24 Donovan Avenue N10 2JX
Sarah Sproson 55 Albert Rd . A Big Yes to EV
charging points
Sarah Westley, 17 Cranbourne Road
Sarkan Ayvaz Flat 2 86 APR N10 2AD
Shahriar Haque, Flat 3, 149 Victoria Road
Simon Gilbert 213a Alexandra Park road N22 7BJ
Sindy Lane 30 Coniston Rd N10 2BP. End of
Curzon Rd towards Alexandra Pk rd would be good for
supply of EVCPs.
St Saviour Court, Alexandra Park Rd N22 7AZ
(opposite 243 APR)
Steven Feldman 80 Muswell Road
Steven Flower
Stuart Ogilvie 97 dukes Ave

Suneeta Chadha 20 Alexandra Park Rd N10 2AB
Susan Eldridge, 36 Clyde Road N22
Susanna Abse 17 Muswell Ave N10 2EB
Suzy Rosenthal 21 Donovan Avenue N10 2JU
Sylvana Young, 19 Lansdowne Road
Tamara Feldman 65 Outram Road N22 7AB
Tapper, 41 Muswell Avenue
Tarun Chadha 20 Alexandra Park Rd N10
Tere Beltran 30 Eleanor Rd. N11
the street would benefit form an EV charger as we are
looking to replace our car with electric
There is a charging point nearby which is in constant
use because it is slow. Fast charging points would be
useful
This question is irrelevant to the subject of the
consultation.
Tivian Mendes Dos Santos, Ground Floor Flat, 42
Alexandra Park Road, London N10 2AD
Tony Key 179 Alexandra Park Rd
Vanessa Gray 2 Cranbourne Rd N10 2BT
Victoria Harwood Kapadia, 53 Grosvenor Road, London
N10 2DR
We have already paid for one ourselves
We have one
We may in the future, but not yet
We would not like one as this would mean a lost parking
space or spaces in the road.
We'd like these rolled out over the next 5 years
What's the cost?
Where would this go? Outside my house? I can't
always park right outside it
William Carey Flat 2 262 Albert Rd N22 7UW
Wm Winstone and Frances Winstone 124 Victoria Rd
N22
Yes - 1/64 Muswell Rd
Yes I need a EVCP - Cynthia Jenkins 35 Thirlmere
Road N10 2DL.
Yes if it can also be used by petrol cars to park?
Yes Jennifer Hamrogue, 33 Victoria Road, N227XA
Yes that would be good
Yes, in the future, but not now
yes. 24 Muswell road
You need to put more EVCPs in all streets in the area
Yu Kwong Billy Yeang 2 North Lodge, Vallance Rd
N22 7UB
Yumna Ismail 27 Winton avenue
Zoe Bishop 5 Sakura Drive N22

Comments

(Because of very large numbers of comments, this table contains a 70% sample)

| Road name | Comments & suggestions |
|-----------|--|
| Albert Rd | |
| Albert Rd | |
| Albert Rd | Access to west end of Albert Rd should be limited to stop rat runs at peak times. I would support an LTN. Albert Rd is quite narrow at this section with cars parked both sides, so it is a nuisance |
| Albert Rd | After 4pm Albert Rd is used as a rat run. It is narrow, so 2 cars can't pass each other. This causes arguments. I think it should be one-way |
| Albert Rd | Albert Road is used as a rat run/cut through road for hundreds of cars in the evenings between 5-6:30pm, turning on to Albert Rd/Durnsford Rd (High Rd) The traffic is so dense, it renders Albert Rd a one way road. The noise, traffic, beeping horns and pollution is profound. Introducing a one way system may have a more positive impact. In regards to the CPZ proposal, I have lived on Albert Rd for nearly 15 years and have never struggled for a parking space. Kind regards, |
| Albert Rd | Albert Road Rec need to be able to park freely |
| Albert Rd | As other residents will have told you, Albert Rd doesn't have a problem with day time parking. It's only at night when everyone is home that problems arise. Most houses here consist of 2 maisonettes each with 2 families and usually 2 cars. We don't have commuters here. |
| Albert Rd | Completely unnecessary. Spend time fixing all the potholes on Muswell Hill |
| Albert Rd | CPZ is NOT required Oliver Tambo park serves the community and is used by families and children. A CPZ would stop them coming in. Staff at Rhodes Ave and APR Secondary Schools who provide a stellar service to pupils would not be able to park and a CPZ would make their lives and working conditions even more difficult |
| Albert Rd | CPZ is not required. Space is always available. |
| Albert Rd | CPZ not required. Parkign controls would not affect car usage and would, therefore, not reduce pollution |
| Albert Rd | Dear Haringey, thank you for the consultation on a proposed CPZ for the Alexandra Palace West area. I suspect I will be in a minority but am in favour of a CPZ for this area. However, a more significant problem is the amount of rat-running we suffer on Albert Road, particularly late afternoon/early evening from drivers wishing to turn right onto Durnsford Road to gain access to the North Circular and wider local road network. We have raised this issue a number of times over the last few years but with no success. Personally, I think a banned right-turn at the junction of Albert Road/Durnsford Road (as on the adjacent Crescent Road) would solve this problem and significantly reduce the sheer volume of traffic using Albert Road at these times. We were promised consultation on a local LTN scheme last year but to date have heard nothing. A secondary problem is speeding traffic along Albert Road, particularly later in the evenings. Albert Road does have speed cushions installed along most of its length but these are frankly not fit for purpose and do little, if anything, to slow traffic. A more robust form of speed tables or humps is needed to control irresponsible and dangerous driving, especially on a road used by many children walking to and from local schools. Thank you. |
| Albert Rd | Enforce virtual signalling 20 mph limit which isn't enforced and stop blocking offside roads forcing everyone onto our road. |
| Albert Rd | Evenings can sometimes be a problem, but a CPZ would not help that. I also think there will be local resentment at what is seen to be a money-making venture for the council |
| Albert Rd | For many years there has been a problem with the refuse lorry getting into the entrance to Albert Close from Albert Road, would it be possible for the double yellow lines to be extended in Albert Close and along Albert Road. The lady that lives in the house on the corner of Albert Road and Albert Close is disabled if she needs a disabled bay it might be best to put it in Albert Close at the side of her property as she normally comes out of her property using the side gate in her wheelchair. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Albert Rd | Free parking is one of the reasons many people pay more to live here |
| Albert Rd | Having lived in various areas of Muswell Hill and Crouch End I can honestly say that this particular area suffers much less than most when it comes to parking issues. I really do not consider that such restrictions are necessary. Furthermore, as a parent with a child at Alexandra Park school, I know that the majority of their staff travel in by car and these measures would prove problematic for them and would possibly lead to a loss of valuable staff. Far better to focus on other more pressured areas! |
| Albert Rd | I am a cyclist and am aware of the need to tackle climate change, but a CPZ is wrong. We need a roll out of EVCPs in order to help electric car ownership. How do Haringey staff and refuse services travel around the borough? They use vehicles. Focus on better waste management. I doubt Haringey's integrity and truthfulness. Where will increased parking revenue go to? |
| Albert Rd | I don't have a car but it appears there are parking spaces on Albert Rd. I do not want to pay for having occasional visitors and service calls. CPZ is not necessary. Haringey council should liaise with London mayor and TfL to improve public transport |
| Albert Rd | I see no considerations for teachers, staff, or carers at schools. Do not introduce these CPZ into our streets. |
| Albert Rd | I STRONGLY OBJECT to the introduction of CPZ into any and all of the roads listed. |
| Albert Rd | I support a CPZ only if: 1) there is a promise that permit prices will NOT be increased significantly each year; and 2) if we can be assured that parking space will be available for us. A higher priority for us are traffic calming measures as non-residents use the road as a rat-run at dangerously high speed. |
| Albert Rd | I support a CPZ here. Parking is not always a problem but can be occasionally. Arguably, a bigger issue is the rat-running along Albert Rd with cars looking to turn right on to Durnsford Rd to gain access to the North Circular and beyond. This is a problem mainly in early evenings. A secondary issue is speeding traffic. Albert Rd does have speed cushions but these are useless. I hope these issues can be considered when assessing LTNs |
| Albert Rd | I'd find it too expensive (I'm elderly on fixed income) and as a family member requires regular trips for specialist medical attention, I would have to buy a lot of expensive VP. Parking can be difficult at school times but otherwise it's OK |
| Albert Rd | I'm surprised that a Labour council should propose such a discriminatory-encouraging act. No change needed |
| Albert Rd | it is mainly a residential area and there is no need for traffic restrictions |
| Albert Rd | Keep it as is, it really is not an issue. The concern is more around commuters driving through our road at high speed. Parking is enough. |
| Albert Rd | My children attend APS which is an excellent school. Most of the teachers travel to work by car and won't be able to continue working at the school if this is introduced. Currently there is no issue for ding parking in the street for us or our neighbours. We oppose this strongly. |
| Albert Rd | Never had any problems parking here and I don't wish to pay to park |
| Albert Rd | No need for CPZ as we don't have any problems at all. A CPZ would have negative affect on Oliver Tambo park visitors as well as creating problems for school staff. Bounds Green tube is far away, so commuters don't park here |
| Albert Rd | No parking restrictions required. LTN does not affect parking but does cause major disruption to life in this area as a sacrificial zone. Our 12 year old daughter has developed susceptibility to Asthma and breathing difficulties as a result. My wife now has to get OFF the 102 bus at the top of Conley hatch lane to walk home due to congestion caused by the Bounds Green LTN. LTN are badly thought out and poorly implemented with no consideration for sacrificial areas. CPZ's are implemented in a way that makes roads look like junkyards, poorly designed and poorly maintained street furniture. No Haringey CPZ required here. |
| Albert Rd | Non locals / CPZ overspill park on Albert rd and therefore I can't park on my road |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Albert Rd | Our road often has drivers driving down it in excess of 30mph, and it is frequently congested due to you closing off surrounded roads. There is also very little in the way of cycling infrastructure. You'd be better off looking at how to address some of these real issues. |
| Albert Rd | Parking problems rarely occur on Albert Rd. A CPZ would make life difficult for our visitors - and also for park users - some of who park here for short periods and do not cause problems for residents |
| Albert Rd | Please leave parking as it is. |
| Albert Rd | Please stop |
| Albert Rd | RESPECT LOCAL DEMOCRACY! GO WITH THE MAJORITY (WHATEVER THAT MAY BE). DON'T RAILROAD THIS THROUGH LIKE YOU DID WITH BOUNDS GREEN LTN. You can't just remove cars. People with families as well as elderly and disabled often need to use cars. Making journeys harder does not save the environment or people's health. Invest properly in EVCPs. |
| Albert Rd | Strongly object to this as there is no parking pressure. we don't have all the money required for visitors passes and permits. What have parked cars got to do with climate change?? |
| Albert Rd | The issue is only in the evening where multicar households take up excessive space. Frequent use of skips also impact local parking. I do NOT support a CPZ on my road or in the immediate area |
| Albert Rd | The Alexandra park area proposed does not need control parking.. |
| Albert Rd | The better option for reducing air pollution on our road would be to introduce more one way roads like the Haringey ladder system which works very well |
| Albert Rd | The chief problem on this road is cars using it as a rat run in the late afternoon and evening. They drive dangerously fast and cause long traffic jams. |
| Albert Rd | The council just wants to make money. There is no other reason for a CPZ here. There are plenty of spaces in the day. It does get busy at night but a CPZ would not change that. I haven't answered all the questions because only one asks me if I want a CPZ. The rest are making me choose what type , and a CPZ is NOT NEEDED HERE |
| Albert Rd | The issue for this road is not parking but cars speeding down and also using it as a cut through for the North Circular. This at times make the road dangerous due to speeding or unusable due to large traffic from non-residents. |
| Albert Rd | The parking control zone covers the local shops in Alexandra Park Road and Crescent Road/Albert Road. Could there be a bay set aside for short term parking for non controlled parking residents to visit these shops by these shopping areas. In addition there should be more control of cars, vehicles turning left out of crescent road onto Durnsford Road left turn only). and then u turning just beyond the central barrier. I have frequently nearly been hit by vehicles turning at this point as have other residents walking back from the underground and tube. There appears to be no enforcement of this no right turn and is a continuous danger to pedestrians and other road users at this point of turning. I have reported this several times but to date no changes have been made. Albert Road where is leave the main Albert Road outside Albert Park (goes to a smaller road) is solid with traffic trying to go both ways up and down a single lane road. Frustrations run high at busy times and it is a dangerous situation to the public as well as children crossing these roads the drivers are too intent on getting home and not on those trying to walk, cycle etc. |
| Albert Rd | The parking is fine as it is, and has been for the past 14 years that we have lived here. |
| Albert Rd | There are two local schools in this area. Many staff members travel to work in these outstanding schools. This needs to be considered to ensure the education of our young community. |
| Albert Rd | There is no issue with parking in our road and introducing a CPZ will just penalise householders by making them pay to park outside their own house. If parking restrictions were necessary then make residents parking free for one car per household. |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Albert Rd | <p>There is no need for parking restrictions to come into place on Albert Road (N22) nor the surrounding roads. We do not have any issues with parking from events going on in the palace nor do we have any from commuters. We live on a road where the majority of properties are flats therefore 'per house' you would expect to see two cars per household. With the pandemic and more people using online deliveries it is natural for all roads to see more vehicles coming through to deliver goods - this is not going to change. The same as people getting work or home improvements done to their properties, which they are entitled to do so therefore you may see builders vans or skips - again all temporary. On the weekends you may have a few more cars for parents / people visiting the Oliver Tambo rec - which we should not be discouraging! exercise is important for health. Other reasons why parking permits should not be put in is that due to the volume of cars on the road of different sizes, average parking slots will only take away parking spaces and over time residents will be really annoyed by having this in place. A more useful thing to have would be to review the flow of traffic and possibly make the road one way! The closure of surrounding roads for cleaner air and knock on effects even from bounds green road closures has an impact to the amount of cars coming down/ cutting through Albert Road. Having lived here for many years making people pay more on top of their increasing council tax to park on their own road is unacceptable.</p> |
| Albert Rd | <p>There isn't a problem with parking on Albert road. The only problem relates to people speeding down the road and using it as a cut through. This could be solved with traffic calming measures. Restricting parking won't reduce emissions because people won't sell their cars if they need them. This is a money making exercise for the council that is unnecessary and not in the interest of the residents on Albert road.</p> |
| Albert Rd | <p>There's no need for more disabled spaces as the one on Albert road is never used.</p> |
| Albert Rd | <p>This area does not need a CPZ. It is completely unnecessary and it would be very disappointing if this were to be enforced.</p> |
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I am happy with how things are in my area. We do not need parking restrictions of any sort. What you could do is put a speed camera on Alexandra park road as that is the biggest issue I have as one day someone will be harmed or worse.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I am one of 220 staff who work for Alexandra Park School, an outstanding school which serves the families and children in the heart of the community with an outstanding teaching and support staff who deliver the best quality teaching and care. The most important thing a school can do is place the very best individuals in front of our children. Recruitment is always difficult in education and Alexandra Park School employs outstanding staff by recruiting widely and competitively – seeking applications from across London and beyond. More than 65% of APS staff live further than 5 miles from the school and a similar number drive to work each day. We share our community’s ambition for environmental sustainability and our school’s environmental strategy places emphasis on education as the real driver for environmental change. We prioritize sustainability in our infrastructural decision-making and the education of our young people on the importance of good environmental stewardship, so future generations can thrive. We seek to lead by example in reducing emissions and promoting active travel and some of our staff do live locally and can walk or cycle to work. However, a critical issue for us is that the school is not well served by tube or rail, and commuting with student books, resources or after one of the frequent late evenings is not practical for many who live further afield. In addition, the school has a very small land footprint and our priority is to use the space we have for children and not car parking. I would also be concerned about the impact of a CPZ on the local shops on Alexandra Park Road. There is strong evidence that the introduction of a CPZ significantly impacts on local people shopping locally because they are unwilling to pay or unable to find suitable parking to pop into local shops. Whatever the perceived benefits may seem by implementing a CPZ - mainly revenue to the local authority - they are a bureaucratic imposition on the freedoms of the local community and do not bring the tangible benefits expected. Therefore, if a CPZ is introduced, the majority of staff would no longer be able to easily travel to work. In a recent survey, 78% of staff would need to reconsider their position if they could not drive to work. Whilst CPZ schemes sometimes do include ‘essential worker’ permits, these do not cover all school workers and can become a significant bureaucratic obstacle for schools. Indeed, several of our key staff have been recruited from other schools where CPZ schemes have been introduced. In this context, our understanding is that the introduction of a CPZ would have a severe negative impact on the school. If you want to keep an outstanding school serving the local community you need to balance long term sustainable community needs and priorities. PLEASE DO NOT IMPLEMENT THIS SCHEME.</p> |
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I am totally against CPZ zones being introduced in the area and on our road.</p> |
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I commute to Alexandra Park School by car from a different borough. Should a CPZ be introduced, I would have to leave my position at the school as using public transport is not a viable option for me and my family. In an ideal world, I would love to use public transport. However, as a mother of two very young children, one of which I have to drop off at school, and the other at a childminder, this is just not possible. Having worked at this school for over 15 years, I know it is a very important part of the local community. The school could potentially lose 78% of its staff if a CPZ is introduced. I urge the residents to consider the fact that the success of the school and its excellent reputation has a direct impact on the local residents and area, whether they have school-aged children or not.</p> |
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I do not consider we need CPZ parking controls as view this as a revenue raising exercise for the Council. We are already having to cope with ULEZ and there are significantly fewer cars parked on the streets. We are nowhere near the station/tube. If you wish to address climate change issues, please review the access the 184 bus has: there are clear signs at the start of Alexandra Park Road /Albert Road corner that the weight limit is 7.5 tons. The Unladen Weight of the electric bus is 12.5 tons excluding battery and passengers. Given that the double decker bus may only travel twice a day as part of the school run, this is unacceptable and is placing great strain on the surrounding buildings and underlying infrastructure. I wish to know whether the utility companies have been informed. Sadly there is no joined-up thinking in pursuing 'climate change' initiatives.</p> |
| Alexandra Park Rd | <p>I do not think a parking scheme is a good idea at all - more should be done to reduce traffic on Alexandra Park road and more crossings should be in place - rather than focusing on parking schemes</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Alexandra Park Rd | I do not think it is necessary to extend existing Controlled Parking Zones for the moment. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I don't see how charging residents to park near their own homes solves the issue proposed in this consultation. What is actually the cause of the problem? Is it multi-car households taking too many spaces? Or is it people from the surrounding area taking advantage of free parking to visit nearby Alexandra Palace and Park? If measures were to be introduced, I would propose 1 permit be issued per household at no more than £60 per year (regardless of year or emissions, we already have vehicle tax and ULEZ for that, thanks). Additional permits per household should be substantially more expensive. And the operational time would need to be all day Monday-Saturday, as the roads tend to be busiest on Saturdays around here. Even though I occasionally have to park a few hundred yards away from my house, I do not think the situation is bad enough to merit introducing the parking controls in this proposal. I also think the Council should seek to understand the cause of the parking issue definitely before suggesting measures. It may be different from area to area, road to road, and if it's being caused primarily by residents anyway, then all these measures achieve is the penalisation of Haringey residents and higher living costs. I will also say, that the proposed higher cost for vehicles registered before 1 March 2001 is outrageous. My ULEZ compliant, reliable 20 year old VW Golf was registered in May 2001 which comes dangerously close to this arbitrary cut-off date. I see absolutely no reason for this banding at all apart from another questionable reason to charge people more under the guise of "being green". The age of a car should have no bearing on parking charges - that's what vehicle tax and ULEZ charges are for. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I don't think that the area needs parking control. The majority of our clients walk to our studio and most of the time we cycle to work - but when we do need to drive there will always be a parking space available within a 5 minute walk. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I drive an EV for work, but there are very few available EVCPs and this causes problems for me to work |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I strongly disagree with the introduction of a CPZ in this area - it is only fair where everyone is using the same spaces and has an even chance of securing a parking spot. There is such a large proportion of driveways on this road and surrounding roads, that those without a driveway are already disadvantaged - and with the introduction, would be even more so having to part with money at a time where all households are facing increased bills. There are also several unseen ways residents will end up paying several times over. Where residents are having long-term renovation works, having to supply a visitor pass will also increase the overall cost. Works can sometimes take 6 - 12 months to complete. The nursery at the end of Alexandra Park Road needs their staff to be able to park on the road as they need to arrive early. Any additional cost to the school will be passed on to parents - so those with young children attending, will be effectively paying twice in this scenario. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I strongly object to a CPZ being introduced on my street or those near by. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I support CPZ in my section of Alexandra Park Rd. I'm not sure why the annual permit charge is based on CO2 emissions as this seems to confuse a parking problem with an environmental problem. It is the actual use of vehicles which affects the environment - not parking them. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I understand that the council needs money, but there are other ways to get it. There is plenty of parking spots here and the only issue is occasionally with events at Ally Pally |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I work at Alexandra Park School. I start work at 08.00 and finish after 6.00pm, sometimes later. The LTN across the NCR has already had a significant impact on my commute. This will severely impact my commute. I work long hours and public transport is not an option. It's already incredibly difficult to find a parking space. Please do not make it even harder! |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Alexandra Park Rd | I work at Alexandra Park School. I drive to work a couple of days per week from my home in Barnet, when I need to have a car with me to visit my aged mother after work (she lives in Watford, which is not accessible via public transport from here). On other days I walk or take public transport which takes around 50 minutes. The school has virtually no onsite parking and no space to create any more. I never find a space onsite and so need to park in surrounding streets when I drive. Although it's busy, you can always find a space somewhere and the commuter cars from colleagues that park in the streets all leave by the time residents come home from work. Therefore, I don't believe that commuter parking by my colleagues and myself causes a major issue and I oppose the introduction of a CPZ. I would also suggest that cycle lanes be installed on Colney Hatch Lane (from Barnet). If there was a cycle lane, i would be more inclined to travel by bike. As is it, Colney Hatch Lane has no provision for cyclists, is narrow, extremely busy, with many parked cars and potholes. It's simply not safe to cycle on it. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I'd ask that a CPZ be implemented if the consultation shows a majority in favour |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I'm opposed to any CPZ scheme that makes me pay to park outside my house. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I'm opposed to CPZ because of the high cost of permits. If charges were reduced, I would be more positive about it |
| Alexandra Park Rd | I'm concerned for school staff if a CPZ scheme is introduced as many teachers need to drive for work |
| Alexandra Park Rd | If you introduce a CPZ I will no longer be able to work at APS as I live too far from the school and spinal issues make it very painful for me to use public transport. Please reconsider as the effect this will have on the staffing at APS and Rhodes Avenue will be incredibly detrimental to the learning of local children. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | In our view, the justification for this consultation is unclear. Beyond a single reference in your document to "some residents" experiencing increased parking pressure and visitors to community services, there is no explanation why the consultation has been triggered. How many residents have expressed concerns over parking? What services are suffering from a lack of parking space? Is there a threshold of complaints that triggers a consultation? How many responses are needed to make a decision? What if the majority of residents do not reply? Is any decision based on the responses of a few? All of these questions are unanswered. We would be happy to consider a CPZ if there was a clear justification for its use. At best this feels like a disproportionate response to the complaints of a few residents; at worst it feels like the council is looking for a flimsy excuse to increase revenue through parking permits. We therefore cannot support the proposal of a CPZ. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Introduce tougher speed control measures as cars and motorbikes speed along our road. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Introducing a CPZ in the designated area would create an absolute nightmare in this area, and additional difficulties for drivers like myself - owning an EV, without a driveway, and charging on nearby charge spots - the parking culture already makes it difficult to find an empty charger where i can actually pull up to - further controls would worsen this situation... |
| Alexandra Park Rd | |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Teachers at nearby schools need to park their cars to get to work. Therefore I am opposed to the CPZ. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Terrible idea, it's bad now but a CPZ wouldn't make it better. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | The proposed CPZ will impact adversely on local residents but will not promote 'active travel'. It will increase council revenue however. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Alexandra Park Rd | The CPZ was decisively rejected last time and my fear is that a CPZ would make more residents pave over their front gardens which would be environmentally disastrous. People don't park here to use shops or tube. Only residents and their visitors park. We appreciate that the council needs to raise revenue, but this is not the way to do it |
| Alexandra Park Rd | The unnecessary extension of DYL has reduced parking space |
| Alexandra Park Rd | There are 3 parking pressure points in the area you designate as APW. The shopping hub of Muswell Hill to the west, Alexandra Palace station to the east, and the schools in Rhodes Avenue to the north. Our house is too far from any of these to be affected and there is plentiful on-street parking as a result. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | There are no issues that need addressing by new parking restrictions where I live. I object for 2 reasons: 1. the shops and pub on APR would be adversely affected and we really need these shops and services to survive. 2. The schools need their teachers to be able to park easily. Our school has surveyed its teachers who say that they would not be able to continue if a CPZ was put in on APR and Rhodes Ave. 3. I know a number of elders who are concerned at the problems a CPZ would cause for carers and visitors. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | There are no parking issues in our road. This is a money making scheme by the council. The number of commuters has drastically reduced since March 2020 and many will continue working from home. This means there is reduced commuter parking and displacement parking. You must demonstrate that this is not the case if you wish to put in a CPZ. There has been no noticeable issue since Alexandra Palace introduced parking controls. Putting these parking controls in place will have a detrimental impact on local teachers who can't afford to live locally or even on a direct transport issue. I will always value ensuring children can get access to the best education and the best teachers over parking ease. Stop trying to enforce what local people do not need or want. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | There are no parking issues in the whole of the area, so a CPZ is not needed. We can always park outside or near our home. It's a non-issue in this area. Additionally there are two schools nearby. The teachers at these schools need somewhere to park. It will negatively impact on those schools if the teachers are no longer able to park freely. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | there is no need for a CPZ in this area. I disagree that residents should have to pay to park on the road. I accept that you do not have the right to park right outside your property. What will the staff in the nursery do. they don't live nearby as they don't earn enough. A CPZ would increase their travel time as I'm assuming you want them to use public transport rather than park outside CPZ? So for the nursery to open at 8am for local residents to use, you will be asking staff to leave home around 6-6.30am every day. Do you realise many of the staff are young women? So, your CPZ is effectively making young women more vulnerable as they will need to be waiting at bus stops and walking down roads alone really early in the morning. If / when one of them is attacked because of your CPZ - don't then do a big campaign for women's safety when you've taken the safest option away from them. Shame on you for putting money and petty issues around people not being able to park right by their house ahead of personal safety and ensuring that low paid workers (disproportionately women) are able to safely get to work. I see no evidence that you have even considered the impact on personal safety of women when considering the CPZ. This will apply to all the local nurseries, the local schools and those who work in retail and hospitality. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Things work fine as they are. Any congestion stems from the Bounds Green / North Circular area and from the main business district of Muswell Hill shops and restaurants. |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Alexandra Park Rd | This is a complete and utter nonsense which can only have at it's heart revenue generating aims, the sort of dogmatic anti-car zealotness that's seen Alexandra Park Road clogged up due to low traffic schemes or both. I suspect you know as much and this is why you've announced a consultation on December 1st that closes on December 29th i.e. over a busy Christmas period when people will have other things on their mind. There is simply no need, none whatsoever, for controlled parking in this area. Please explain better your "awareness" that some residents are experiencing increased parking pressures and give empirical evidence relating to pressure on access visiting community services. You can email it to me - ljohnvans@yahoo.co.uk or call me on 07764519313. They're the same contact details I provided to all the councillors in my ward last year to discuss the real problem on Alexandra Park Road - speeding. Not one of the councillors in the controlling party got back to me. Not one. We DO NOT NEED parking control here. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | This is clearly a money making scheme once again for Haringey Council. Our area does not need a parking scheme and wouldn't benefit from one. There is ample parking in our area. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | This is just an excuse to charge residents. Perhaps you should look at charging multicar households. Why have DYL been removed from in front of dropped kerbs? Having marked bays would tackle careless parking. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Time to enlarge the CPZ as too many people park here and then ride into the town centre |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Totally not needed in this area it will affect local businesses that have struggled through covid anyway and will affect the community health of Ally Pally. People will be unable to use the library, drive up to walk through the park etc. Residents mainly have off street parking anyway. At the most a 2 hours free parking but no return but no pure money making. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Totally unnecessary and would damage local businesses. I don't have a car but a CPZ would cost money I can't afford to have visiting friends. There would be absolutely no benefit for me or the environment - simply a money-making scheme for the council |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We are strongly against any CPZ here and we believe the free parking facilities work very well. We ask you to stop this and only consult in future if residents request it. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We do not need any more parking restrictions in this area. By having more and parking restrictions the Council is affecting local shops. Please STOP introducing more CPZs. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We do not need any parking restrictions in our road. There is always enough space for parking, even with a bus stop right outside our house. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | we do not need controlled parking |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We do not need it. The CPZ finishes 100 m from us but we have no issues with overspill. I can always park here and so can visitors. We do not need CPZ. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We don't need a CPZ. There is no overspill problem, plus the station is too far away so there are no commuters here. We don't have shops or businesses nearby |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We don't want any CPZ. Carers are needed for our disabled relative and we just don't want parking restrictions which will create more stress |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We need speed limits and a limit on large vehicles i.e. no lorries. We've had several accidents involving lorries and buses. |
| Alexandra Park Rd | We're strongly against any CPZ here. Our money would be far better spent on services that are needed |
| Alexandra Park Rd | What does Q2 mean? CPZ favours the wealthy who can easily pay to keep their cars parked on the road. "households near to us have 4 cars. We see no benefits in a CPZ and are concerned that you expect us to pay to park while making parking more difficult.. Suggest you put in more pedestrian crossings in APR |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Would want pay-to-park if a CPZ was imposed. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Alexandra Park Rd | Yellow lines on one side of the road to enable flow and an alternative that could control traffic |
| Alexandra Park Rd | Your proposal for a CPZ has nothing to do with your spurious claim about green travel. Furthermore, your LTNs where you have closed roads leading to Colney Hatch Lane have increased traffic on APR to an unsafe level with increased pollution. I do support active travel but all you want is more money. I SAY NO TO CPZ. Not only do I pay enough council tax but energy, food and other costs are going up, so I don't want to pay even more when it's not necessary. Please reopen those now closed roads. |
| Bidwell Gdns | Parking here is not a problem. Don't want a CPZ nearby as this could cause spill over from Durnsford / Albert roads. Reducing parking does NOT reduce vehicle mileage - if anything a CPZ increases it as drivers search for spaces. Environmental claims are nonsense. |
| Bidwell Gdns | Parking is not a problem generally. A CPZ would have a huge effect on the school and the park as many drive there for sports activities and they would have nowhere to park |
| Bidwell Gdns | Q^ and Q& are N/A. Looks as if Haringey council introduces CPZs as still another way of raising money |
| Bidwell Gdns | The extension of the ULEZ has already reduced commuter parking |
| Bidwell Gdns | There is absolutely no meaningful demand for resident's parking/CPZ in this area. Please focus instead on the LTN and reducing drive-through/rat-run traffic instead. That WILL make a big improvement to our lives. A CPZ will not. |
| Bidwell Gdns | We don't need a CPZ here. We have a family who visit regularly and they can currently come at any time without hassle. This feels like a cynical money-making move by the council. The council is also imposing LTNs as well, so I don't know why you would need parking controls if you can't even drive down the road |
| Bidwell Gdns | We've no idea why you are proposing this, other than to make money |
| Bidwell Gdns | Your form makes the assumption that every resident is a car owner. The two people in this household are not car owners, for environmental reasons. We would both welcome fewer parked cars and less duelling traffic in this area in rush hour. |
| Cecil Rd | |
| Cecil Rd | A CPZ is neither needed nor wanted in Alexandra Palace West. Having lived here for 30+ years, I can recall fighting off previous suggestions of introducing this and related measures, and yet here we are again. None of us want a CPZ. Everyone understands how to come and go and park their car with consideration and tolerance just as it is now. |
| Cecil Rd | Absolutely no need for a CPZ and we would be very disappointed if it was put in. A CPZ would ruin the character of the area |
| Cecil Rd | Cecil Rd is not close to the tube, shopping centres or Ally Pally; so we don't require a CPZ. On a personal note I have spent a few £000 to replace my car with one which is ULEZ compliant. Therefore an extra CPZ charge is punitive and unnecessary |
| Cecil Rd | CPZ would cause us more damage than good: impact the quality of teaching to our local schools and issues with deliveries and visitors. |
| Cecil Rd | I don't have a car but my neighbours tell me that parking can occasionally be difficult but they are adamant that they don't want the inconvenience of a CPZ. I stand by their wishes |
| Cecil Rd | I don't think parking is a problem and we are too far away from the shops of Ally Pally. The only slight problem is multicar households and builders vans - neither of which would be reduced by a CPZ. I do understand that the council's budget has been reduced and I see that increasing revenue is necessary. If this is the case then I would prefer to be consulted about other ways to source revenue. If a CPZ must go ahead then I would prefer 1 hour in the afternoon, so that guests can stay overnight without having to pay or move their cars. Thanks |
| Cecil Rd | I don't want any CPZ here. There would be negative impact also on local businesses & schools. It is not wanted and merely a money-making scheme |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Cecil Rd | I strongly oppose this plan. There is absolutely no justification for controlled parking in this area. There is never a problem finding a parking space. It is a 10 minute walk to the shops on Muswell Hill Broadway so there's no incentive at all for people shopping in Muswell Hill to park here. At any time of day there are lots of free spaces in all of the streets in the surrounding area, which clearly demonstrates that controlled parking is totally unnecessary. |
| Cecil Rd | I very strongly object to the proposal to implement a CPZ in our street. The vast majority of cars that park in our street are owned by residents and so there is absolutely no benefit to us as residents to have a CPZ. It will actually be another burden of cost inflicted on us, at a time when the economy is struggling to get back on its feet and unemployment is rising. It will create more problems as friends, relatives and other visitors will then have to use visitor permits (or risk getting fined) which will remove the freedom we have now, where friends will pop in and visit in an ad-hoc manner. This is especially important for the more vulnerable and elderly people on the street who need as much contact and support as possible from their friends. I have lived on this street for over 15 years and as we have a strong sense of community residents do park considerately and look out for each other, and therefore there is no need for any enforcement from the council. |
| Cecil Rd | I'm in favour of this - especially to reduce numbers of 4 by 4s (Chelsea tractors). My concern is that residents will convert gardens to dropped kerbs to avoid charges. This not only reduces available road space but is not environmentally friendly. These dropped kerbs should be banned |
| Cecil Rd | Only issue is late evenings. There are schools in the area and staff need to travel in from outside and be able to park freely. EVCP should be standard on all lamp posts. Excessive YL on corners reduce parking space. |
| Cecil Rd | Parking on Cecil Road is not a problem and any changes would be unhelpful |
| Cecil Rd | The CPZ proposal is a money-making scheme by the council and would have a very negative impact on residents with expensive charges and the hassle of visitor permits. Multicar households are the problem (which a CPZ would do nothing to address) - there are no commuters or shoppers parking here |
| Cecil Rd | There is currently no need for a CPZ in Cecil Road or the immediately surrounding area. If such a scheme were to be introduced we would regard it merely as an additional tax, the basis of which we believe cannot be justified. To reiterate, we have lived on Cecil Road for almost 20 years and have never had a problem parking. |
| Clifton Rd | |
| Clifton Rd | A CPZ is not needed. |
| Clifton Rd | An unused visitor parking permit should not expire. There have been many occasions that some people with Van are loitering on our street. Even drug dealers were arrested one Saturday. This is sad because there are many kids playing in the park opposite. Hopefully, the permit will deter them from parking here and make it safer for the kids in the park. |
| Clifton Rd | Can usually park easily unless a nearby road has extensive roadworks, or if a resident has a party! |
| Clifton Rd | CPZ unnecessary and detrimental for residents. Please don't do this. |
| Clifton Rd | I don't think we need a CPZ |
| Clifton Rd | I've lived here for years and there is no need for CPZ. Sunday mornings can be busy with families attending youth football training at the local park. Only other time is the annual fireworks at Ally Pally. Clifton Rd always has sufficient space for residents to park - even if not always outside their houses. There is no case for change |
| Clifton Rd | No need for cpz. Allow friends, relatives, deliveries, to visit without the stress and cost of parking. Moreover, teachers at the local schools need to park. They do so on the main road by Tambo rec. If some residents experience parking difficulty it is due to multiple car households, including maisonettes, CPZ's won't resolve those issues. |
| Clifton Rd | Please... no more controls or interference |
| Clifton Rd | Proposed CPZ is not needed. It's important to have unrestricted parking for businesses, shops, dentist, doctor and schools. A CPZ would impact adversely on these as well as resulting in more costs for residents |
| Clifton Rd | There needs to be a return of 2-hour VP for tradespeople, friends etc. The all day VP rate is punitive |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Clifton Rd | There is absolutely no need whatsoever for controlled parking in Muswell Hill south. Finding a parking space hasn't been an issue once, people do not park here to commute. Introducing controlled parking will only hurt local businesses and make Muswell hill harder to access. I wholeheartedly oppose this proposition and hope the views of residents are genuinely considered. |
| Clifton Rd | We do not feel there is any need for parking controls in our road or surrounding roads. We understand that there was not a significant number of requests asking for the introduction of a CPZ in this area. Roads like Victoria Road (where some houses have been converted into flats) may be slightly difficult to park in at times, but we do not think this is due to commuters or teachers from the local schools parking there, so the introduction of parking controls would have little effect. We fail to see how the introduction of a CPZ will encourage public transport and prevent our roads from being overrun by cars and feel this is a disingenuous assertion, as it seems more likely that it is revenue-driven. |
| Clifton Rd | We do not need CPZ, it is just a way for Haringey to raise revenue and while I understand that the Tories have decimated local govt funds I do not agree with raising them by introducing more and more CPZs |
| Clifton Rd | We don't want or need a CPZ. If you need revenue, then raise it by council tax. |
| Clifton Rd | We don't want or need a CPZ. There is enough parking for all who need it and we are not affected by commuters etc. |
| Clifton Rd | You'll probably take no notice of residents' views, as this scheme looks like another of Haringey's money-making ideas; and no notice will be taken of the results of this consultation. |
| Clyde Rd | I wholly disagree with this! Nobody in this area wants a CPZ. We have no issues parking, and it would make it impossible for people working in the area, such as teachers, to park for work. The council has tried on numerous occasions to introduce this as it is a MONEY MAKING scheme. It should not be allowed, and the council needs to STOP! |
| Clyde Rd | I'm awaiting a DDB upgrade following my application in September |
| Clyde Rd | No CPZ is required. |
| Clyde Rd | No CPZ is required. This is, in my view, is not about congestion or the environment. It is about trying to raise taxes. We had a consultation on this same issue not long ago. The CPZ was not wanted then and is not wanted now. |
| Clyde Rd | No need for CPZ |
| Clyde Rd | No to parking restrictions! It would decimate local businesses that rely on passing trade and shoppers. It would mean more people would take away rent gardens for driveways and ruin the aesthetics of the road, and it is just a ludicrous example of Haringey council trying to reconcile the funds they mismanage on a daily basis. Absolutely NO to CPZ |
| Clyde Rd | Not needed. We have no issues parking |
| Clyde Rd | Perhaps another space for a club car to park ... encouraging some local residents to relinquish car owning. |
| Clyde Rd | Please do not things any more difficult with "Rules" |
| Clyde Rd | Residents need the freedom to drive out and find parkign when they return. Sometimes when coming back late at night I have to park 2 streets away and leave my car unsupervised, while walking home in the dark |
| Clyde Rd | There's no issue with parking in our area. Why should I pay for doing something I can do already? This is a money-making scheme |
| Clyde Rd | This is another tax and more people will go for off-road parking. The costs you are suggesting are crazy. NO thank you |
| Clyde Rd | This looks like another money-grabbing exercise by Haringey council. Considering covid plus the extra money people are paying in taxes this appears to be a stealth tax. Why does the council think it can make people's lives even more miserable and expensive than they already are. I just hope this consultation is open and transparent and that our responses won't be ignored. Haringey council has a track record of manipulating consultations to get what it wants |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Clyde Rd | Unnecessary congestion caused by commercial use of a property that is also a multicar household |
| Clyde Rd | Visiting carers will soon be required for one family member and we will also need tradesmen. At a time of rising inflation, now is not the time to bring in even more charges. I have paid for a crossover. What effect would the proposed CPZ have on access? I do NOT support a CPZ in my area |
| Clyde Rd | we do not need a CPZ |
| Clyde Rd | We don't need a CPZ. Only problem is late evening when all residents return and many houses have multcars - which a CPZ would not help with. I don't want a CPZ as I don't want to pay a lot of money for something that isn't needed. It's hard enough to afford to live here. Also if you put in a CPZ, a lot of people will concrete over front gardens to and dropped kerb so they can park off the road. This road is a historic Edwardian street and is aesthetically attractive. A CPZ and off road parkign would be damaging in many ways. This smacks of making more income for something that doesn't need to happen. We strongly object |
| Clyde Rd | We DON'T NEEED OR WANT A CPZ here |
| Clyde Rd | We feel that once again this is a complete waste of the council's, and council taxpayers', time and money. We have lived in Clyde Road since 1984 and the parking is far better it was in the 1990s when we were blighted with multi-car households and dangerous double parking. Now the problem is at night when everyone is home. During the day one can always find space to park in the road. We are very concerned that a CPZ would lead to more drop downs and parking in small front gardens which are big enough for cars. This inevitably leads to a diminution of quality of life as it makes the road far less attractive, and is environmentally unsound at a time when we are being encouraged not to pave over gardens. It is also a hazard for small children, the elderly, the visually impaired and those with mobility issues our road if people drive over the pavement & have cars protruding onto the foot way, which gets quickly damaged and thus costs the council to repair. Of course it also reduces the number of parking spaces. We think that trying to tie this into the laudable aim of reducing traffic is wrong. Most traffic in Clyde Road is residential or deliveries etc. On a wider note we understand that this proposed CPZ would lead to difficulties at local schools with a possible loss of staff. It will also affect the smaller local shops on Alexandra Park Road who are having a hard enough time as it is. After your botched consultation in 2016 we had hoped this would be the last we would hear of a CPZ. Please ensure that you convey your findings to all residents, whether coming under any proposed CPZ or not, and without revealing how individual households responded as this was probably very close to breaking data protection legislation. We are also unhappy about Question 5 on this consultation as it is slewed to getting the answer "yes". Obviously a single road cannot be left in isolation as it would become a honeypot for residents in other roads who don't want to pay. For an effective CPZ to benefit residents we suggest using the DVLA database to issue residents with a free parking permit with frequent random spot checks. This would deter non-residential parking. It is interesting to find in conversations with neighbours just how much opposition there is to this proposal, far more than in the past. There does seem to be belief that this unwanted scheme is simply a money making exercise. On the matter of EV charging points, these will of course become more necessary, but this does not seem the appropriate place to ask about them as requires a whole new infrastructure across the borough, and indeed the city. Tim & Caroline Fletcher 12 Clyde Road |
| Clyde Rd | We need the CPZ (and voted in favour last time), as it's extremely difficult to park on our road |
| Clyde Rd | We no longer have a car but like most older people we are very worried about having to apply for visitor permits. It appears complicated to buy permits online (not everyone is online) so the buying process really does need to be improved and made easier for people over 70 |
| Clyde Rd | Would be good if the annual permit also came with some VP. Last time there was a consultation, people did not want partially-included roads. There is often a congestion problem at junction with Durnsford Rd - especially at evening rush hour times because the narrow road with parked cars does not allow 2-way traffic. Could this be considered as a separate initiative |
| Coniston Rd | |
| Coniston Rd | No benefit for residents |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Coniston Rd | No need to change current arrangements |
| Coniston Rd | No parking restrictions are needed in the Alexandra park West area. Stop trying to raise revenue from things that are not needed. |
| Coniston Rd | No tube or shopping, entertainment facilities here; so no need for CPZ. A CPZ would deter friends and family from visiting. I can't see any need for it. WHOSE STUPID IDEA WAS THIS? |
| Coniston Rd | Object to any CPZ here. Nearly all cars are owned by residents so a CPZ would offer nothing. There would be the same number of cars parked but we would have to pay. Coniston Road WhatsApp group confirms there is no support for the scheme |
| Coniston Rd | One of the reasons the council started this consultation was in order to aid in achieving more active travel. There has been some support in our street, considerably more than support for a CPZ, for the addition of bike storage on the street. Just increasing parking controls doesn't aid active travel if the alternatives remain unchanged. The addition of a bike storage area would be many times more effective than a CPZ. Another aim of the policy is to improve air quality. Since Oct21 and the start of the increased ULEZ zone there has already been an increased burden on residents living within the zone, either through payment of the daily charge, or through needing to purchase a compliant vehicle. There is no reason to believe that the CPZ would do anything other than add to this burden, while have a negligible impact upon air quality. |
| Coniston Rd | Please leave a free parking for the weekends We are already struggling financially so it is very difficult for us to pay for parking permits. One of the main reasons for us to choose this flat was the free parking in Coniston Road. Thank you. |
| Coniston Rd | Please make the road one-way to stop cut-through traffic. |
| Coniston Rd | Stop this at once - where will visitors park? What about the Muswell Hill high street. No thought given at all |
| Coniston Rd | There are no problems right now but I do worry if there are changes in neighbouring streets, then this can have a knock on effect. A small problem in one place can impact on our street. Mostly our street is fine. |
| Coniston Rd | There is absolutely no need for this controlled parking. There is no commuter parking as not near stations and too far away from Muswell Hill for shoppers to Park. It is simply greed on the council's part, I absolutely object to this quite ridiculous proposal on the grounds that it is not required. We already are subject to some of the highest council tax in London. It is ridiculous to introduce these measures. |
| Coniston Rd | There is no need for parking restrictions. Stop taxing motorists to subsidise the council budget. If this is not about generating revenue then permits should be free to residents. |
| Coniston Rd | We can't afford any more of these taxes. We use our car to get to work |
| Coniston Rd | We live here and it is not fair to charge us to park outside our home. I say NO to CPZ |
| Coniston Rd | We object to a CPZ in Alexandra Park West |
| Coniston Rd | We're concerned that teachers coming to Muswell Hill schools should still be able to park without incurring charges. Provision should be made to allow them to continue. |
| Coniston Rd | While my road is relatively busy for parking, I don't feel it needs a CPZ. A CPZ would just be another form of taxation |
| Coniston Rd | You should stop residents converting front gardens into parking. It is environmentally very unfriendly which increases flood risk as well. |
| Crescent Rise | Another money-grabbing exercise |
| Crescent Rise | Completely unnecessary. Leave the road as it is |
| Crescent Rise | How will teachers at the schools in the area be supported in the event a CPZ is introduced? |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Crescent Rise | I am absolutely against a CPZ in the area. I have learnt that the majority of staff would not be able to travel easily to my son's school which would affect the quality of teaching that can be supplied. I also don't want a CPZ in my area in general - I like the ability to move around it freely I see parking controls ending up with more cars, not less. More ugly street furniture. More money given up for this too. Generally, I think it's not going to benefit us. If you can please sort out the hideous traffic problem on durnsford road caused by the measures taken near the north circular, this would be of interest. Other than that, please leave our area alone. |
| Crescent Rise | I cant think of any way that this would support the residents of the area |
| Crescent Rise | Not happy being charged by CO2 emissions. We are already charged by ULEZ based on vehicle movements. How does a parked car produce emissions? You should charge based on car size as the SUVs (Chelsea Tractors) occupy much more space. Also charge more for multicar households. Our street doesn't have daytime parking issues but we do struggle in the evenings. Also skips should pay for occupying parking space |
| Crescent Rise | Parking in the area is not an issue. we can't afford the charges and don't feel they are needed. There is always parking space on our road |
| Crescent Rise | Pollution levels need to be reduced . All of the streetlights should be converted to EVCPs |
| Crescent Rise | Strongly object. You are just trying to make money off people. You've twice increased council tax. Where do you think people get the money from? |
| Crescent Rise | Totally against CPZ - scrap this pathetic plan which will damage local businesses already suffering thanks to Covid |
| Crescent Rise | We don't have parking problems. With people's working habits changing, parking will be even less of an issue. What is a problem is Haringey's decision to have virtual VP only. This has made visitor parking much more complicated and challenging especially for elderly and those without tech knowledge. |
| Crescent Rise | We have allocated (but not enforced) parking for our block, but other residents park here when there's no space on the street. We need the bays marked with our flat numbers. I've lived here a long time and have previously asked for this |
| Crescent Rise | You should have taken the ULEZ into account before consulting. We have bought a ULEZ compliant diesel and now you come up with additional charges. |
| Curzon Rd | |
| Curzon Rd | Unsupportive of CPZ proposal for Curzon Road and surrounding areas. The blanket proposals feel like a money generating exercise for the council rather than an attempt to address any real concerns or issues. Specifically, Curzon Road does not have a significant parking problem, and introducing a CPZ would only raise costs for households and reduce the flexibility for residents to park in our own neighbourhood. In addition, the proposed costs of visitor passes - £4 a day - seems unnecessarily high for a residential area - these are costs for our friends and family who wish to visit us, not solely commercial enterprises. I'm broadly supportive of lamp posts being converted to allow electric charging, but not supportive of fixed parking bays which will reduce the overall capacity of parking on the street. |
| Curzon Rd | We have 2 parking issues. 1) Shoppers / visitors going to Muswell Hill + builders vans; 2) Multicar households - some with 5 cars. There are no EVCPs on the road - we need as many as possible |
| Curzon Rd | You are penalising residents here. You are ignoring the needs of those who need carers by imposing charges for carers to park. If you really want to help, please address te clutter of builders vans etc. |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Cranbourne Rd | I have lived here for many years, this is in my opinion, completely unnecessary. My family and friends who live in the area are completely opposed to this. What we have petitioned for are multiple electric charging points as we do not have driveways or garages and we are all upgrading to electric cars. This request has been ignored by the council and instead you are imposing a money grabbing cpz in an area that doesn't need it. Thank you for that. If you don't want to provide us with charging points then flood Muswell Hill Broadway with them, it will provide revenue for you and force people to spend time in town supporting their local high street. This has proven success in towns outside of London and it would reflect very positively if Haringey would show the same foresight and adopt a similar scheme. |
| Cranbourne Rd | Introducing EV bays would increase parking pressure on households without them. As it stands, if you get home late, you cannot park in our road, so wiping out more bays will not be helpful. We've come back from hospital a couple of times recently after 9.30pm and were not able to park. The only other option is to cap the number of permits issued to a maximum of 2 per household.. There are some houses here with 3 cars. |
| Cranbourne Rd | NO CPZ -as it will have no real affect on either traffic or air pollution and is just a way to raise money by taxing the motorist. |
| Cranbourne Rd | No CPZs wanted. However every lamp post needs to become an EVCP |
| Cranbourne Rd | No general problems, so we don't want to be in a CPZ |
| Cranbourne Rd | No system is perfect. But the current arrangement - without any parking restrictions - is working adequately. I cannot see how the proposed changes would work better but would introduce other limitations for residents. |
| Cranbourne Rd | Not aware of any parking difficulties in this or surrounding roads |
| Cranbourne Rd | Stop private driveways from taking up public parking space. Enforce permits for multicar households (i.e more than 1 car). Subsidise EVs because many -- including elders, cannot afford to buy them |
| Cranbourne Rd | The council would better serve its residents by spending its budget wisely supporting those in need instead of introducing a costly, unwanted and unfair scheme. It neither benefits the residents nor the environment and merely imposes a further tax on households which are already struggling in the current climate. |
| Cranbourne Rd | The survey ostensibly concerns possible problems with parking and seeks to find how residents feel about the necessity or otherwise for parking controls. Were Alexandra Palace West to become a CPZ - a solution to a perceived PARKING problem - why does the council seek to impose differential parking fees based on the CO2 emission status (or engine size for older vehicles) of the vehicles involved? The CO2 emission status or age of any particular vehicle has no effect on the availability of space for parking or the need to park, any more than does the vehicle's colour. Accordingly, an equal standard tariff per car per year would be the most equitable method of charging. An exception to this equality of treatment would be a consequence of the observable need for electrically-propelled cars to park for extended periods while their batteries are charged. This factor argues for the imposition of a premium over the standard tariff in respect of such cars on the basis that they "consume" excess amounts of parking space/hours. |
| Cranbourne Rd | There is no need for controls in any of the roads in this area; parking is almost always fine. Introducing controls would not, in any case, increase the number of available parking spaces, given that essentially all people parking around here are residents. |
| Cranbourne Rd | Useful to stop allowing any more driveways |
| Donovan Ave | Neither this road nor the area needs any CPZ. CPZs are too expensive and restrict visitors and services. They can cause isolation and negative impact on mental health and emotional wellbeing |
| Donovan Ave | No need for any parking controls in our street, or the surrounding area |
| Donovan Ave | No parking problems on Donovan Ave, or surrounding roads. We as a family strongly object to parking controls and restrictions |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Donovan Ave | Our streets do not have parking issues and this proposal is not needed. Parking can be a bit difficult in the evening when people are home but there is never a real problem |
| Donovan Ave | The parking on Donovan Avenue is horrendous and the conversion of single occupancy residences to multiple occupancy residences will only make this worst. I'm also concerned that if near streets go to CPZ but Donovan does NOT then we will suffer from overflow. I think all nearby roads should go to CPZ or none should go to CPZ (not a mixture of both) |
| Donovan Ave | The road Donovan avenue is very quiet road and is easy to find parking space . I don't think that needs to be change. Is not making any sense if you still do it is not going to be helpful for us because we don't need it. You just want to get more money from us. |
| Donovan Ave | There is no need of CPZ as there never been a problem finding parking and for sure no need of additional expenses in all ready expensive living. |
| Donovan Ave | We do not support the proposal of a Controlled Parking Zone. |
| Donovan Ave | We oppose the plan for parking controls. It is not necessary on our street and will create extra hassle for all. We've lived here for 10 years and never had a problem with parking. |
| Dukes Ave | |
| Dukes Ave | A CPZ is not necessary in the area where I live. The current situation works well for everyone. The peak times for parking around these streets is evenings when there is an event at Alexandra Palace or weekends when the weather is good - the CPZ is highly unlikely to be enforced at this time. So a CPZ is basically irrelevant in relieving any parking stress. A CPZ will restrict people accessing the park from Dukes Avenue which is unnecessary as there is plenty of parking available during the day. A CPZ will inevitably reduce the amount of parking space available to residents when bays are painted and perfectly good parking space is omitted. A CPZ will encourage residents to construct off road parking on their own driveways. This is something that destroys the pavements with cars driving over and splitting paving slabs and creates another danger to pedestrians in an area where many children access the park via their scooters and bikes. The conversion of gardens into hard standings for cars is an obvious threat to the Conservation Area here. It's completely unnecessary to essentially introduce a tax on people visiting friends who live in the area when there is almost no upside to the scheme proposed. |
| Dukes Ave | Charging extra for diesel vehicles is unfair. Not all diesel vehicles are equally polluting. Euro 6 compliant vehicles should be exempt from the diesel surcharge whereas older petrol vehicles are heavily polluting and should be charged accordingly. If a vehicle is ULEZ compliant there should not be a surcharge for parking permit provision. Our local schools and GP surgeries will lose vital staff if they are unable to drive to work. Parking in this area is not overly problematic - why not leave things as they are? |
| Dukes Ave | CPZ controls not wanted or required |
| Dukes Ave | CPZ is not needed. This is just another way to get more money from car users. |
| Dukes Ave | CPZ not needed. It would just create problems for everyone i.e visitors, carers, and trades services as well as residents |
| Dukes Ave | It's essential for our church - as for other businesses - that people can park nearby at any time (funerals, weddings, soup kitchen, and services). CPZ residents-only parking would be disastrous. Most residents around here have driveways so any controls should keep visitor parking while deterring commuter parking Your proposal covers too large an area, as many roads have no parking issues, and a sensibly-designed system could avoid spill-over. It is vital for us to have parking available at all times otherwise it would impact our provision of events and services for the Borough. We are strongly against a CPZ |
| Dukes Ave | Keep current arrangements. I don't want any CPZ |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Dukes Ave | No changes needed. Continued access to the park, Ally Pally and facilities is vital for the future. Also important for health, and many cannot afford exorbitant charges. I don't have difficulty finding parking space. Making the Avenue one-way between Dukes Ave and Vallance Rd might ease congestion. If income generation is the real objective, then you should be honest and say so. I can understand the need, but there are other ways to achieve it. Keep us CPZ free. |
| Dukes Ave | No changes required |
| Dukes Ave | NO NEED for a CPZ. Things are working fine now. there is no need for 'short term visitor parking' as this will result in chaos for ALL residents. Elderly people would be affected by a CPZ restricting 'meals-on-wheels' deliveries and how on earth are pensioners expected to be able to pay for daily short term parking vouchers to allow carers, cleaners, food deliveries, online deliveries, and prescription deliveries from the local chemist?? Young mothers with babies and small children would also find it very inconvenient - causing unnecessary misery. None of the problems you suggest affect us. We have no need for a CPZ as it would only cause chaos. |
| Dukes Ave | No need for CPZ. Parkign works well. Muswell Hill is a major shopping centre and people need to come in and park easily. This is a tax on residents - we pay more than enough on council tax already. PS I am not a millionaire |
| Dukes Ave | NO NEED FOR CPZ. We object strongly |
| Dukes Ave | No parkign issues here, but a CPZ would promote conversion of front gardens. As these take up road parking space, they should still be charged |
| Dukes Ave | No particular need for CPZ in Dukes Avenue. We strongly object to it. Why suggest it? We do not need CPZ. It would also impact negatively on local shops which are struggling as it is. This would be another blow to the high street. Muswell Hill has no tube, and it has been able to retain a 'village feel' as a result and we feel a CPZ would destroy it. Once again we strongly object to this proposal |
| Dukes Ave | No problem parking |
| Dukes Ave | No problems weekdays - sometimes gets congested on weekends because Ally Pally have introduced parking charges which displaces visitor parking on to our streets |
| Dukes Ave | Not necessary to have a CPZ. I suspect this is all about revenue for the council. School teachers and shop workers often need to drive so let's not make it difficult for them. A CPZ will reduce visitors and shoppers and will be detrimental to the vibrancy of the area - it would kill Muswell Hill economy |
| Dukes Ave | One family member is a blue badge holder and it's difficult to find parkign outside the house. Needs to be able to park close by - especially with luggage |
| Dukes Ave | Only reason for this is for you to raise money |
| Dukes Ave | Parking is adequate here. All this is, is a money spinner for the council. Give the money to the Police to deal with crime - that will be much more helpful |
| Dukes Ave | Support CPZ also rollout of EVCPs to enable residents to switch to electric vehicles where off street parking and charging is not available |
| Durnsford Rd | No need for CPZ in this part of Durnsford. Your attempts to justify and promote a CPZ make it clear this is just an attempt to raise revenue. There is ample parking on this road |
| Durnsford Rd | Parking is fine. We need some free parking for visitors and general economic reasons in the area. To take away parking is a very stupid move for the borough and we don't support it at all. |
| Durnsford Rd | There are no issues regarding parking on Durnsford Road. |
| Durnsford Rd | There is not a parking issue this is to make money for the Council. Local school staff will leave their jobs as they won't be able to park near by. Many live far away. You will affect local schools in a negative way by bringing in another unnecessary CPZ. It is not needed. |
| Durnsford Rd | This is just a ridiculous idea to an area where there are no issues. Please move on and help the community instead of wasting time on this. You all must be very bored - none of your proposals here have any effect on the environment so please stop using this as an excuse. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Durnsford Rd | We really need to cut down the speed of cars in Durnsford road |
| Durnsford Rd | Why are you trying this? We are part of a huge group and parking is not an issue. These continuous attempts by the council to implement CPZ and LTNs are the biggest issue for residents. This is a money making exercise for the council. We are now in the ULEZ area, so vehicles are already fined for emissions and now the council is trying it on as well. It's the size of the vehicle that is relevant to parking, and not the emissions. |
| Durnsford Rd | Your focus should be on traffic volumes and speeding issues down Durnsford Road. Stop through traffic to A406 at peak times of the day. As well you know this road heavily contributes to one of the worst traffic jam hotspots in the UK. This has been grossly overlooked in the recent Low Traffic Neighbourhoods scheme proposal. CPZs are a stealth tax, if it was truly to benefit residents we wouldn't have to pay for the privilege of parking outside our properties, it's ridiculous. Likewise to have to pay for parking for visitors to our properties. It's a sub-urban area and restrictions of this nature are unnecessary. |
| Elgin Rd | No need to impose any CPZ here. Local shops are thriving because of freely available parking space. We're nit near a tube. What are your reasons for this, when no one has requested it? We DO NOT SUPPORT this ridiculous proposal |
| Elgin Rd | Please listen to us - we do not want a CPZ in this area - there is no need We have lived here for 25 years and even in the busiest times when there is an event on in The Palace there is still no problem parking Please spend the money on improving the roads and public transport network This is blatant stealth tax |
| Elgin Rd | Q5 is misleading. Elgin Rd does not have any parking issues, so why are you asking us these questions. |
| Elgin Rd | There are no parking problems in Elgin Road. Even if controls were introduced in neighbouring streets, Elgin Road is too far away from local shopping centres and stations to make it very unlikely the road would be used for parking. Imposing parking controls would affect our quality of life, making it harder for friends and relatives to visit during controlled hours. |
| Elgin Rd | There are no problems and you tried this on before . We will fight the council and the councillors all the way on this. It is clearly just a way to try and fund the council shortfall. Haringey should concentrate on key services for which we pay a lot but receive nothing. We're in contact with surrounding roads and know that NOBODY WANTS A CPZ. The councillors suggested it is a done deal, but we already have solicitors who are prepared for action. |
| Elgin Rd | There is absolutely no need for any CPZ controls in our road or surrounding roads. If you knew the area you know this |
| Elgin Rd | We are lucky enough to live in a quiet street where children can play safely and the air quality is good, and noise levels are low. We want to keep these positive aspects. Given that parking at Ally Pally is no longer free, then the surrounding roads should be regulated on busy event days so that residential roads are not used for parkign by visitors. |
| Elgin Rd | We're satisfied with current parking arrangements on Elgin road, so it is a shame you are trying to do this. Please think again |
| Elgin Rd | You have low rate EV charges. Many EVs are big and need fast charging - they should pay more |
| Elms Ave | I am very concerned that having a CPZ would adversely affect our High Street. It is vitally important that visitors are able to park as not all can use public transport. Personally I find parking in Elms Ave can be challenging but I do not have mobility issues. |
| Elms Ave | I've filled in this online as well as I thought I'd lost the form. With more and more driveways plus multicar household (several with 3 cars) there is, sadly, a shortage of parking spaces. I have said NO to a CPZ but I think we are headed that way especially if the council keeps on allowing permission for new driveways. Thanks |
| Elms Ave | keep it as it is. This is a money making scheme and is not required. Also your permit structure borders on oppressive. |
| Elms Ave | Not wanted Please repair the pavements as they are difficult for wheelchair users. Please ensure that trees are not 'strangled' with tarmac poured thickly around the roots. Traffic calming is needed around the school at the Muswell Hill end. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Elms Ave | People should not be allowed to make driveways as it disproportionately reduces road parking space. It's often impossible to park in own street |
| Elms Ave | there are 25 cross-overs in this road which is anti-green. Space bars are excessively wide and restrict parking for other council tax paying residents without these privileges. Many with driveways leave their cars on the road. This unfairness needs to be addressed..... Please provide Ann Cunningham herself with a sight of this questionnaire. Thank you |
| Elms Ave | We strongly do not believe Muswell Hill would benefit from parking controls. Muswell Hill is at least a mile away from any Tube Station. Local businesses rely on people coming in their cars to shop and dine. The last thing we need is to deter visitors, with parking costs and lack of parking. In fact, we view this measure as potentially damaging our local economy due to the unique nature of Muswell Hill's location. We are whole heartedly against this action. |
| Grove Ave | I did not answer Q6 and Q7 as I felt they were not relevant, given my answers to Q3, Q4 and Q5. We do not have a parking problem in Grove Avenue We do not need a Controlled Parking zone We feel very strongly that the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in Grove Avenue would present many problems - for the local school, for residents and for visitors. We sincerely hope that you will not introduce a Controlled Parking Zone |
| Grove Ave | I have lived on The Avenue since 2006 and there has only ever been parking problems for residents on Fireworks night. Introducing a CPZ to solve this annual problem would be a totally disproportionate response. I suspect the introduction of a CPZ is simply a revenue raising exercise given that the proposal is to charge residents for parking on their own roads. Car owners already have to (and quite rightly so) pay road taxes, fuel duty and potential charges related to the ULEZ in order to mitigate emissions and traffic pollution. However, to target particular Haringey residents for additional funding under the pretext of helping residents' park and to reduce emissions is disingenuous. The survey has leading questions and does not allow for 'None of the Above' or 'Not Applicable'. If you answer 'no' to Q4, you are still asked to answer Q6-9. This implies that they are in favour even when they say 'no' in Q4, and it creates the impression that the decision has already been made by the council. The answers to Q4 will be of primary importance and will presumably be disclosed. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Grove Ave | I object to any introduction of a CPZ in Alexandra Palace West on the following grounds: 1) There is no problem parking on The Avenue, N10 at any time of day, except for the very occasional evening events hosted at Alexandra Palace which the proposed CPZ would not address; 2) The CPZ will have a detrimental impact on Rhodes Avenue Primary school and Alexandra Park School - two thriving and Ofsted rated 'Outstanding' schools - the majority of staff would no longer be able to easily travel to work and indeed several of the staff have been recruited from other schools where CPZ schemes have existed. In the light of recruitment and retention crisis for teachers in London, I believe that this must be a key consideration for our local residents. 3) The additional cost to our household is coming at a time when people are facing rising costs of living and this is a further 'tax'; if this was a genuine measure to reduce emissions and unnecessary car journeys then why would residents be asked to pay anything? 4) The recently introduced ULEZ has already made a significantly positive impact on reducing vehicle usage by the most polluting vehicles. There was a reduction of 37% of non-ULEZ compliant vehicles from 127K to 80K, compared to the two weeks prior to the introduction. This also put an extra cost on local residents that needed to upgrade their vehicles ahead of the ULEZ introduction. 5) The introduction of a CPZ will encourage more household to pave over front gardens for driveways. This impacts the water table causing subsidence and other structural and drainage issue to properties in an area where subsidence is already an issue due to London Clay soil. 6) Paving over driveways will also impact the character of the road, part of which is in a conservation area. 7) If parking spaces in the road are reduced by paving over driveways, emergency service access could be compromised and conditions for pedestrians, particular children travelling to school or the park, will worsen by cars reversing out of their driveways. 8) The introduction of a CPZ will affect local businesses, including Korto, The Maid of Muswell, Redwood Pharmacy and numerous small shops. These businesses have suffered enough during the COVID lockdowns and restrictions. 9) Introducing a CPZ will make it more difficult for casual visits to residents that are already marginalised and isolated, increasing the burden that will ultimately be put on the State. I would like it recorded that I consider this consultation to have been launch at a time of year when participation in the survey may be low due to festive season and rising concerns about the Omicron variant. I expect it to be publicly disclosed as to the proportion of residents that have responded to the survey and the response to each question. |
| Grove Ave | Never any parking problems on Grove Avenue. This appears to be a money-making scheme rather than a genuine consultation |
| Grove Ave | No need at all for a CPZ on Grove Avenue |
| Grove Ave | No need for CPZ as there are no problems parking. As many houses have driveways, this obviously reduces the need for on-street parking. |
| Grove Ave | No need whatsoever for a CPZ. The area is not near transport hubs etc. but there are schools and a CPZ would put a financial burden on teachers and staff. The cost of permits you have supplied us with is totally irrelevant as they are for 2021 not 2022 when the threatened CPZ would be introduced |
| Grove Ave | No parkign issues here as we're not close to the Broadway. There is a problem with seeping traffic - especially skip lorries which cause much vibration and noise as they speed over the road humps |
| Grove Ave | No problems with parkign here and a CPZ would disadvantage residents without driveways and/or on low income. Make it easier for people to charge EVs so they have a choice; but do not punish residents with unfair charges. £4 a day for visitors is also extortionate and penalises those with less money. There's no need for this in Muswell Hill |
| Grove Ave | Not needed. Council is just trying to make money! |
| Grove Ave | Only roads close to Muswell Hill Bdy have any problems. A CPZ would be detrimental to our property prices and it would be unacceptable to be charged on top of £3000 council tax to park outside my home. There are ZERO PARKING ISSUES ON 90% OF THE PRPOSED AREA. |
| Grove Ave | There is no parking issue in our road. This feels like a money-making exercise where we will be forced to pay to park outside our own houses. There are very few shops and businesses nearby and plenty of space for residents to park with many having their own driveways. |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Grove Ave | There is no parking problem on Grove Avenue, N10. |
| Grove Ave | There is not a parking issue currently in Grove Avenue, by introducing parking controls the council would be creating a parking issue not solving one. What is being proposed is of absolutely no benefit to us but instead forcing residents to pay extortionate amounts of money for the privilege of parking outside our own property. In effect lining the pockets of the council, at the expense of local residence. Very much against this proposal as I'm certain my neighbours are too. Suggest the proposal is withdrawn. |
| Grove Ave | There would be no benefit for us having a CPZ on our road - there is no issue with parking. People are already being charged extra for diesel cars through the ULEZ policy - there doesn't need to be a second penalty conflated with parking fees. |
| Grove Ave | This area really doesn't need a CPZ. Shops will suffer and a daytime restriction does nothing for the occasional use of our street/s for Palace event goers. |
| Grove Ave | This seems like an attempt to raise revenue rather than meet any needs. You should know by now that there is no support for a CPZ. Doing this over Christmas also feels like a cynical attempt to marginalise opposition. Many residents need family visits, carers and other support services and they would be badly impacted by your proposal. |
| Grove Ave | Trying to slide this through over Christmas is a ploy that you should not assume has gone unnoticed, nor has your attempt to introduce CPZs by creep. This has no benefit for residents but is just a way of raising money while imposing aggravation and inconvenience for residents. While there is, rightly, recognition for those with blue badges, there is no recognition of those who cannot use public transport but who are not registered disabled. Regarding the question about 'preferred' times (I don't prefer any time or CPZ) but in fact if a CPZ was put in then having 8pm to midnight would curtail rowdy event leavers and overnight non-local parking. Such times are not even offered. It looks like permit prices actually favour multicar households because they can select the cheapest tariff for one car and then pay just £50 for each additional car irrespective of its correct tariff. I want to see you publish the results of this consultation and not try to cover it up. |
| Grove Ave | We don't want CPZ. The only issue is speeding vehicles crossing the humps and making houses vibrate and shake. I realise that council funding is an issue but this proposal by stealth is unacceptable. I would be inclined to support funding drives via more conventional means such as council tax - not trying to slip it in under the radar. No need for CPZ. and please ENSURE YOU PUBLISH THE SURVEY DETAILS BY ROAD |
| Grove Ave | We live well away from transport hubs and see no need for parking controls. Why should we pay to park when there is plenty of space? I assume this is a revenue generating attempt which will be politically extremely unpopular |
| Grove Ave | We strongly oppose controlled parking in the street. There are always plenty of spaces and much of the street has driveways to park on. As a governor at Alexandra Park School, I am also concerned that the school's staff will not be able to park anywhere which means it won't be able to recruit the best candidates for roles at the school. Thank you. |
| Grove Ave | We would be very unhappy to have restrictions put in place on our roads |
| Grove Ave | While residents close to Muswell Hill might support a CPZ. there is simply no need for it on roads further away. Residents should not need to pay £00s for the "privilege" of parkign outside their homes |
| Grove Ave | Why are you trying this? Our road does not really have any parking problems |
| Harcourt Rd | No need for CPZ - money making for council |
| Harcourt Rd | No need for CPZ in this or surrounding roads. This proposal seems to be a revenue-raising exercise by Haringey council |
| Harcourt Rd | Our road is absolutely fine for parking, and I see no reason to introduce CPZ. It will be an added expense for the residents and will make it more difficult for visitors and workmen to have these restrictions imposed. |
| Harcourt Rd | Parkign in Harcourt Rd is not affected by either the nearby stations (Alexandra Palace or Bounds Green) or the park (o r Tambo) despite good usage. We therefore see no need for restrictions in our road |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Harcourt Rd | Please do NOT put in a CPZ here. It's very expensive and I can't afford it. |
| Harcourt Rd | There is no need for a CPZ - no, thanks. |
| Harcourt Rd | There is no need for a CPZ in our area. It would cause difficulties for teachers at the local schools and have a negative impact on businesses as well as being expensive for residents, tradespeople and carers. The biggest problem in the local area is traffic thanks to "traffic calming" around Bounds Green but a CPZ would not resolve that. |
| Harcourt Rd | There's not shortage of parking, so we don't want CPZ |
| Harcourt Rd | This CPZ is not required and not welcome! There is no issue with the parking on the street and it is not an issue to find parking. The reason for your consultation is disingenuous. You refer to having safe green travel to improve air quality for the health of residents however this consultation and the questions that you ask do not refer to that at all Only about whether it is easy to park on the road or not. The only reason this consultation appears to be sought is to raise additional revenue for the council. I also completely disagree with the prices that you are proposing. Why have you added a blanket £80 annual diesel surcharge fee on top of the permit charge? We have a (second hand) newer model diesel car which is ULEZ compliant as it has lower emissions than other cars (using AdBlue technology) but yet you consider it acceptable to slap on and £80 fee?! If the band of car is considered acceptable for ULEZ why would you consider ok to on just add on a blanket premium? We have changed our lifestyle to be greener we walk to many places whenever we can, we cycle and have a car for all those occasions that we cannot reasonably walk to. I am a carer for my disabled Mum and need the car to be able to get to her up north. We cannot afford an electric car and a hybrid car is heavily targeted for its catalytic converter. Please listen to residents and not consider such a unwanted and redundant proposal. |
| Harcourt Rd | We never have parking problems and there is no need for a CPZ |
| Lansdowne Rd | Need enforcement of parkign on DYL. Biggest issue is the use of Dukes Avenue and other roads connecting Ally Pally to the A406. WAZE and Google Maps direct cars down these residential streets. Dukes Ave has a primary school and reducing traffic flow should be a priority |
| Lansdowne Rd | No major problems here. This is purely a money-making venture by the council. Residents are already getting legal advice to fight this unrequired intrusion into our lives. |
| Lansdowne Rd | no need for CPZ. the only sensible use of resources might be to deal with Bonfire Night parkign around Ally Pally |
| Lansdowne Rd | No parkign problems here and don't want any CPZ. It would be bad for the shops which have already suffered enough with covid. Most people have front gardens and if a CPZ was imposed then they woudl convert the gardens to dropped kerbs; which would be most environmentally unfriendly |
| Lansdowne Rd | No parking problems here and no need for CPZ. More CPZs would only damage struggling shops and businesses with fewer visitors. The answer to congestion is to limit car numbers e.g. by financial penalties for more than 1 car per household. Permits for carers, medical staff and workmen mean extra costs and hassle for households. Also, CPZs mean that more people convert gardens into driveways which in not environmentally good, and is very unsightly |
| Lansdowne Rd | No problems parking. A CPZ woudl just increase the cost of living. I'd like to think this is a genuine consultation rather than window dressing to disguise a decision already made to force a CPZ on us |
| Lansdowne Rd | No to CPZ. In the current climate, we don't need any extra costs. |
| Lansdowne Rd | Not needed. We welcome visitors to Ally Pally green space - and to events, and woudl not want these restricted by a CPZ. This street does not need controls, but we do need a rollout of EVCPs |
| Lansdowne Rd | Object strongly to this. Our roads are not near shops or transport hubs. Ally Pally parking charges have not yet impacted us. I'm staggered by all the roads you have included in this proposal. e.g. Cecil, and Cranbourne. This makes me think the scheme is purely a revenue-generating exercise. LTN roads are included and as allotment holders, we are concerned about parking in Winton Ave. I also suspect Blake Rd residents will be horrified at the further displacement of parking into their road |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Lansdowne Rd | Parking at present is fairly good. Occasionally events make it difficult, but this is not really a problem. Our child is picked up from school by his gran at least 3 times a week and in addition to buying residents' permits we would have to buy VP for Gran to drop in at the house with our children and stay until we return from work. |
| Lansdowne Rd | There is no need for a CPZ in Lansdowne Road or any of the surrounding streets. There are no problems with parking here. A CPZ would be a solution to a problem that does not exist. |
| Lansdowne Rd | There's no problem parking in local roads. I've lived here since the '70s and have never noticed any problems with parking. Many of the houses in this and surrounding roads have driveways. I strongly object to a CPZ here |
| Lansdowne Rd | This is a disastrous proposal and COMPLETELY unnecessary. The council is just trying to make more money. There is no problem with parking in my street. I also believe that restrictions will ruin the shops around Muswell Hill which have already been damaged by covid lockdowns. Leave us alone and stop destroying businesses. We already have stupid bike and bus lanes which cause more pollution by hindering traffic movement. The green argument is also ridiculous as residents will install many more driveways. We all know why you are proposing these restrictions and we will fight them to the bitter end. |
| Lansdowne Rd | This review is completely unnecessary, and I see it as a way for the council to get more money from residents |
| Lansdowne Rd | We do think there should be disincentives for multicar usage. Given the trend towards alternative travel means, it is not an appropriate time to try and introduce a CPZ. It is neither required nor justified. EVCPs (min charge 50Kw / hour) are needed but not installed so that they restrict local parking spaces |
| Lansdowne Rd | We don't need CPZ parking in this area |
| Methuen Park | I don't drive and don't need to buy a permit but the impact on me would be to make it more difficult to have friends and family visits, since I'm not sure where they would park. I would support pay-to-park bays but not permits. The status quo works fine for me at present as visitors can usually find spaces nearby |
| Methuen Park | I don't have a car but I cycle instead. I'm aware that commuters use this area to park as it's close to Muswell Hill shops. As a cyclist, I'd welcome a traffic-free neighbourhood and CPZs could be a step in the right direction |
| Methuen Park | I think it would be wrong for carers to have to get permits. They should be given a permit to cover all areas they work in. Speed calming is much more important than CPZ. Charges at Ally Pally and the ULEZ may already deter visitor numbers. What is the social cost of your proposal on businesses in the area? Rates for permits are unduly complicated. Residents should be given 10 free VP included with any annual permit charge |
| Methuen Park | I think that the permits would be good but I don't want them because of how much it'll cost me per year to have the privilege of parking on my own street. We already pay some of the most expensive council tax and now you want to charge us to park on our own street? Absolutely not. |
| Methuen Park | It is good that the proposed CPZ is for the whole area of AP West - this avoids displacement from street-by-street. If it is for a 2 or 4 hour period, please make it the same period in adjacent zones - this to avoid the silly change-over that happens in parts of Crouch End. |
| Methuen Park | Methuen Park needs speed humps because it is used as a cut-through to avoid queues on the Broadway. It's dangerous and noisy. |
| Methuen Park | Much more critical than parking is the speeding on our road. It does not have speed humps and is used as a cut-through. We need humps installed as we are concerned about the safety of children who walk along to get to Muswell Hill Primary. |
| Methuen Park | Only have 2 hours. Make VP cheap and easy to obtain. Enforce against people who have garages, so they use them for parking. Enforce against driveways. We need a CPZ here |
| Methuen Park | Parking for residents should be free |
| Methuen Park | Parking should remain free for residents who already pay road tax, ULEZ and council tax. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Methuen Park | Permits might free up a bit of parking, but I think it ridiculous to have to pay to park on my own road. We already pay extortionate council tax so don't want any more charges. |
| Methuen Park | This is just a money-making exercise for the council |
| Muswell Ave | |
| Muswell Ave | A CPZ would not create more parking spaces, and most cars here are owned by residents and their visitors |
| Muswell Ave | Can some EVCPs be installed via lamp posts at various points in the road? We already have one in an off road parking area. |
| Muswell Ave | Charging points in lampposts |
| Muswell Ave | CPZ would increase business running costs and would inconvenience customers. Currently there is no problem. Please clarify the situation regarding parking on the white lines alongside crossovers. |
| Muswell Ave | Current arrangements are fine. Local schools would suffer from coz. Please Don't introduce it. Thanks. |
| Muswell Ave | Do not introduce the proposed parking scheme. |
| Muswell Ave | I am not convinced that the introduction of a CPZ as proposed by the Council would be beneficial to residents or provide a safer or greener environment and am therefore against the proposal, while recognising that the views of residents in the roads specifically affected should be paramount. Experience with CPZs elsewhere is that they can be expensive and a hassle for residents particularly in obtaining permits for service vehicles and visitors. The part of Muswell Avenue on which I live (the 'north' end) is not currently included in the proposed CPZ. If the current proposals go ahead and a CPZ is introduced in the roads to the south of our part of Muswell Avenue, there is likely to be some negative knock-on effect on our road from commuters, shoppers etc seeking to avoid the CPZ roads. Personally I think that impact would be minor as our road is a sufficient distance from both Muswell Hill centre and Bounds Green tube for it to be worth while for most commuters or shoppers etc to want to park here. I would therefore be against the inclusion of our road in any future CPZ even if the current CPZ proposals are approved. |
| Muswell Ave | The proposal for the CPZ does not include my road, or the area on the north side of Alexandra Park Road, and we would be right on the edge of the zone, which would mean a substantial increase in traffic to our road of people looking for a parking space. It is already noticeable that in the evenings at least half a dozen cars disappear from the street near the junction with Alexandra Park Road - from about 41-61 Muswell Avenue, which is a strong indication in my view that there is already commuter traffic. I often see people park and get out of their cars, then walk towards the 134 or 43 bus stop on Colney Hatch Lane. So I am against the proposal as it stands because it would lead to a significant increase in traffic along my road and in the surrounding area from commuters, and that would bring an increase in pollution which is already high due to traffic on Alexandra Park Road and Colney Hatch Lane. But, I would support a CPZ that included the streets on north side of Alexandra Park Road as well, because I think there is a problem with commuter traffic already. |
| Muswell Ave | There is absolutely no issue with parking on our road. The reason there are possibly issues with parking on other roads is that so many of them have houses with driveways so there is actually very little pavement space for cars to park - but given that the houses have driveways, then the residents of those streets clearly don't have an issue with parking as they can park on their drives. Making those streets CPZ would not in any way benefit the owners of the properties nor would it increase the number of available parking spaces to assist local businesses. It would be a purely revenue raising operation and that is not sufficient reason to introduce CPZs in the area. |
| Muswell Ave | There is no need for controlled parking in this area. |
| Muswell Ave | There is no need to introduce CPZs in Muswell Hill. It is always possible to find a parking space. If introduced in surrounding areas it will produce a squeeze and thus artificially create a knock-on issue. I strongly oppose. |
| Muswell Ave | This area does not need a CPZ. This is simply a device for the borough to extract money from local residents. It is quite disgraceful that the consultation period includes the Xmas period which shows at best a complete disregard for local residents or at worst a desire to reduce the number of responses. |
| Muswell Ave | This CPZ is not required. It will create overspill into the roads you have excluded from this and cause more issues. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Muswell Ave | This is an extremely biased questionnaire - designed to introduce stealth taxes. Please do your elected duty and act in the interest of your residents. Few residents are wealthy, and many have lived here for decades. |
| Muswell Ave | We don't need a CPZ. It seems to me just to be the council controlling us and making money from us. |
| Muswell Ave | We oppose any parking controls in the area. As soon as you apply controls, there is a knock-on effect in nearby roads |
| Muswell Ave | We pay a premium to live in this area and I think it's unfair to implement surveys gather responses then introduce controlled parking regardless of residents opinions. One of the reasons for moving into this area was that there were no controlled parking zones, there are plenty of areas nearby and good effective bus routes that allow alternative ways to travel without the worry of car parking. We pay plenty of council tax and the issues that bother us ie; led street lighting was introduced without consultation to local residents. This not only harms local wildlife but is obstructive to residents as the lights are so bright. We would never welcome controlled parking in this area and are prepared to take this further if required. |
| Muswell Ave | What is the point of the EVCP question? We are ALL going to need them very soon. Please explain this question more clearly in future editions. |
| Muswell Ave | Your proposal would make it a nightmare to live here. It has nothing to do with climate change, but just a money-making scheme. It would make this into a ghetto |
| Grosvenor Rd | Do not do this as it will making parking in Grosvenor Road worse with all the people parking outside the zone. IT is a very bad idea and is there to just make money |
| Grosvenor Rd | Do not put in a parking zone, the proposed area - that does not include Grosvenor Road - will make it impossible to park on our road as it will lead to overspill from the CPZ area on the neighbouring roads. By being out of the zone it will also mean I cannot collect shopping in Muswell hill - in my electric car - and will force me to get heavy shopping from further away. This will be the same for others in petrol cars thereby increasing pollution and it will further contribute to the loss of the high street shops. The local schools need roads to park in for their teachers. This is so important for the education of local children to have the best teachers, many of whom have to travel from far away. Reintroduce white lines so people can park in their own driveways, as is the case in most of the roads near the high street. Please do not introduce this scheme! |
| Grosvenor Rd | does not require a cpz in our road |
| Grosvenor Rd | I am opposed to a CPZ in the Rhodes Avenue area as it will only worsen school hours parking problems by pushing traffic on to adjacent roads and could harm retention and recruitment at Rhodes Ave and APS schools. |
| Grosvenor Rd | I have three comments. First, the survey form needs to better address how it captures the comments of residents who do not live in the proposed area, whether they live on roads adjacent to the area or further afield. Second, I agree in principle with the creation of a CPZ but not with the geographical extent of the area. There is clearly parking pressure on the roads close to Muswell Hill's shops and businesses but nothing like the same pressure in the central part of the area, around The Avenue, The Grove and surrounding roads. Therefore, I would support the creation of a smaller CPZ closer to MH's shops and possibly extend the existing Bounds Green and Alexander Palace CPZs to deal with pressures stemming from the tube and overland stations. Third, what plans does the council have for dealing with parking displacement which will inevitably happen on roads adjacent and close to the proposed area like mine? |
| Grosvenor Rd | I would like to lower my curb and have a parking space so I can charge my car. This would be most beneficial for me, the neighbourhood and the environment. |
| Grosvenor Rd | If there is a CPZ then Grosvenor road needs to be a part of it. |
| Grosvenor Rd | If you introduce CPZ the two schools will lose their teachers. It will severely impact our children's education. Parking as it is fine. Don't mess with it! |
| Grosvenor Rd | If you introduce this CPZ the rest of our road would become an overspill zone, it would be an absolute nightmare. There are never any problems finding spaces in ours or the surrounding roads so I don't feel like there is need for a CPZ. This is simply another way for the council to fleece us for money. |

| | |
|------------|---|
| Muswell Rd | I don't think we need this. No problem parking. And in fact its useful to have no CPZ for visitors and workmen. I don't see why I should have to pay to park in my own street!! |
| Muswell Rd | I have a driveway. Only problem is people parkign in front of it. I have twice had to contact you to remove the offending vehicles - which you have done with kindness and efficiency. I am old and live alone and need family to come in and park easily - including in front of my driveway. Like many folk, I am not good at internet activity. I did not receive a freepost envelope, so I've sent this and hope it arrives at the right department. |
| Muswell Rd | I have many visiting carers who need to park nearby. Who pays for the VP if a CPZ was put in? Would my direct payment increase to cover this? |
| Muswell Rd | I would like Haringey not to find more ways to take my hard-earned money and to make life more irritating when we already have enough to deal with. I would NOT want to have parking zone restrictions of any kind in Muswell Hill. I would like Haringey to make my life better and not worse by creating over spill in my road. I have had no problems with parking and do not wish it to become one. |
| Muswell Rd | I'm very much against this proposal. It would be of no benefit to us at all and would adversely affect local businesses. It is just a way for the council to make money. |
| Muswell Rd | I've lived here for 50 years and am happy with the way it is. |
| Muswell Rd | In the interests of the local shops and keeping our community thriving, IF a CPZ is introduced, I think a solution similar to the arrangement in Crouch End would be desirable - i.e. 10-12 in part of Muswell Hill and 14-16 in other parts. |
| Muswell Rd | Much of this area is close to Muswell Hill shopping centre and is often used for all day parkign by non-locals and workers; thereby denying residents a space near their home. There is also overspill from the existing CPZ. A daily 2-hour CPZ would deal with the problem and encourage more use of public transport. |
| Muswell Rd | Muswell Rd adjoins the Broadway and parking has become a nightmare over time - made worse by the excess of cross-overs which effectively [provide free private parking for the owners of often large houses. The space bars are enormously long and all this squeezes the rest of us into decreasing space. Please stop allowing these wretched cross-overs, they are inconsistent with a sensible parkign plan. We have wanted a CPZ for years and it can't come soon enough. CPZ alo necessary all day to reduce air pollution from shoppers driving in and out |
| Muswell Rd | My views on this are predicated on improving the electric charging infrastructure here. I purchased an EV last year but charging it locally is impossible. There are 2 lamp post chargers on Rosebery Road but one is blocked by a camper van since the summer, and the other invariably has cars parked in front. The provision of ECVPs need to be rapidly increased. If the EV charging infrastructure is not improved, then I reject the CPZ proposal as it woudl only punish car owners. |
| Muswell Rd | No Comments apart from No CPZ |
| Muswell Rd | No need for CPZ. Your proposal seems merely to raise revenue |
| Muswell Rd | No parkign problems here. CPZ is unnecessary and inconvenient, and will do nothing for the environment or for residents |
| Muswell Rd | NO to CPZ |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Muswell Rd | Parking in my road is becoming increasingly difficult year by year. I often have to park in other roads. I see commuters arriving on a daily basis in the morning and parking their car until the evening. There is at least one car dealer in the road who owns several vehicles including a large camper van which is for sale. I see dog walker vehicles parking in Dukes Avenue regularly. Also uber drivers and others stop to have a break/eat lunch etc as many areas nearby have CPZ or double yellow lines. Many houses own multiple vehicles. The pressure on parking spaces is such a problem now that I am very keen to have CPZ. The entire area under consultation here, suffers from cars cruising around looking for parking spaces. This is both dangerous and polluting. My household are cyclists and the general congestion and number of cars, both moving and stationery is dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. There are no cycle lanes in Muswell Hill. Anything that can be done to discourage driving and promote alternatives - cycling, walking and public transport, should be strongly supported. I would support the introduction of some one way streets with cycle only gaps. The speed bumps do not reduce traffic speed and other traffic calming measures may be more effective to slow down the speeding cars that break free from the congestion on the Broadway and race down my road and Dukes Avenue and the link roads. |
| Muswell Rd | Residents who've converted front gardens to park on should pay for a resident parking permit. Very often, vehicles at these properties are away during the day but this does not leave a vacant space for others to park in. |
| Muswell Rd | Should install EVs on lampposts. The lack of EVCPs deters purchase of electric cars. |
| Muswell Rd | Some visitor parking is desirable, but I'd want it so that residents could purchase permits as required. A general pay-to-park scheme wouldn't do much to reduce commuter parking |
| Muswell Rd | Stop creating ways to line council pockets with further ways to fine good people. We don't have parking issues in Muswell hill. |
| Muswell Rd | Support CPZ, but charges look a bit steep |
| Muswell Rd | The proposed CPZ covers a large area and many roads further away from the Broadway will not want controls. We who live much closer do need parking controls now, so a CPZ should be installed in roads close to the Broadway |
| Muswell Rd | This has been rejected before. Is this consultation just a sham? Many questions are 'leading' so as to enable you to try and ignore opposition. Why bother us with this questionnaire if you have already decided to do this? |
| Muswell Rd | This is just a money raising plan disguised as 'help' for residents. Eco goals are already addressed by ULEZ. Please focus on the many other failing aspects of the borough |
| Muswell Rd | This whole scheme will have a negative impact on the area, creating a problem where there was none. Never any problem to park. Cost implications for residents and businesses, inconvenience and cost of having to buy permits for visitors and tradespeople, puts people off coming to the area to shop, workers in local shops and businesses and services having to pay for parking. It will not change the ability to park but Haringey council will be the beneficiaries. Leave it as it is. |
| Muswell Rd | We don't need a CPZ as there's plenty of space. What we DO need are more EVCPs |
| Muswell Rd | We don't want a CPZ because it would restrict our visitors. We are very concerned about front gardens being paved over and being used for off-street parking. Currently there are very few houses with this. There are no parking issues at present |
| Muswell Rd | We feel strongly there need to be a greater number of EVCPs available to encourage people to buy electric vehicles. We would buy one sooner if we knew we'd have a nearby space to charge it. At the moment it would be too difficult to go elsewhere to charge our vehicle, and then come back home and find we do not have a space to park again. Thank you. |
| Muswell Rd | We live near the Broadway and feel very strongly that we need a CPZ. I appreciate people living further from the Broadway may prefer not to have a CPZ. We are lucky in Muswell Hill in there being two good sized car parks for shoppers to use. Bus services are excellent in the area for commuters, people eating in restaurants & shoppers. |
| Muswell Rd | Would be great to have Muswell Road one way to the Avenue. It is much too narrow for two-way traffic |
| Outram Rd | |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Outram Rd | The majority of households do not have driveways or personal garages. To impose a CPZ when household expenses such as heating are increasing rapidly is inappropriate and will further add significantly to costs. |
| Outram Rd | There are now 3 DBs in constant use. My carer has to look for parkign in other roads. There is need for more general parking for blue badge holders |
| Outram Rd | The council has previously tried to impose A CPZ despite a 70% rejection rate.. What you shoudl do is: Remove the existing CPZ. 2. Put EVCPs on lampposts but do NOT have dedicated points which block off parking spaces. I already walk and use public transport. Your proposals disproportionately affect the poorer in the neighbourhood. Petrol stations shoudl also have EVCPs. Don't have DDBs but keep disabled bays . Stop teh LTNs which displace pollution and congestion to main roads where poorer people live and work |
| Outram Rd | ULEZ has already reduced traffic volume. We DO NOT WANT A CPZ IN ANY FORM WHATSOEVER! |
| Palace Court Gdns | |
| Palace Court Gdns | CPZ woudl damage the character of the area. Please leave it alone. Thanks |
| Palace Court Gdns | CPZ would impact adversely on local shops, woudl penalise friends, family, carers and tradespeople. It woudl also result in overspill on to surrounding roads. Everyone knows it is a money-making scheme. |
| Palace Court Gdns | Good that the London mayor encourages walking and cycling etc., but this is not possible for elders, those with disabilities, and those needing services. Lots of roads in the proposed area are on steep hills a long way from the shops and only residents park in them. Putting in a CPZ would only encourage more residents to concrete over their front gardens - with loss of green space. That goes against any "climate change action plan". |
| Palace Court Gdns | Money-grabbing Haringey Council |
| Palace Court Gdns | Palace Ct Gdns is a cul de sac of 1930s houses with shared driveways to garages which cannot be used for parking by modern cars which can't fit inside. However the main problem is increased use of driveway ('front garden') parking in surrounding roads. There is no need for a CPZ which we see as an extra tax. We residents manage parkign quiet effectively. Better to ban SUV (Chelsea tractor) cars throughout London if you want to reduce pollution as there's no need to drive these large cars which are growing in number and are inappropriate for London's roads. |
| Palace Court Gdns | Parking here is not a problem. Neighbouring streets with a CPZ would create a problem for us. CPZs would reduce available parking spaces. It is unclear to me how this is anything other than a way to generate revenue for the council. I don't support any proposed CPZ here. |
| Parham Way | |
| Parham Way | No parking pressure in these roads even though there are schools and green spaces used by non-locals. I moved here form a road which was in a CPZ because I hated the restrictions on visitors and services for residents. There's no commuter parkign here and most properties are single dwellings, so NO NEED for restrictions. |
| Parham Way | We've never had parking issues. Only time there is pressure is with some events at Ally Pally e.g. Bonfire Night fireworks. Having many more EVCPs woudl encourage more electric car use |
| Princes Ave | CPZ is not needed. Mostly, parking is fine. Only problem is at night when all residents are home and this would not be improved by a CPZ. A CPZ woudl also create problems for carers, trade services, and local businesses. I am vehemently against any CPZ |
| Princes Ave | CPZ woudl not be any use as parkign problems occurs only at night. A CPZ would cause added inconvenience and expense to non-car owners who do =need to have visitors as well as service calls. Marked bays and /or echelon parking on one side of the road would improve parkign provision |
| Princes Ave | Do not want CPZ. It works well as it is. Do not want the expense of having to buy annual permits plus permits for friends, family visitors or workmen |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Princes Ave | I am incredibly opposed to be asked to pay for parking in my own street or nearby streets. This is problematic and costly for myself as a local and for the times that visitors come round or home renovation works are being done. After a pandemic that has caused financial hardship and job losses for so many, it's insensitive and unfair that the Council is trying to claw back money from its residents at this time under the guise of having 'safer/greener roads'. If people don't want their roads overrun with cars, stop creating higher-density housing in the local N22 area and turn dead spaces into parks and gardens rather than more flats. A good example of this is the Alexandra Park high street where a shop front was converted into more flats and a further large flat development is occurring next to old hardware store. There are much fewer commuters engaging the local rail stations than before and any complaints by residents over lack of parking can always find a place in nearby roads. They ultimately only have themselves to blame as they have more than one vehicle (sometimes up to 3 or 4) per household which is totally unnecessary. Unless Haringey Council will give each house it's own allocated parking space, putting charges in place will absolutely not create more parking in our streets, less-busy road ways or more positive environmental benefits. Many people are also now working from home regularly which is contributing to less cars leaving the road in the day because less people are commuting by car. Please let's not pretend that this is about creating more safety or reducing commuting traffic as it very clearly isn't. |
| Princes Ave | I am passionately against a CPZ, and neighbours living within the current CPZ say it hasn't made much difference at all. I have lived in Princes Ave for 21 years and the main problem is finding a place to park in the evenings, indicating that it's mainly a multi car household problem. No CPZ can solve this problem (which is hardly a major problem in my view) and so I'd rather live with it than pay for something that won't work. I've noticed a slight improvement in parking availability during the day - perhaps down to people's commuting habits changing during Covid, and with more people working from home now, I envisage this will continue to improve. On the above point, as part of the planning application consultation for additional flats at Wood ridings Ct N22, we were told that a parking survey was taking place. It is my understanding that this hasn't happened (discovered after a FOI request by a neighbour). Or is THIS the survey? I appreciate that Haringey are trying to address air quality issues and I think electric charging points in Princes Ave are a great idea as it will encourage people (including me) to go electric. I'm not clear on how this would work - would the charge points be connected to the car owner's specific household electricity supply? Or would they be charge points for anyone with an electric car to use? |
| Princes Ave | I believe every resident has the right to own a car and park it on the street without the council trying to tax it. This is shameless profiteering |
| Princes Ave | I know the council is trying to raise money but this is NOT the way to do it. CPZs do not ease residents' parking and they damage local businesses. I DO NOT want a CPZ |
| Princes Ave | I see this proposal as nothing to do with parking, and all to do with raising revenue for the council. Parking in Princes Avenue is most difficult at night, when the parking controls would not apply, so this measure would not help residents in parking. |
| Princes Ave | Princes Avenue doesn't need a CPZ as parking is not difficult. Imposing a CPZ is just a money-making exercise by Haringey Council |
| Princes Ave | Princes Avenue is a wide road and more parking spaces could be provided if you installed echelon parking on one side of the road |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Princes Ave | Re EVCPs - I do not yet have an electric car, but because of the parking issues, I cannot purchase one as I can never park near my home. I would like to see residents parking, with any revenues invested into EV infrastructure - ultimately we will need to think collectively on this in the coming years if we want to make the transition to greener vehicles, the current status quo is delaying household shifting. Secondly, the worst time for parking is in the evenings. I know if I get home after 8pm I will not be able to park often, and sometimes have to park a few streets away and walk home alone late at night. In part, I wonder if the neighbouring CPZ is using our road for overnight visitors parking or for residents without permits. I also think there are multi vehicle households - and there is little disincentive to people owning cars, because there is effectively nowadays no road tax and fuel duty has been frozen for 10+ years - we are not paying for the impacts we have on our local environment, be that through emissions, pollution, visual and noise disturbances, or the use of public space/roads that could equally be used for trees or cycling routes or other greener alternatives. |
| Princes Ave | Residents' vehicles occupy all the spaces, so a CPZ would not make a difference but would instigate unwanted charges and associated admin hassle. A CPZ would be a major inconvenience |
| Princes Ave | There have been several attempts by the council to impose this and all have been fought against by residents. Looking at the map it is obvious that the council simply wishes to make money by charging everybody who owns a car to park near their houses. Please find another way to raise income |
| Princes Ave | There is no benefit to be gained from introducing CPZ's, we are all very aware of that. The only benefit will be more revenue for Haringey Council. That is of no help to the residents and visitors to the area. The concept of a CPZ does not address the lack of parking whatsoever. Other ideas would be, marked bays (so drivers have to park within the allocated space and not across two, this addressed the bad parking habits people have developed in these roads and immediately frees up more parking spaces. Or even better, change the majority of the roads to one-way only; introduce chevron parking on both sides of the street where the street is wide enough. Do the same for streets that are not wide enough, but just introduce marked bays. The council can still achieve revenue from parking enforcement (parking within bays), gain significant extra parking capacity, and not upset everyone as this consultation is going to. Such schemes have been implemented across the UK and the results are marked. I find it hard to believe that we should have to point this kind of benefit out to the people who plan our street layouts. If Haringey attempts to push this through by misrepresenting anything whatsoever, I fear the backlash may be extraordinary. Haringey needs to do this right this time. |
| Princes Ave | This CPZ would affect us and most of our neighbours We do not agree with a CPZ especially around Alexandra palace scbok9wherr teachers travel from far away by car and they need parking. I don't understand if us as residents don't ask for a CPZ why is tried to be enforced on us |
| Princes Ave | This is a money-making scheme and was not requested by residents. There are no parking pressures / issues here. The council wants the whole area to be one continuous CPZ. Listen to the people for once and stop forcing unwanted parking schemes on us |
| Princes Ave | We do not need a CPZ so please do not waste your time and energy enforcing one |
| Princes Ave | We do not want to pay for parking on our street or any other streets. It's bad enough that you have to pay for parking in most places in North London. Parking on my street is not a problem. I can usually park in front of my house. The surrounding streets are also fine. Do not make our life more difficult and charge us to park on our own street. |
| Princes Ave | We don't need a CPZ here. Parking is not an issue |
| Princes Ave | We're happy with current situation. A CPZ does not guarantee parking space, so why should we pay for nothing |
| Princes Ave | You need to ensure that DBs are used by genuine blue badge holders |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Rhodes Ave | I do not believe the introduction of CPZ would make any difference to the number of cars parked on the roads of the proposed zone. This is a residential area and the majority of cars belong to residents within the area and introducing a CPZ would not reduce the numbers of parked cars. The idea that this is somehow going to reduce car emissions when TFL have recently brought in ULEZ is ridiculous as most people will have compliant or electric cars within the zone thus already reducing emissions. Also the majority of the residents parked cars are not moved during the day as most people commute to work using public transport or work from home. The only time parked cars become an issue on my road (Rhodes Avenue) is during school pick up and drop off where some parents are travelling from outside the area to drop off and pick up children from the schools and CPZ would enable them to do so more easily as they can sit in their cars waiting for their children as there would be more free space to park on CPZ zones. I strongly object to the introduction of this scheme and resent having to pay another tax just to park near my home. I also believe that Haringey's current management of CPZ in other areas of the borough is chaotic and unusable and would not want to use it to park near my home. |
| Rhodes Ave | Quite a few parking spaces are taken by staff at the 2 schools, and we fully support this. A CPZ would negatively impact staff at the schools. Also having a CPZ just pushes the problem of insufficient parking spaces into other areas, and we don't see this as an overall improvement |
| Rhodes Ave | The purpose of a CPZ is to help people park in their local area. Residents have no problems parking their car on Rhodes Avenue. This appears to be another tax on residents, a money grab by Haringey Council. |
| Rhodes Ave | |
| Rhodes Ave | This proposal is obviously just a money making scheme for Haringey council. Nobody I know in our area wants CPZ. The teachers from Rhodes Avenue and Alexandra Park schools would have to find parking in Grosvenor Road and the 'Lake' roads if this was brought in. Local shops in Alexandra Park Road would also be affected and lose revenue at a time where they have already struggled due to the pandemic. |
| Rhodes Ave | We are 100% against this proposed Controlled Parking Zone, as there is no need for it whatsoever. There are no parking problems on these streets. They are not near any tube stations or venues that do not have their own parking facilities. Nothing has changed since the last consultation which proved that a controlled parking zone was unnecessary. Many shops and therefore livelihoods would be adversely affected, which is unacceptable in this current climate of local business insecurity. The both Ofsted Outstanding rated Haringey schools in this proposed Controlled Parking Zone rely on top quality staff members who live 5+ miles away from the school. Both schools would be unable to recruit staff who could not drive to their place of work and park safely. This would mean that the schools would lose their valued and experienced staff members and would be unable to sustain their Ofsted Outstanding rating. The monies raised for Haringey Council by this proposed Controlled Parking Zone is not justifiable when compared to the suffering and damage it would cause to the community, schools, businesses and residents in the zone. |
| Rhodes Ave | We oppose parking controls. Parking is not a problem, and a CPZ would damage local businesses |
| Rosebery Rd | CPZ not needed in Rosebery Rd. It would cost us money without offering any benefit. CPZ would damage traders and inconvenience our visitors and services. We also opposed the previous attempt to impose a CPZ here |
| Rosebery Rd | DON'T need controls here. I see this as purely a revenue generating exercise |
| Rosebery Rd | Don't want any further charges. Currently it works perfectly so no CPZ needed. |
| Rosebery Rd | Dropped kerbs waste space because only the owner can park across them. A CPZ would make the owner park elsewhere thereby reducing available space |
| Rosebery Rd | I am strongly opposed to a CPZ. The extra charge to park would be a considerable burden and we would have less not more parking. |
| Rosebery Rd | I feel it is unfair and unnecessary for additional costs for owning a car plus when workman attend to your property as a resident extra costs will be incurred via visitor permits. Especially when public transport is not great and does not take into account of safety during the night when returning from a nights out. Public transport is not safe as we have seen in the news recently. |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Rosebery Rd | I have a revolutionary suggestion: Leave things as they are. This whole form is worded so taht you can impose parking controls. I am furious that you want to try and force in parking controls for your own gain and dress it up as if it was an environmental issue |
| Rosebery Rd | I have lived in the area for 25 years and there has never been a problem parking. I find there is ample parking always outside my house and the surrounding areas. No need for controlled parking. |
| Rosebery Rd | I recently applied for a driveway and it was refused. Several years ago I inquired about permit parkign and also about EVCPs (which was the main reason I wanted a driveway). There is an EVCP on the lamp post next door but that is often in use. There are 2 unused disabled bays, so we have lost 3 spaces. The road is often full of builders vans as well as cars left parked by shop staff in the Broadway. |
| Rosebery Rd | I strongly do not want a CPZ in Rosebery Road. There was a CPZ at my previous address in Harlingen and it was a nightmare trying to get permits, the bureaucracy was awful. Also, why should I have to pay to park outside my own house? |
| Rosebery Rd | I strongly oppose the proposed CPZ. It is unnecessary on these residential roads. It is a very cynical move to propose a CPZ on mainly residential roads that are not adjacent to a tube or rail station. There will also be a devastating effect on our lovely local businesses, who need all our support in this challenging trading climate. I have small children and the effect of not being able to park on my road, near my house, would affect my family life. |
| Rosebery Rd | In my view, Rosebery Road simply does not need controlled parking. It is far enough away from transport links that it is not blighted by commuter parking. Similarly, it is not blighted by shoppers parking as it is far enough away from the Muswell Hill central area. What will be needed are more on-street electric car charging points as more people would like to make the switch to electric vehicles, but cannot do so at present. |
| Rosebery Rd | It does not seems to be a good idea to introduce CPZ. We don't see any benefits, but more is issues and disadvantages. |
| Rosebery Rd | Keep it as it is. It works well |
| Rosebery Rd | Let's be honest the CPZ consolation is a sham-it has already been determined by politically motivated Council officers. It is not aiming to control parking but as a revenue stream that can be milked in future years .As you have already decided to introduce the CPZ at least make it minimally painful for residents by only applying it for 2 hours a day Monday-Friday |
| Rosebery Rd | No need for a CPZ- it's just a way to make money for the council's coffers. Also I respectfully ask you to extend the consultation time, given that it's being run over Christmas. |
| Rosebery Rd | NO NEED FOR CONTROLLED PARKING HERE. We also need to retain front gardens - as a CPZ will make people turn them into driveways |
| Rosebery Rd | No need for CPZ. This proposal has obviously been generated by the council - not by residents |
| Rosebery Rd | No need for parking restrictions as it works at the moment. Think of the shop owners. They will struggle if you make it difficult for people to park in Muswell hill. |
| Rosebery Rd | No need for this!!! |
| Rosebery Rd | NO NEED FOR WEEKDAY RESTRICTIONS. Must be Weekends only |
| Rosebery Rd | Nothing wrong currently with parking on Rosebery Rd |
| Rosebery Rd | One occupant in Rosebery Rd leaves a trailer and several vehicles parked. I am told he always puts cones out to reserve space. This is selfish and annoying for other residents |
| Rosebery Rd | Parkign has never been difficult but quite a few business vehicles - used by residents, are left parked and several residents with garages in Parham Way choose to park in Rosebery Road for their convenience. We are opposed to CPZ because they rarely benefit residents but simply lead to more costs and the signage is ugly and spoils the natural view of the road. Also inconvenient for residents' visitors and services. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Rosebery Rd | Parking scheme proposed is discriminatory in terms of tariffs. Parking is about space - not fuel usage. Engine size is also irrelevant to parking. It is inappropriate for a council to set or influence vehicle ownership policy. That is a task for central government through road tax. This 'consultation' is legally flawed because you have not disclosed simultaneous consultations which have impact on this area. Furthermore, you have not carried out or disclosed any cost benefit analysis of the effect on local businesses |
| Rosebery Rd | Please do not introduce a CPZ into this area. Our road and the surrounding roads do not need it. There are always plenty of spaces and by introducing one, it will only push more cars onto roads that do not have parking restrictions. There is absolutely no need to have one and would purely be a money making scheme. I have never ever had trouble parking, not even when there are events at Ally Pally. |
| Rosebery Rd | Seems like another money-making scheme being forced onto residents. We have suffered enough during the pandemic - along with rising fuel costs and you want to add more pressure and suffering. Hopefully the extra money you make is used for food banks and clothing banks to help those who won't be able to afford basic necessities |
| Rosebery Rd | Suggest tripling the charge for each extra car in a household. I would also like traffic barriers so cars cannot access this road - only bicycles. A barrier in the middle of Rosebery Road would be very nice. |
| Rosebery Rd | The area does not need a CPZ. Alexandra Park has sufficient onsite parking which for decades has been able to satisfy parking for any events held there. |
| Rosebery Rd | The CPZ it is not necessary. We are good as we are so we don't need the change. This is just for the purpose of making money out of it. As simple as that. You should listen to the people. |
| Rosebery Rd | The way you've asked the questions 5, 6 and 7 indicates you have already decided to impose a CPZ. It is not needed. It is occasionally difficult to park late at night, but a CPZ would be irrelevant for this |
| Rosebery Rd | There are no reasons to have a CPZ. Please stop allowing residents to pave over their front gardens. This often leads to obstructing the pavement and increases flood risk |
| Rosebery Rd | There is a squeeze when all residents are home at night and I support car reduction. However, I would prefer not to have any CPZ and instead would like to see money spent on services we actually need. |
| Rosebery Rd | This is a very quiet road with lots of parking space. A CPZ would be very inconvenient for residents |
| Rosebery Rd | This is obviously a money-making scheme by the council |
| Rosebery Rd | We already pay extensive taxes and charges. CPZ appears more of a way of raising council revenue than of solving mobility and congestion problems. We already use public transport for day-to-day shopping and travel to work, and school. It seems unfair to further penalise car owners. I trust you will publish the results of this consultation in full. It appears that previous consultations on traffic controls and parking have not been published. |
| Rosebery Rd | We are firmly against the introduction of a controlled parking zone in our area. |
| Rosebery Rd | We are in desperate need of permits. People park all day on our road for the schools, shops and the station. People are putting bins out so they can keep a parking space. Rosebery Rd needs a CPZ |
| Rosebery Rd | We do not have a problem with commuter parking in this area so there is no need for a CPZ. Our road is only ever busy in the late evening when everyone is home for the night and a CPZ would do nothing to help with this. To impose one on us is tantamount to an additional tax for no added benefit. |
| Rosebery Rd | We do not want or require CPZ parking. There never a problem with parking. Stop trying to take our money. |
| Rosebery Rd | We don't want a CPZ forced on us |
| Rosebery Rd | We're not near any shops or tube. Totally against any CPZ here |
| Rosebery Rd | Zero need for a CPZ. Parkign is quite adequate. A CPZ would be highly inconvenient for visitors, services and deliveries. A CPZ would damage local shops by restricting access for customers. This looks like a veiled cash grab by the council |
| Sakura Drive | I don't agree with CPZ. We have a major problem with parking because of nearby CPZ. Biggest problem is Aubrey Close where cars park illegally and block access to bin lorries and emergency services. We need more EVCPs rolled out. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Sakura Drive | Please don't introduce parking controls in this area |
| St Regis Close | As we don't want a CPZ, Q6 and Q7 don't apply |
| St Regis Close | Electric vehicle charging point which is not private will simply add to the parking burden. We do not need a cpz in this area. It merely gives inconvenience to residents, their visitors and their tradesmen. This is purely a money making exercise on behalf of the council |
| St Regis Close | I am opposed to CPZ in this area |
| St Regis Close | I am opposed to the introduction of parking permits in this area |
| The Avenue | Absolutely no need for any CPZ on the roads listed |
| The Avenue | Ample parking here - no need for restrictions. CPZ would damage local shops, library. It would ruin our area. |
| The Avenue | Currently parkign on each side of the road restricts vehicles passing and causes confrontations. DYL are needed on the park side of the Avenue. If the bus route could be switched up the Avenue and via Dukes Avenue to Muswell Hill, that would encourage park visitors to use the bus instead of their cars |
| The Avenue | Do not introduce controls. Many people use these roads to come to the park for exercise or to do pick ups from school or visit the dentist. |
| The Avenue | Encourage fewer cars by charging much more to drive them esp the huge SUV Chelsea tractors which are utterly unnecessary in London. Enforce the 20mph speed limit more rigorously |
| The Avenue | I do not want a CPZ |
| The Avenue | I don't think we need a CPZ in this area. I particularly don't want it around APS school as it will severely impact how staff can travel to school. This school does a fantastic job for our children and community and I want them to be able to attract staff from a wide area who need to drive and park. I don't believe parking is an issue in this area. |
| The Avenue | I have a hybrid car, I do NOT have any parking issues and therefore do NOT need a CPZ. It is an abuse of power, totally unnecessary - an additional tax that the council has by stealth, implemented across the borough. I would rather see more EVCPs than CPZs. This is an agenda to squeeze more money out of residents under the guise of improving parking. Total rubbish. Should be ashamed of such lies. Disgraceful |
| The Avenue | I think no changes should be done, any controlled parking areas will cause more problems rather than solve any. |
| The Avenue | I'm concerned at the reduced road space resulting from driveway conversions, as well as parking demand from residents in flats. The top of The Avenue by the park needs to be addressed urgently. The road is also used as a cut-through to and from Wood Green. |
| The Avenue | I've lived here for years and see no reason for a CPZ, which would only inconvenience residents and their visitors with unnecessary costs. I hope you will note my comments and that no further action will be needed |
| The Avenue | NO CPZ. HANDS OFF OUR STREETS |
| The Avenue | No issues with parkign and prefer the flexibility of no CPZ. We have friends visiting during the day and the current arrangement is perfect from our point of view |
| The Avenue | No need for CPZ |
| The Avenue | No need for CPZ in our road. However some controls would be useful during major events at Ally Pally |
| The Avenue | No need for this. |
| The Avenue | None of the problems I mentioned would be resolved by a CPZ. I do suggest that Haringey coordinates more effectively with Alexandra Palace |
| The Avenue | Parkign restrictions damage the local community |
| The Avenue | Problems at the top of the Avenue come from the road being too narrow to accommodate passing traffic. Toad rage, bad language and scratched cars are a constant problem. There need to be passing points, or a one way system. What we need is to remove the front garden wall and create a parking space with an EVCP |

| | |
|------------|--|
| The Avenue | The Avenue and surrounding streets do not need CPZ. This would make parking a problem, when it is currently not an issue. Haringey parking department doesn't seem to work very well as they are impossible to contact. Also, needing to know visitor car registration numbers in advance and not being able to have more than one visitor at the time are not a good ideas. I strongly oppose extending the CPZ. |
| The Avenue | The Avenue is fine as it is. No need for CPZ |
| The Avenue | The only problems at our end of the Avenue are traffic volumes and parking availability on Nov 5 and New Years Eve celebrations. A traditional CPZ seems completely disproportionate to address this issue. It could be much better managed by temporary traffic restrictions which are used on other surrounding roads. We have off road parking but on occasions when we or visitors need to park on the road there is never an issue and we are invariably able to park within 20m of our house. |
| The Avenue | The top of the Avenue between Vallance Road and Dukes Avenue needs special measures. There are no passing points except the entrance to my drive in, which at busy times people park across, or so tightly that I can't get into or out of my drive. There have been fights when cars are unable or unwilling to back up to Dukes or Vallance (and very dangerous). |
| The Avenue | There is no justification for a CPZ here. It is clearly a revenue generating move and would cause problems for visitors and family relationships. Also, more residents would pave over their front gardens which is not good for the environment. A CPZ would damage local shops who rely on customers being able to park easily. |
| The Avenue | There is simply no need for a CPZ in the Avenue, if Haringey introduce one it will be purely as a money-making exercise. |
| The Avenue | This is absolute madness for our road. I have a driveway and would largely be without impact but it feels hugely unfair to neighbours which cannot create off street parking that they will now be charged to park outside their own property when they already pay huge amounts to the council annually in taxes. It will be a hassle when you have family gatherings and a cost to us which isn't right. The road never has any issues with parking, it's just a money making scheme. Awful. |
| The Avenue | This is mostly a residential area with schools who will need to have free access to venues when needed as needed. It has worked well and no need for any control. There will be more problems having pay parked. I do not feel there is any benefit for the residence and schools and business around this area. Sounds more like council trying to raise funds nothing to do with running of this community. Please leave this area out of the control plans it will make more chaos and disruption for the school communities. |
| The Avenue | This proposal is NOT NEEDED. There is already a CPZ around Alexandra Palace Train station to deter commuters. The Mayor introduced ULEZ so that solves the council's strategy on air quality and health. Walk around the proposed area and it's evident that there is no parking issue. I can't afford to buy an electric car (minimum £30,000) yet those that can are charged the least. How is that fair? I've lived in Muswell Hill for 12 years and NEVER had an issue parking outside my house. I fear more houses will apply for off-street parking which will detract from the history, beauty and charm of the area. Speaking with my neighbours, they all see this as a CPZ proposal too far and simply a job-making and money grabbing exercise for Haringey Council. It risks driving people away from the local shops and thriving business community in Muswell Hill. There is no underground station anywhere near the proposed area so this proposal is just punishing those that can't afford a new car and is creating a problem where one DOESN'T CURRENTLY EXIST. It's nothing to do with supporting improving air-quality and supporting the health of residents as ULEZ and the rise of Electric Vehicles is already seeing to that. As soon as I can afford to buy my own electric car, I will, but please don't penalise us in the mean time and put up signs and draw white lines all over our lovely neighbourhood. |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| The Avenue | We object in the strongest terms to the possible introduction of a CPZ. There is no need for one on The Avenue. We have lived here since 1994 and, in 27 years, have always found somewhere to park on the street, if not directly outside our house then a little further down. The Avenue is quite a walk from the shops on Muswell Hill Broadway and is not near a tube or rail station or school, so we do not get people parking cars here for those purposes. It is much more convenient for tradespeople, builders and visitors to be able to park without restrictions. There is occasionally increased traffic with events at Alexandra Palace at weekends, and obviously on fireworks night, but a CPZ would not affect, or improve, the flow of cars on the street. In summer there are more people visiting the park but even so, there is always somewhere to park on The Avenue. A CPZ would mean we would have to pay to park in our own street. We very much hope you take our comments into consideration. We are also contacting our councillors and MP to register our objections. |
| The Avenue | We would prefer NO controls but if they are put in then they should include daytime weekends as that is when congestion is worse |
| The Avenue | We've lived here for years and never had a problem with parking. A CPZ will incur us with extra expense with no benefit. Also what does engine size or omissions have to do with parking - other than to increase council revenue. We are already subject to ULEZ, so yet another tax seems grossly unfair and is not necessary. We already have an EV but costs for these are not mentioned. In our opinion, this is nothing but another tax on motorists and a money-making exercise for the council |
| Vallance Rd | Absolutely no need for this. We are not near transport hubs or other services. The only possible reason for your proposal is to obtain additional money. |
| Vallance Rd | Always plenty of space to park in this road |
| Vallance Rd | CPZ not needed |
| Vallance Rd | Encourage Ally Pally users to use public transport e.g. by setting up a park & ride service. A CPZ is a tax on residents at a time when we pay enough council tax. Most of the time there is ample parking space in Vallance Rd. Also suggest you talk with the DVLA about charging more for car owners with multiple vehicles |
| Vallance Rd | Even during peak events at Ally Pally there is still available parking outside my house. There is no need for a CPZ. I can see that the revenue gained from a CPZ is far greater than the CPZ running costs. We do not need a CPZ in this area. |
| Vallance Rd | I am strongly against the Alexandra Palace West CPZ. There is absolutely no need for it. |
| Vallance Rd | I am very concerned about the effect that introducing parking controls will have on Alexandra Park School - in particular its efforts to recruit and retain staff. It is important to me that this brilliantly performing school, which makes me so proud of Haringey, is not damaged. |
| Vallance Rd | I do find it hard to believe that we are being asked to consider CPZ in this area. We have been residents here since 2004 and have never experienced problems with parking, I do know the surrounding roads pretty well too and would not say parking restrictions are needed. I am very concerned that the introduction or threat of CPZ will encourage people to concrete over their front gardens to provide a drive, which is dangerous for pedestrians and will further decrease the biodiversity in this area and add to flood run off problems. Surely in this day and age we should be encouraging more planting of plants and trees etc not less. I do think introducing more car charging points is a good thing in the area. If CPZ is introduced in this area I can only think it is another way for Haringey council to gain financial benefits, we as residents should not be asked to contribute in such an underhand way. Jo Hampson |
| Vallance Rd | I really feel that most roads DO NOT need CPZ. Perhaps those right near the Broadway or Alexandra palace station. Otherwise there is little need. Roads are busy all day and evening it is not due to commuters and it will not lower pollution levels. This is a local council income generator for one of the most highly taxes boroughs in London. Squeezing middle income earners even more. |
| Vallance Rd | I've lived here for years and there has never been a problem. I object to the proposed CPZ |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Vallance Rd | In the entire proposed parking zone there is very good parking availability, and no one ever complains about it. Creating the parking zone does not benefit the residents. Therefore the only beneficiary is the council by levying an unwanted fee which is like a stealth hike in council tax. This CPZ is not wanted or at all needed |
| Vallance Rd | Just a money-making exercise for the council |
| Vallance Rd | My family have lived here for decades and never have parkign difficulty except perhaps on Bonfire Night when the fireworks display is on at Ally Pally. There is never any parkign difficulty on Vallance, Elgin, Talbot, The Avenue or other local roads. Ally Pally charges have had little impact on surrounding roads. Given the ULEZ extension, your claims about emissions are nonsense. Penalising modern diesels is just a scam as these are more efficient than petrol engines because of their filters and after-burners. Certainly I understand that councils need more funding but attempting to raise money through CPZs is NOT the way to do it. |
| Vallance Rd | My partner needs fulltime care form district nurses, carers and family for all her needs as well as shopping . CPZ restrictions would have massive adverse impact on us. |
| Vallance Rd | NO CHANGE REQUIRED Old people depend on family and carers support, SO NO TO CPZ |
| Vallance Rd | No issue with parkign and a CPZ is not needed. We already have ULEZ to stop the most polluting cars. I wonder if this proposed scheme is even legal, given the lack of justification. It woudl inconvenience family and friends who visit us - let alone the costs and potential fines. |
| Vallance Rd | No need for any CPZ |
| Vallance Rd | No need for change. System works well as it is |
| Vallance Rd | No need for CPZ. Is this a money-raising exercise? |
| Vallance Rd | No parking issues in this area. The ULEZ already targets the most polluting vehicles. I'm strongly against the proposals for visitor permits as this woudl make it difficult and expensive for friends and family visiting. Your proposal lack financial detail including arrangements for contractors and services. There is no detail about provision of EVCPs or for the properties which are not currently viable . CPZ not needed |
| Vallance Rd | Proposed CPZ is completely unnecessary and would create problems for visitors, family, carers and other services. Have you even considered the environmental costs of people converting front gardens into parking spaces? To suggest charging by CO2 emissions is outrageous, as ULEZ is is already operative. You are using an environmental smokescreen to justify a revenue-raising scheme. IT would have a deleterious effect not only on residents but also on businesses, schools and community centres. NO TO CPZ |
| Vallance Rd | PROVIDE 1 CAR LENGTH PASSING SPACE ON SOUTH END OF THE AVENUE (NO MORE THAN 2 REQUIRED) |
| Vallance Rd | Strongly object to CPZ as it is not needed and would create a burden for visiting friends, family, and services. This is not an appropriate way to generate revenue and could encourage households to build off-street parking, which has been a blight on the area in recent years - destroying the character of the area and increasing flood risk. |
| Vallance Rd | There are never any parkign problems and we STRONGLY OBJECT to this proposal as being 1. unnecessary 2. big burden on friends and family visiting 3. we doubt whether imposing such a wide blanket CPZ is lawful. This is not an appropriate way for the council to raise revenue |
| Vallance Rd | There is absolutely no need for parking restrictions in Vallance Road or Elgin Road (We live on the corner of Elgin and Vallance Roads). The introduction of a CPZ will cause unnecessary complications and costs for visitors and tradespeople alike. In addition, it will cause problems for people using local amenities such as the classes at CUFOS, the library and the Laboratory (Gym). The introduction of the ULEZ is already encouraging the removal of older polluting cars from the area. The CPZ is unlikely to make a significant difference to this scheme and therefore is an invalid justification. |
| Vallance Rd | There is absolutely no problem getting parking space in Vallance Rd., so there is not a problem to solve. I want things to stay as they are |
| Vallance Rd | There is always plenty of parking spaces |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Vallance Rd | There is never any issue with parking on Elgin Road, Vallance Road or Talbot Road with the possible exception of fireworks night. There is no sense that these roads are being overrun by cars. The ULEZ already makes the most polluting cars unviable. You do not provide any details on the regime of fines and/or visitor permits for this scheme. You do not provide any information about potential future increases in the charges. This will make providing for visitors and contractors complicated and error prone leaving residents, visitors and contractors liable for fines. You do not provide information about the financial benefit to the council. I am concerned that this is a scheme to cover a shortfall in council funding than serving local residents, who will face increased administrative burden, financial burden and likelihood of being fined. You are conflating providing charging points with the parking scheme. Charging points could be provided regardless as you have already done on the Avenue presumably at little or no cost to the council. |
| Vallance Rd | There is no problem around parking in this street (Vallance Road) as we are not close to shops or a station. We don't see the need for it. it would be expensive, bureaucratic and wholly unnecessary, even if other streets adopted it. |
| Vallance Rd | We are, frankly astonished that you are pushing a CPZ. Why are you trying this on? The local community neither wants nor needs a CPZ |
| Vallance Rd | We see this CPZ proposal as completely unnecessary. Residents see this as a bare faced revenue raising exercise wrapped up in political correctness. Haringey is already within the ULEZ which came in this year and as such many residents have already been forced to take steps to replace their more aged cars with less polluting ones. I have lived in this area for over 30 years and cannot see that there has been a discernible deterioration in parking conditions other than that have been self-inflicted. e.g.: removing parking within Alexandra Park. Moreover, I see that the proposed pricing structure is biased against "diesel" cars with no differentiation between "Blue Diesel " cars which, in many cases are in fact less polluting than petrol equivalents and older diesels . As stated by GreenElement.Co.uk- who support sustainable development, they say: "As mentioned earlier diesel cars can be extremely efficient. They produce less carbon dioxide per litre of fuel compared to petrol cars. However, they need to address the issue of releasing particulates. Adblue is a liquid that is stored in the tank and injected into the exhaust pipe. The liquid causes a chemical reaction to take place that converts harmful Nox particulates into nitrogen and water. Source: https://www.greenelement.co.uk/blog/are-diesel-cars-worse-for-the-planet/#:~:text=As%20mentioned%20earlier%20diesel%20cars,injected%20into%20the%20exhaust%20pipe . The proposed pricing structure is based upon emissions, which makes sense, but then to apply a blanket "diesel" charge- does not. Overall this proposal is without merit or local support. |
| Victoria Rd | Far better to limit the use of the roads as a rat run. Parking is not the issue, the rat run is. We have as residents repeatedly rejected this proposal. |
| Victoria Rd | For me the CPZ is not necessary. The difficult time to find a parking space is in the evening when all residents are home. The CPZ will not have any effect on this. And it's not a problem really if you can't park directly outside your door. |
| Victoria Rd | Generally there is no problem with parking. Occasionally there are issues late evening caused by multicar households. A CPZ would probably not solve this, but there should be a limit on multicars per household |
| Victoria Rd | Glad the CPZ has been extended to a wider area since the last proposal because this did not progress previously due those not included in the proposed zone voting against due to worries about the overspill that residents closer to the station and existing CPZ experience today. |
| Victoria Rd | Have you asked the residents if they own more than 2 cars? Is this an issue around parking? Do residents use their own driveways. Do residents believe they own the space in front of their houses? Are they paying for this space? Is this a thing that residents now own the road they have a property on? If this is the case shouldn't every property in London be given this questionnaire? |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Victoria Rd | I am hoping to change my vehicle for an electric car but have been put off by lack of charging points and would therefore welcome greater availability of those. However I would not be in favour of dedicated individual spaces with charge points, if this would reduce the overall numbers of parking spaces. We should be encouraged to switch to electric vehicles but people who can't afford to do so should not be discriminated against. Would it be possible to have charging points fixed to lampposts? Demand for charge points will hopefully be increasing, so the ideal would be to have one installed in every lamppost. I am concerned that people with electric vehicles are currently obliged to run cables across pavements, which can be a trip hazard. Our parking misery results largely from commuters parking to use the train to get to work but train travel should be encouraged so would it be possible for some reasonable priced parking to be provided close to Alexandra Park station to relieve pressure on surrounding business and residential streets? |
| Victoria Rd | I am not supporting this because of the impact on my children's school (APS) and the fact that teachers will not be able to park and they will need to look for a new school. This is far worse than me walking 2 mins to find a car park but if the other streets do then that is the worst outcome. Can you not help the school and provide them car permits? They don't earn enough to add this to their yearly bill. Households with more than 1 car registered to a house should be charged a massive fee. A household only needs one car. |
| Victoria Rd | I am shocked and appalled to hear that this change has been proposed! The introduction of a CPZ is completely unrequired on a road with ample parking for residents and visitors alike, and simply punishes residents by forcing them to obtain costly permits for parking where they live and have always parked problem free! |
| Victoria Rd | I do not have an electric vehicle yet but plan to switch soon. I have seen occasional charging points appearing on lamp posts in some streets locally, perhaps in Barnet rather than Haringey. I would like to hear more about the council's strategy for installing EV charging points. Will they always be dedicated bays like the ones near Alexandra Palace Station, or will there be sufficient of them eventually that they can be used for charging or parking? My street is so congested that dedicated bays would use valuable parking spaces. Is there a document that lays out the council's plan for the switch to EVs? |
| Victoria Rd | I don't own a car, but frequently rent cars. It's hassle and cost to get parking permits for rental cars, visitors and tradesmen. I feel penalised for not owning a car, if I have to get daily or hourly permits to park a rental/car club car. As those have different registration numbers, I could not get an owners permit. I'm strongly against this. |
| Victoria Rd | I don't understand why our street has not been consulted directly & had to find out about it from community forums. Also you need to make provision for teachers at local schools to park economically or for free. |
| Victoria Rd | I want to buy an electric car so I welcome the opportunity to get an EVCP. I also think that having marked bays on the road would make better use of available space. Another option would be to have "green bays" outside people's homes, so they can charge their EVs from their home. These bays would be specific to the home. I'd pay good money for this. |
| Victoria Rd | I was only told about this consultation through our neighbour what's app group, there has been no communication from Haringey council about this. I am against the parking zone, there is no problem with parking. |
| Victoria Rd | I wish Victoria Rd had been notified of this consultation. Most of my neighbours have had nothing to let them know this was being decided. We have learned of this via Next door. This is not a fair consultation if people are left out and can't have their say. |
| Victoria Rd | I would be happy to pay for a parking permit if the ability to park on my road near my house was improved. I also have noticed that because of the number of vehicles the refuse collection becomes harder than needed as the guys have to push bins through where there are gaps in the parked cars. The volume of vehicles is high and on a number of occasions I have seen the bin men scrape my car to get bins through. |
| Victoria Rd | Most parking problems are due to the amount of tradesmen vans and skips on our road especially in the summer but is an issue all year round. They often double park causing and sometimes are excessively big for our road. Sometimes you can get up to 3 vans for one project and there can be multiple projects at any one time. They often use our bins to, off load their waste too. No CPZ is needed on Victoria Road. |
| Victoria Rd | Multi-occupancy results in more cars. EVCPs take up parking space |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Victoria Rd | NO CPZ in any part of the area. |
| Victoria Rd | No need for a CPZ. Things work pretty well as they are |
| Victoria Rd | No parking restrictions are required No CPZ is required |
| Victoria Rd | No requirement for any change. We already pay very high council tax, a paid parking scheme is unfair and also unnecessary due to the amount of space available. |
| Victoria Rd | Not all roads in this scheme need controls and these residents' objections obscure the real need on a smaller number of streets. A more refined proposal is more likely to get through otherwise to many it appears a 'money making operation'. It should not apply for example to the parade of shops on Alexandra Park Road or the immediate roads. |
| Victoria Rd | Parkign is no more difficult than it was prior to the charges being introduced at Ally Pally. No need for CPZ |
| Victoria Rd | Parkign is not a problem and CPZ is not needed. It would have an adverse effect on local businesses e.g the dental practice, as well as services, tradespeople, carers, CUFOS, the library, and school staff (who often live outside the area and need to drive in). |
| Victoria Rd | PLEASE give us an LTN too. The amount of morning and evening traffic running our road is crazy. |
| Victoria Rd | Please leave things as they are |
| Victoria Rd | Put in marked bays to promote better use of space |
| Victoria Rd | Road needs to be one way to stop the current congestion. Many commuters park nearby to use Alexandra Palace rail station. Yes to a CPZ. However I suggest splitting the CPZ into 2 distinct zones as your proposal makes it too large to meet localised needs |
| Victoria Rd | Sorry to say this but this questionnaire is really poor. There is no consideration for the cost of the scheme and how that affects people decision-making process. It's actually quite depressing that a questionnaire like this can be approved for use.. Questions 6,7, and 8 all assume you voted "yes" for question 4. Question 4 itself assumes an ideal world where cost isn't a factor - How can you answer this question without considering the cost? At the very least Question 4 should be "If you agree to the proposed CPZ charges, do you think your road needs parking controls?" I would declare this questionnaire null and void, as it does even clearly ask the central question. With ULEZ and tax banding for CO2 emissions, I think there are enough penalties for people using older cars (often those who can't afford newer ones). These people shouldn't be penalised based on their income by the council. I would propose a flat cost across all households of say £100 per car - and if this is not an option then I would have to object, even though I can afford the proposed costs myself I know people in the street who can't, and of course, they will object too. If you force the scheme onto them in this way you are pushing them further into poverty which is not something I am happy to support for the luxury of a parking space. I vote you scrap this consultation and start again fully considering all the factors. |
| Victoria Rd | Stop restricting parking areas. Encourage walking and use of public transport. |
| Victoria Rd | Teachers at Ally Pally school would need permits. |
| Victoria Rd | Thank you for actually holding a consultation. However I am perplexed that you would wish to implement such a scheme. Is it not just another cash cow measure? |
| Victoria Rd | The council has admitted that there have been no requests for this CPZ and are therefore attempting to foist an unwanted CPZ on the residents. This is profoundly undemocratic. It is the latest attempt to make life difficult for car owners, coming soon after the Bounds Green LTN decision which ignored the prevailing residents view. How can we believe that the council will listen to the residents in this consultation given that it appears to be hell bent on implementing a large CPZ in this area? There are and never have been parking pressures in this local area, so there is no logical basis for this proposed CPZ other than revenue raising. |
| Victoria Rd | The Council should consider giving staff members of Rhodes Avenue Primary School and Alexandra Park School who currently park on Victoria Road some kind of limited use parking entitlement. |
| Victoria Rd | The CPZ, if introduced, should include some permits for Alexandra Palace School and Rhodes Avenue School staff. |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Victoria Rd | The main problem is caused by overspill from nearby CPZ's and removal of those would solve all parking problems. |
| Victoria Rd | The road is not busy, never have a problem finding a parking spot |
| Victoria Rd | The way our road is right now is fine. Please do not introduce CPZ if your really take our surveys seriously. |
| Victoria Rd | There are no issues. We have not asked for a CPZ. We are fine with minor issues as never expect right to park in front of our house. This proposal will be damaging to the environment as people convert their front gardens for parking - this will be so sad as once paved over they will never return back to flowers and bushes. Why are you destroying our community? Is it for money? |
| Victoria Rd | There are no parking problems here and most parking is by residents. CPZs are very costly and there are many pensioners living here, who are on fixed incomes.. In teh current time of covid and growing financial stress, this is not the time to impose a CPZ. It would just be a money-raising exercise for the council. Please leave things alone. |
| Victoria Rd | There are schools in this area. A CPZ scheme would hinder teachers' ability to get to work and might affect the schools' ability to recruit talented staff. Bad idea! |
| Victoria Rd | There is always parking available - no need for CPZ. I do support speed restrictions. In terms of air pollution, a CPZ makes no difference to residents being able to park in their roads. It does however give revenue to Haringey council. If you want to make more money,, charge more for 2nd and additional permits. I am old and need my (ULEZ-friendly) car. I live alone and woudl buy parking tickets for my visitors. This seems the fairest way for Haringey to get more revenue |
| Victoria Rd | There is no need for a CPZ in the area proposed. I understand there is some problem parking for those residents immediately adjacent to existing CPZs - but this problem would be better solved by allowing any resident within (say) 50 or 100m of a CPZ to purchase parking within that CPZ than extending the CPZ across such a wide area. CPZ seems primarily a money making scheme for the council - evidenced by the desire to charge more for diesel cars - ULEZ already addresses this issue as it charges them when they are driven. That is not a fair proposal especially for those people who have bought newer diesel cars to be ULEZ compliant. Local school (APS) would struggle to retain teachers if CPZ introduced too as many drive to work. |
| Victoria Rd | There is no need for parking controls. This is agenda and money driven, parking pressures do not justify this. There's never been a problem parking in our road. This is an anti car, anti-resident proposal that will have major negative implications for residents and visitors. |
| Victoria Rd | This is a blatant money-grab on already stressed residents. If you need more income then I suggest you increase council tax for all. |
| Victoria Rd | This scheme would penalise those of us who regularly use public transport and do NOT own a car. On occasions when we do need to rent a car for family needs or travel we would not be able to park on our road. Also pay stations for temp parking will be an ugly blight on the neighbourhood. Finally our cherished teachers at APS will have to carry the cost of this and some will likely leave employment here. Please do not do this! |
| Victoria Rd | This would ruin the road with yellow lines, additional signposts, and constant parking patrols - so a definite no. |
| Victoria Rd | Traffic is the problem here - not parking. traffic from the North Circular clogs up APR and Durnsford roads esp at peak hours. A CPZ would do nothing to alleviate this |
| Victoria Rd | Very strongly against CPZ |
| Victoria Rd | We are we again being asked about this? It is becoming anti-democratic |
| Victoria Rd | We do NOT need a CPZ in Victoria Rd. I can park outside my house or close by. The road can be busy ant school pick-up times but it doesn't cause much of a problem for us |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Victoria Rd | We do not need controlled parking. In the surrounding cpz zones the spaces are empty during the controlled times, which is 12-2 pm. There is no issue with parking during the day, if the people in the cpz zones had to park in their zones then they would not be taking our spaces. Sometimes it is difficult to park if you come home after 8pm but cpz will have not effect on that. We don't need cpz, you are not doing it for the benefit of the residents but as a way of making money for the borough. So no thank you to cpz. This issue comes up every 3-4 years, we don't want it, stop bullying us, you can't just keep suggesting it until you get what you want. We've said no as an area repeatedly, no need to ask again. You are covering a much larger area this time and it's completely unnecessary. |
| Victoria Rd | We do not need parking restrictions in the area. I firmly reject this proposal. |
| Victoria Rd | We don't need a CPZ it would screw things up. |
| Victoria Rd | We don't own a vehicle but do regularly rent one. If the council wants to do something useful it should start by stopping further applications for driveways, as these remove on-street parking spaces |
| Victoria Rd | We don't need parkign controls in this area |
| Victoria Rd | We don't need paid parking |
| Victoria Rd | We manage perfectly well on Victoria Rd. Very occasionally it is difficult to park ie coming back late at night when everyone is home but a CPZ wouldn't affect this. There is absolutely no problem during the day at all. It would be a most costly (for residents) and unwelcome move. Also teachers from APS and Rhodes Avenue schools park locally and they would have nowhere to park. |
| Victoria Rd | We would also welcome additional traffic calming to reduce traffic volume and speeding |
| Victoria Rd | We've lived here for some years and the problem is mainly within 10 minute walk of Bounds Green and Alexandra Park stations, and shops in Muswell Hill Bdy. Most of the zone you have proposed doesn't need restrictions. |
| Victoria Rd | Where would workmen and teachers park? Instead of penalising drivers, Haringey should eb encouraging EVs by installing fast charging points |
| Victoria Rd | Whilst we don't support the CPZ scheme, parkign is a growing issue. We need investment in the transport infrastructure to encourage modal shift - esp for short journeys. More frequent hopper buses to Muswell Hill Bdy as well as tube and rail improvements would help discourage car use. Currently it's often easier to use a car. |
| Victoria Rd | Yes I really think teachers should get parking permit if the cpz goes through , |
| Wellfield Ave | |
| Wellfield Ave | A lot of the properties in the street have parking on their land. We have space for two vehicles off the road and, currently, space for a third vehicle on the road blocking entrance to our off street parking spaces. This is true for most of the houses in the road. This limits the extent of public street parking since such parking would block access to private off street parking in front of houses. We are not in favour of the controlled parking scheme. |
| Wellfield Ave | I would welcome the introduction of CPZ, as parking for residents has become a real issue, there are also some cars parked on the road (particularly Wellfield Avenue) that don't seem to ever move i.e. people take advantage of 'free' parking and either abandon their cars or have multiple cars, some of which are hardly used, causing issues for actual residents who then end up parking 2/3 even 4 roads away as a result! CPZ will be a real help, sooner rather than later please! Many thanks |
| Wellfield Ave | Just leave things as they are |
| Wellfield Ave | No changes are needed This is a politically-led scheme and it must be resisted. |
| Wellfield Ave | This is a deceitful proposal not intended to support residents but a cash grab by the council. We need vitality in the high street. Please don't strangle it. |
| Wellfield Ave | Worst thing for this road would be to have spaces taken up by EVCPs and pay-to-park bays as this would leave very few spaces for residents who live here |
| Wellfield Ave | Would like speed humps on our street |
| Winton Ave | |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Winton Ave | |
| Winton Ave | Doing this at the same time as LTNs is inadvisable. If it is part of a coordinated attempt to reduce traffic and pollution, it could be beneficial but would need improved public transport. Blake Rd and Tunnel Gdns are close to the tube station and should be included |
| Winton Ave | Drop off / laybys outside Rhode's avenue primary and chantry hall day nursery If parking restrictions come into force |
| Winton Ave | Happy with current parking and definitely do NOT want CPZ controls in Winton Avenue |
| Winton Ave | I stated that I don't feel parking is a problem for residents on Winton Avenue. If you were to create a smaller CPZ in adjoining streets then, yes, we might then have a problem. But you are proposing a much bigger CPZ which includes streets closer to Muswell Hill and the shops - residents there may well find it difficult to park at certain times. It seems more pertinent to concentrate on that area. I also don't feel your timing is very good - when this proposal comes hard on the heels of the LTN proposals. Most residents will probably object to a CPZ in this locality - especially as the annual fees are quite high and, once a CPZ has been installed, you can raise the fee every year (we have experienced this elsewhere in Haringey). We already pay a high council tax and I don't think we should be asked to pay an extra high fee to park on our road. |
| Winton Ave | I'm elderly and vulnerable. I need visits from doctors and family. I cannot afford the many VPs that I would need. I don't have a car. |
| Winton Ave | I'm strongly opposed to a CPZ here. It is unnecessary and just a stealth tax on innocent residents. Please listen to the views of residents which I know sure will be dead against this scheme. I hope you will not ignore our views and just go ahead regardless. I recommend you abandon this scheme |
| Winton Ave | Leave things as they are. we don't need a CPZ. This seems like a scheme to raise funds for the council. |
| Winton Ave | Never had problems parking, and I see no need for a CPZ |
| Winton Ave | No need for CPZ. You need to enable the allotment holders to park for free. This is a cynical money-making exercise by the council |
| Winton Ave | Parking in Winton Avenue is not a problem. No controls are necessary. |
| Winton Ave | Pay to park bays needed between Bidwell Gdns and 1 Winton Ave - if a CPZ is put in. DYL also needed either side of Bidwell / Winton tabletop |
| Wroxham Gdns | This is a cul de sac - no need for CPZ. I am elderly, housebound and I rely on CARERS as well as my family being able to visit me and provide shopping and help. I am very concerned about the hassle as cost of getting numerous visitor permits especially as I am reliant on a pension. I don't use a computer. PLEASE DON'T PUT A CPZ in her. as I wil become even more isolated. There are no parking problems (I used to drive) in this road |
| Wroxham Gdns | With the impending LTN for where I live this is another pressure point on car owners who are resident here. I would urge the council to take this into consideration with their deliberations. I would also like to put on record that the pressure to encourage public transport use, cycling, walking etc is now currently being undermined by a severe shortfall in TFL's budget (£1.6 billion). Threats to both tube and bus services will do nothing to support the initiatives to reduce car use. |
| Wroxham Gdns | Wroxham Gdns is effectively a cul-de-sac and several houses have drives. Please leave it as it is but consider putting in DYL in the section south of the junction with Bidwell Gdns |
| Outlying roads | Absolutely no need for CPZ. The road is used as a rat run, so some form of traffic calming would be useful |
| Outlying roads | Alexandra park school needs parking spaces for members of staff coming from afar |
| Outlying roads | Any CPZ MUST take into consideration the needs of key workers who commute into the area to allow teachers, medical professionals and support staff to continue to be able to park and provide vital services to the community. The aim should be to discourage parking near the tube station. |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Outlying roads | As a teacher at Alexandra Park school a CPZ would have a huge impact on the school community. Many staff members including myself rely on local street parking. I would no longer be able to teach at this school if I were not able to drive to work. I always manage to park without issue as so feel a CPZ is not required. |
| Outlying roads | Controlled Parking is not needed and not wanted in this area. A CPZ in this area would have a negative impact on the highly successful Alexandra Park School who employ 220 staff, 65% of which live more than 5 miles from the school. |
| Outlying roads | CPZ is not needed or wanted by local residents. |
| Outlying roads | Cpz schemes displace parking issues-they do not solve them, even for the residents. In particular, given the proximity of the streets to 2 schools, parking restrictions in the middle of the day would make it difficult for teachers who have to travel greater distances to get to work to remain in work. |
| Outlying roads | Do not bring this in. This affects the schools in the area. i would really object if the school lost valuable staff who cannot afford the house prices in the area to live locally but enjoying teaching in our schools which the resident children benefit from . Please look at the wider picture rather than just your monetary gain. |
| Outlying roads | do not need a cpz, there is plenty of space at all times to park. stop trying to make money |
| Outlying roads | I am against the cpz for Alexandra park - teachers would not be able to get to School and the School would go down in ranking for Lack to quality Teacher supply and affect the entire borough . We are very lucky to have such excellent schools in the area attracting a thriving community |
| Outlying roads | I am concerned as a parent of children at Alexandra Park School that the introduction of a CPZ in the area would have a detrimental impact on attracting and retaining the excellent teaching staff at the school, many of whom travel into the area each day. |
| Outlying roads | I don't wish to introduce parking restrictions so have not answered the questions regarding times/days etc as don't wish to support the idea |
| Outlying roads | I feel that the parking in the area is adequate for the residents. There is also ample parking available for staff at APS school around Albert rec park. And much needed for the staff. |
| Outlying roads | Introduction of CPZ will have an adverse impact to Alexandra Park School from a retention and recruitment of teachers |
| Outlying roads | Its going mad in this area and sorry to say you are sending unnecessary money on thin gs us locals don't want. You are making turn into a grid lock around our streets with all your new things putting in place. LEAVE US ALONE AND ALL WILL BE GOOD |
| Outlying roads | Leave restrictions as they are. Nearer to shops there are some parking restrictions and these are fine. I don't want any more CPZ in this area. |
| Outlying roads | NO CPZ - absolutely do not need it, just a money making scheme from the council. Totally oppose this. |
| Outlying roads | No more traffic/life disruption. We residents do not want disruptive, extortionate measures. Better management of existing tax revenue. Stop making our lives more difficult. |
| Outlying roads | Parking issues are not the major problem and would be an extreme overreaction. I don't see why I should be expected to park outside my house. I am a pensioner. By far the biggest concern is the speed of traffic from outside the area who use the road as a rat run. |
| Outlying roads | Please do not destroy the peaceful and lovely area of Muswell Hill with unnecessary parking restrictions. I am often around this area using the Alexandra Park /Cufos and can definitely say that there is always plenty of parking day or night. |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Outlying roads | Please don't extend it as far as our road, there really is no need at all and we don't want it. There are only 6 houses on our road and always plenty of spaces. I've spoken to our neighbours too, nobody wants it. We all want to enjoy a peaceful life without all sorts of awful signage and restrictions on our road. What can we do to stop this? Please let us keep this lovely Edwardian heritage road without parking controls. |
| Outlying roads | PLEASE LET TEACHERS AT ALEXANDRA PARK SCHOOL BE ALLOWED TO PARK THEIR CARS ON THE STREET AND NOT PART OF THIS SCHEME |
| Outlying roads | Recent pilots in Enfield show that these approaches of CPZ and LTN are not helping the neighbourhoods and generate more problems than solutions, both for car owners and pedestrians. How about a serious study instead of consultations that end up in childish responses of "response is negative, but we are moving forward because we know better" ? |
| Outlying roads | The CPZ will cause a significant impact on work in the area as I work at the local school. |
| Outlying roads | The latest CPZ proposal for Alexandra Park will only cause more problems for residents living in surrounding roads eg Grosvenor rd, Muswell Ave, Barnard hill. I don't think there is ever a problem parking on the roads that are included in this new CPZ so not sure why parking restrictions are needed. |
| Outlying roads | The schools need parking for teachers |
| Outlying roads | There is no need for a CPZ a designated space for loading bay for the retail section on Alexandra Park Parade would be wise for safer deliveries to the Alexandra park Road parade. Proposed Pricing for permits is too expensive for a small business who often relies on a car to park and deliver goods. Parking controls will damage the local community as will cause great problems for school staff and increase the difficulty for people to park for the local shops thus hitting the high street at already a very difficult time. |
| Outlying roads | There is no need for the proposed CPZ as there are no chronic parking problems in this area. We are too far from tube stations to have commuter parking issues. The most likely problem we will face on the edge of this zone is the charging pushing out people into roads where there is no charging - which will allow Haringey to propose even more permit parking. It is simply a money making scheme as there are no parking problems! |
| Outlying roads | This CPZ would have a detrimental impact on staff (and therefore on staffing) at Alexandra Park School. As a teacher at the school, I only occasionally drive to work but on occasion do have to because I am carrying boxes of books to mark which are not possible to carry on my bicycle. In addition, many of my colleagues live much further afield, do not have the luxury of walking or cycling and need the ability to park near the school. The school has only a tiny car park which does not remotely cover the numbers of staff who need to drive to work each day. Crucially, I do not see the need for a CPZ. On the occasions that I do drive to school, there is always parking available on Rhodes Avenue by the golf course. This is not near to a tube or rail station and there are no destination venues in the immediate vicinity. Providing parking for the staff of 2 outstanding state schools that serve the local area (I am considering the location of Rhodes Avenue next door also) seems more important than creating a CPZ in order that local households can have multiple cars. If the need for a CPZ is related to events at Alexandra Palace then perhaps the hours could be in keeping, ie evenings and weekends - or the equivalent of matchday controls around football stadiums. |
| Grasmere Rd | I am firmly against CPZ. We don't need it. It's already hard enough to park and there's a concern that this will impact staffing at the two local schools too. No one in this area wants this - I haven't heard a single vote in it's favour, whether people are in the proposed zone or just out of it. It makes no sense to any of us. |
| Grasmere Rd | I completely oppose a CPZ around here |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Grasmere Rd | I generally disagree that this area requires controlled parking - resident parking makes up the majority of the parking in this area and it does not suffer from commuter or retail customer parking for the most part. However if the CPZ were to go ahead I disagree with two aspects of the proposed zone. The first is that Rhodes Avenue is included in the zone - this road is used by teachers of the adjoining schools, both of which are rated outstanding by Ofsted and I am concerned that making it harder for them to travel to work will impact high quality staff retention. The second objection is that, if the CPZ is to be implemented in its entirety, it seems faintly ridiculous to exclude the Lakes Roads/Grosvenor road area. This is something of a closed off enclave anyway and excluding it from the CPZ will result in a marked increase in parking of cars looking to avoid the controls. |
| Grasmere Rd | If the CPZ is introduced it should include the lakes road which are currently excluded as there doesn't appear to be any sensible reason for these not to be included. Parking can be difficult and introducing a CPZ in neighbouring roads will create an unmanageable parking problem. |
| Grasmere Rd | One side of the street can be marked for herringbone parking. Paying for a parking permit is no guarantee that a space is available. |
| Grasmere Rd | The proposed CPZ will have a detrimental effect on teacher retention at our local schools and push extra parking onto roads such as ours. My suggestion for what would work better than the proposed CPZ is to leave things exactly as they are. |
| Grasmere Rd | The reality of CPZs is that they actually make it much more difficult for residents and visitors to park both within the CPZ and on the roads surrounding it. Much of the available parking space in our road is affected by the reasons given in Q9 and introducing a CPZ does not address these causes. Marked parking bays would reduce the amount of parking available overall, would bring about a massive detriment to the social amenity and character of the area and would adversely affect local businesses on Alexandra Park Road. A critical issue also for Alexandra Park West is that the local schools are not well served by tube or rail. It is clear that if a CPZ is introduced, the majority of Alexandra Park School staff would no longer be able to easily travel to work. As parents we have been advised by the school that 78% of staff would need to reconsider their position if they could not drive to work; whilst CPZ schemes sometimes include 'essential worker' permits, these do not cover all school workers and can become a significant bureaucratic obstacle for schools; and several of their key staff have been recruited from other schools where CPZ schemes have been introduced. Given the above issues it seems likely that introducing a CPZ would have a severe negative impact on the schools. There should be no parking controls whatsoever in this area. |
| Grasmere Rd | We are very concerned if you introduce a CPZ to Alexandra Park Road, Curzon Rd, Coniston Rd, Muswell Avenue and Rhodes Avenue, then our roads - Grasmere, Windermere and Thirlmere will BECOME a problem area which isn't the case at the moment. If you introduce a CPZ then all visitors to the parade of shops, the Maid of Muswell, the church, tennis club etc plus any visitors to the other roads will park for free in our roads to avoid paying. It will be just creating a problem that doesn't exist at the moment. This would be so unfair on just 3 roads on the edge of the CPZ. If you walk around the area you will see there is masses of parking on most roads around here, especially near the golf course on Rhodes avenue and near Ally Pally - neither should have restrictions - keep them free for teachers and people who want to enjoy the park and lake etc. It would be so unfair to push these people out just to raise money for the council. I would rather just pay more on our council tax than have these taxes by stealth. I imagine a few houses at the top of Dukes avenue sometimes find it hard to park their numerous cars, but they all have drives so should use those. They must have known buying houses near the Broadway, it would sometimes be busy. Don't make it easier for wealthy car owners to park and so squeeze out everyone else. One of the things we love about living in Muswell Hill is the absence of parking rules and restrictions on every road. we used to live in Islington and it was awful, making everyone angry and frustrated with wardens forever ticketing residents for tiny infringements. Please don't change this and change the nature of the place we love. |
| Grasmere Rd | We do not need a CPZ in this area |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Grasmere Rd | We feel the proposed scheme is too big and unnecessary on many of the side roads in this area There really isn't any need for a cpz here and it will be a big expense and inconvenience for residents who usually have no problem with parking. Just keep it to streets nearest centre of Muswell hill if you have to do it. |
| Thirlmere Rd | |
| Thirlmere Rd | As a resident within a neighbouring street of the proposed APW CPZ, we will suffer from increased traffic and parking from those seeking to avoid the CPZ restrictions and costs. I fail to understand the purpose or benefits of introducing the CPZ unless it's purely designed to raise money from already hard pressed residents. |
| Thirlmere Rd | I am totally against this scheme as Thirlmere Rd is outside the proposed CPZ and so would be greatly impacted by the overspill parking. There is also in my view no need for the CPZ in the roads that are proposed as there is sufficient parking. It will be problematic for the teachers at Rhodes Ave Primary and APS secondary schools and clientele of the local shops and Maid of Muswell pub. |
| Thirlmere Rd | I don't think the proposed CPZ is needed except maybe for streets very near Muswell Hill Broadway. But if it goes ahead then it is essential that Thirlmere Road and Windermere, Grasmere, the whole of Muswell Avenue and Grosvenor Road are included. Also we need to retain access to the EVCPs in The Avenue and Rosebery Rd as we have no others nearby to use. |
| Thirlmere Rd | I think this a loaded consultation based on the assumption that you will introduce parking and your questions are loaded to ask as if it is agreed It is biased and not appropriate questionnaire . You are as biased as a social media post and should be ashamed of your tactics. You are creating a problem where there has not been one. You tried this 20 years ago and it has not changed since then if anything it is easier. It is a shameful money making venture. |
| Thirlmere Rd | We do not a cpz. There isn't enough difficulty currently parking. But if you introduce a local CPZ and our road is outside it will make parking much more difficult and force more cars onto our road to park. It seems less about improving parking in the area and more about getting money |
| Thirlmere Rd | We do not need controlled parking in this area |
| Thirlmere Rd | Whilst parking here isn't perfect creating controlled zones will cause more problems. At the moment my road is not included and I fear we will suffer from overspill. We'd actually be creating a problem with this proposal. The local outstanding school (Alexandra park school) has highlighted recruitment problems and to keep that school running the staff need to park. I've lived in this area since 2007 and I've never felt the need for parking restrictions. It's a great area, easy to live in with a great community. I really can't see how this would benefit us at all. In fact I feel it would introduce problems that simply don't exist at this present moment. |
| Windermere Rd | I would like to object to the proposed Alexandra Palace West Possible CPZ. It is already difficult to park on my road and this will CPZ will push people to park on the adjacent roads like Windermere Road making it even harder to park. It will also make people less likely to visit Muswell Hill and negatively impact local businesses. |
| Windermere Rd | If the proposed Alexandra Palace West CPZ is introduced it would be devastating for the 5 roads north of Alexandra Park Road due to overspill parking. There would be nothing to stop residents in Rosebery Road for example parking in Thirlmere road to avoid the permit fee. Parking is already very difficult at certain times of day and I think it could become impossible for residents of the 5 excluded roads to find any appropriate parking. Therefore if the CPZ is introduced it needs to include those roads up to the boundary with Barnet. Goodwyns Vale and Barnard Hill may be 'protected' to some extent by the road barriers on Grosvenor road and Muswell Avenue. |
| Windermere Rd | It is absolutely crazy to implement a CPZ in our area. Our streets and local areas are used by teachers at both Rhodes Ave and Alexandra Park schools. If you implement a CPZ, they will be impacted. There are no problems of parking in our area and this feels like a money making exercise, and nothing more. |
| Windermere Rd | It is not clear what problem this proposal is meant to solve |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Windermere Rd | It is so difficult to find parking on the road at certain times of the day. Events at St Andrews church do not help and those who are elderly or with young children or disabilities, like myself are getting really fed up with being unable to park anywhere on the road because of vans and commercial vehicles parking during the day. I am really shocked to see the proposal to introduce a CPZ in neighbouring roads but not on Windermere road. If a CPZ is introduced but does not include Windermere road it will put a nail in the coffin for being able to park. I have one small car and it should be possible for me to park on the road on which I live. |
| Windermere Rd | My husband and I are totally against the proposal for a CPZ in Alexandra Park West. We believe this will have an adverse effect on the businesses in Alexandra Park Road. In addition, it will push cars onto adjoining roads, such as Windermere Road. We are already struggling for parking spaces, but this is because some households, by necessity, have more than one car, which obviously causes pressure when the space outside each house is less than the length of two cars. I think the proposals for an adjacent CPZ would be the wrong one for the residents of the streets concerned and the adjacent streets such as Windermere Road. |
| Windermere Rd | There is no need for a CPZ in Alexandra ward. Occasionally you cannot park outside your house but you can always park nearby. |
| Windermere Rd | There is no need for a CPZ in the Muswell Hill area |
| Windermere Rd | There is no need for CPZ in this area if Muswell Hill totally no need it is just a fund raising exercise you need to take a serious look at how you spend money today in other areas |
| Windermere Rd | We do not want CPZ |
| Windermere Rd | We oppose the current proposal because it would make the existing problem worse for Windermere Road by pushing drivers off surrounding roads and onto Windermere Road, Grasmere Road and Thirlmere Road. Parking in these roads is as problem in the evening and overnight when residents are at home. It is rarely a problem during the day but would become a problem if this proposal goes ahead. Chevron parking on one side of Windermere Road could help to ease the difficulty by allowing more cars to be parked. Windermere Road is wide enough to allow this if it were permitted. |
| Windermere Rd | Whilst my property is outside the proposed CPZ, we will inevitably be negatively impacted by the introduction of parking restrictions on the other side of Alexandra Park Road and Rhodes Avenue, and I can see no logical reason why Windermere Road and the other Lakes roads should be excluded if a CPZ is to be introduced. |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | I don't drive but would like to be allocated the permits for friends and family to visit |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | We all know this cpz is all about money. I feel we pay a lot of money already! I am right on a Broadway with no parking permit as I can't afford one. So for me parking in nearby roads (very few without cpz already) is essential. |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | We still don't need a CPZ, for all the reasons we listed when the council tried to introduce one c.15 years ago. If you need more money, just raise council tax for highest bands. |
| Muswell Hill Bdy | When/If CPZ will be introduced, the front gardens of the Victorian houses will highly likely be turned into car parks as the residents will avoid paying for parking permits. As Architects and local residents we think it will be a shame to see all gardens resulting in a loss of green space and biodiversity which has happened throughout from Dukes Avenue to Muswell Road. Additionally allowing front gardens to be altered to car parks will result in a loss of parking space for other residents as dropped kerbs will affectively privatise that section of the roadway. |
| Not stated | COZ not needed in Alexandra ward. |
| Not stated | Cpz will impact APS school staff driving to work. It is better for council to set up areas where parent can use for 10 mins to drop off kids rather than making a cpz |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Not stated | I rely on my car because there is no Tube. The added cost of parking permits is not wanted. Builders will continue to park illegally even if there was a CPZ. I've lived in other boroughs and CPZs did not stop parking problems. Surely this is just a way of Council making money, and it won't best serve residents at all |
| Not stated | I work at APS school and would find it difficult to do so if I can no longer park in the local area as I travel a distance to get to the school. |
| Not stated | I've never had problems parkign in any of the roads shown in your proposed CPZs |
| Not stated | it takes nerve or total lack of sense to seek further upsetting our local community after the 2 yrs we just had. Notably, APS and Rhodes primary s outstanding school status depends on there not being such a scheme implemented. |
| Not stated | It would greatly impact the staff at both schools in the area to a detrimental way |
| Not stated | Lansdowne Rd does NOT need a parking scheme. It will not improve anything |
| Not stated | Only problems are in the weekday evenings - which are not covered in your proposal. CPZ is completely unnecessary, and your proposal comes across as a revenue-raising venture. |
| Not stated | Stop just trying to make money out of residents! Since the ulez there are less cars in our road. |
| Not stated | The occasional passing place along Dukes Avenue & The Avenue, would assist with traffic flow during peak times. |

DDB Requests

- 15 Victoria Rd N22 7XA
- 195 Alexandra Park Rd N22 7BJ
- Albert Ivimey 79 Muswell Rd N10
- Alexandra Farrow 28 Muswell Ave N10 2EG
- Anthoulla Michael 32 Methuen Park N10
- Carol Hansen-Jones 253 APR N22 7BJ
- Christine Symeonides 98 Vallance Rd N22 7UG
- Diana Stuart 1 Grove Ave N10 2AS
- Fidel Yaleenhaga 10 Clyde Rd N22 7AE
- Frances Crowe 20 Elgin Road Wood Green N22 7UE
- Gerard Hawthorn 3 Elms Avenue N10 2JN
- Have garage but cars park outside. Mother has blue badge
- I have one already, but I need carers as well, so where would they park?
- I wrote to Ann Cunningham about this on 18/09/21 and on 24/10/21 but have not received a reply
- Judith M McGirr 24 Outram Road N22 7AF. I will apply online for a general DB
- M A Kennedy 4 Lansdowne Rd , Muswell Hill, London N10 2AY
- Mr Costakis Constantinou 3 Cecil rd N10 2BU
- My wife is disabled and I'm her carer. She has a blue badge. Sylva Simsova, 18 Muswell Ave N10
- Onur John Ozkul 149a Alexandra Park Rd N22
- Sandra Ann Henshaw 90 Coniston Rd Muswell Hill N10
- There are 2 DBs here - one of which is no longer used. Council needs to update its information
- Ulrika Preuss 1 Crescent Rise N22 7AW
- What a badly-worded question
- You need to ensure that DBs are used by genuine blue badge holders
- Amanda Lall-Chopra Flat 1 No 2 Donovan Ave N102JX
- Ann Sexsmith, 67 Dukes Avenue, London N10 2PY
- Disabled dedicated parking bay is discriminatory, anyone disabled should be allowed to use it.
- Martin Burstyn 111 Rosebery Road London N10 2LD
- Mr Paul Kenny, 13 Albert Close, N22 7AL
- My son is disabled, and I am in the process of applying