

Report for: Head of Highways and Parking following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality

Title: Hornsey North East Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Extension - Statutory Consultation

Report authorised by: Simi Shah Group Manager, Traffic and Parking Projects

Report Author/s: Matthew Davies - Parking Policy and Projects Manager

Ward(s) affected: Hornsey

Report for Key/ Non-Key Decision: Non-Key decision

1 Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1. This report sets out the outcome of the statutory consultation carried out between 10 December 2025 and 9 January 2026, on the introduction of new controlled parking measures in the Hornsey area, as set out in Appendix 1 and noted as Hornsey North East Controlled Parking Zone (HNE) Extension. All properties in the following roads were consulted: Hawthorn Road, North View Road and South View Road.
- 1.2. Following consultation, this report recommends implementing the proposals outlined in Section 3 of this report.

2 Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1. N/A

3 Recommendations

- 3.1. That the Head of Highways and Parking, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality:
- 3.2. Considers the objections and representations received during the statutory consultation alongside officer's responses to those objections as set out in Tables 1 to 3 in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of this report, context provided in the resident engagement decision report approved 1st December 2025.
- 3.3. Approves the extension of the Hornsey North East CPZ area be implemented with the operating hours of 10am–2pm Monday to Friday on Hawthorn Road, North View Road and South View Road.

4 Reasons for decisions

- 4.1. Statutory consultation forms part of the legal process set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984) and the **Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ("LATOR")** for controlling vehicular movements by introducing measures such as parking places and waiting and loading restrictions. It is not a referendum on proposed parking measures, or a repeat of the public engagement exercise, but provides the opportunity for any interested party to formally object to proposals. The Council is required under legislation to consider all objections to proposals before deciding whether to proceed to implement measures.

- 4.2. The decision does not result in a contract being awarded or expenditure in excess of £500,000 being incurred nor any virements, so it is not a key decision for that reason.
- 4.3. The decision will impact only one ward and, in particular, it will not result in substantial public interest/significant social, economic or environmental risk and so is not a key decision for this reason.

5 Alternative options considered.

- 5.1. An alternative is to not extend the Hornsey North East CPZ to include the above-named roads. This is not recommended as there is a clear need for parking controls in this area, and this is supported by a majority of residents who responded to the public engagement undertaken in May/June 2025. **This decision aligns with Haringey's CPZ policy.**
- 5.2. Another alternative is not to include North View Road in the CPZ extension as residents of this road objected with a 55% majority in the public engagement and the council received 30 objections (18 objections and 12 partial objections) from North View Road as part of the statutory consultation. All 12 of the partial objections objected to the 4hr CPZ and requested 2hr or 1hr operating times. This option has been discussed with ward councillors and the view is that this option will create even more issues for the residents of North View Road by increasing the parking stress on their road.

6 Background Information

- 6.1. A public engagement exercise commenced on 20th May 2025 on the extension of the existing Hornsey North East CPZ. This provided residents, businesses of the proposed CPZ area and surrounding community, 21 days to provide their feedback via online submission, email or post. The public engagement concluded on 10th June 2025, however, to accommodate any postal delays, feedback received up to 5 working days later was considered.
- 6.2. Analysis of the public engagement resulted in the council receiving 366 responses, from 668 registered properties; this represents a 55% response rate which far exceeds the **councils' parking policy minimum response rate of 10% required to form a decision.**
- 6.3. Of those who responded, the majority, 227 respondents (62%) indicated support for extending the Hornsey North East CPZ. This exceeded the 51% response rate set out in the Parking Schemes Resident Engagement Policy.
- 6.4. However, looking at the results street-by-street, highlighted a slightly divergent viewpoint. South View Road and Hawthorn Road showed significant support for CPZ controls at 78% and 80% respectively but there was 55% opposition from North View Road. The council received 11 responses from Hornsey High Street with 82% opposition to them moving from Hornsey South CPZ to Hornsey North East CPZ so the recommendation was not to proceed to statutory consultation for this proposal.
- 6.5. Based on that public engagement exercise, approval was granted under delegated authority on 1 December 2025 to proceed to statutory consultation on the introduction of parking controls in the following roads: Hawthorn Road, North View Road and South View Road by extending the Hornsey North East CPZ.

7 Statutory Consultation

- 7.1. Statutory consultation is not a referendum on proposed parking measures, or a repeat of the public engagement exercise, but provides the opportunity for any interested party to formally object to proposals.
- 7.2. Statutory consultation commenced on 10th December 2025 for a period of 21 days. The process legally required the publication of a notice of proposal in the London Gazette,

Enfield, and Haringey Independent and the notice was erected on lamp columns in the affected streets. The closing date for objections and comments was 9th January 2026. Letters detailing the results of the public engagement and decision along with information specific to the statutory consultation, including costs of permits, which roads would be controlled and how to respond, were hand-delivered to every property within the proposal area. A copy of the letter was loaded to the **Council's** website to ensure access by all interested parties. Copies of the statutory notification letter and plan detailing the extent of the proposed area is available in **Appendix 2**.

7.3. In line with approved procedures, the proposal was also loaded into the Council's traffic management order (TMO) portal-Appyway. This enables anyone to inspect the proposals from any digital device. Submissions and objections could be made directly through the portal. In accordance with legislation, residents or stakeholders were also able to inspect TMO plans at the Council's reception and provide objections via email or by writing to the Council.

7.4. See **Appendix 3** for a copy of the statutory 'notice of proposal' advertised. As part of the statutory process, the views of the following statutory bodies were also sought, some as required by the LATOR:

- AA
- London Transport
- Police (local)
- Fire Brigade
- London Ambulance Service
- Freight Transport Association
- Road Haulage Association
- RAC
- Metropolitan Police (traffic)
- London Travel Watch
- Haringey Cycling Campaign

7.5. The council received 78 responses to the statutory consultation which is shown in Table 1 below. Please note that 2 neutral responses from North View residents haven't been included in Table 1:

Table 1

Road	STATUTORY CONSULTATION - with percentages adjusted to reflect each road opinion							
	Support CPZ		Partly Support CPZ		Object to CPZ		Partly Object to CPZ	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Hawthorn Road	8	80%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%
South View Road	1	8%	3	23%	7	54%	2	15%
North View Road	7	15%	8	17%	18	38%	12	26%
Other local roads	0	0%	1	13%	7	87%	0	0%
Overall	16	20.5%	12	15%	32	41%	16	20.5%

Table 2 – Summary of comments provided during statutory consultation

Option chosen during Statutory Consultation	Brief summary of comments received
Support CPZ	One resident is relieved that North View Road will be included in the proposed CPZ. If it was not parking would become impossible. Hours need to align with neighbouring roads in Hornsey North East CPZ. Hawthorn Road residents have become aware that some North View Road residents may be seeking shorter hours and wish to note that they would prefer the current proposed hours to remain unchanged.
Partly Support CPZ	9 of the 12 (6 from North View Road and 3 from South View Road) responses who partly supported the proposal because they wanted reduced hours operation (2 hours only). 2 from North View Road wanted extended hours 8am-6pm
Object to CPZ	The Council is ignoring the results of the preliminary engagement by forcing the CPZ on North View Road which should respect their views and not assume parking pressures will worsen if they are omitted. Residents weren't made aware of the costs of parking. Council has caused the parking issues by introducing parking controls on neighbouring roads. One South View Road resident wants us to remove Nightingale Lane as residents from this road park on the roads with no controls to save buying a permit. The objections from other local roads are roads to the west of the proposed CPZ extension and feel that it will create more issues for their roads by pushing more drivers to park for free on their street.
Partly Object to CPZ	All 16 responses who partly objected did so because they wanted reduced hours of operation (either 2 or 1 hour). 12 of these were from North View Road.

7.6. Table 3 summarises the themes of comments/issues raised by residents during the statutory consultation and contains the officer response to these comment themes. A spreadsheet containing full details of the comments can be found in Appendix 4.

Table 3

Issue Raised	Officer Response and Assessment
<p>Consultation Outcome Not Being Respected</p> <p>A significant proportion of respondents expressed concern that the proposal is proceeding despite streets—particularly North View Road—recording a small majority opposition during the public engagement. Objectors argue that repeated consultations over time and progression contrary to local voting outcomes undermine confidence in the</p>	<p>Officers acknowledge the strength of feeling expressed by some residents regarding local voting outcomes. However, consultation exercises are designed to inform decision-making rather than determine outcomes in isolation. While street-level results are a relevant consideration, decisions must also take into account wider network impacts, displacement effects from existing CPZs, road safety considerations,</p>

<p>consultation process. Some respondents also question the accuracy, transparency, and presentation of consultation results.</p>	<p>and consistency with borough-wide parking policy. Officers are satisfied that the consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Council's adopted engagement framework and that all representations have been properly recorded and considered.</p>
<p>Perception of Limited Daytime Parking Need Many respondents state that daytime parking on the affected roads is generally manageable and does not justify the introduction of controls. Respondents frequently report that parking pressure is more acute in the evenings and overnight, periods not addressed by the proposed hours of operation. Several residents note continued parking availability during weekdays, weekends, and during major events at Alexandra Palace.</p>	<p>Officers acknowledge that some residents consider daytime parking to be generally manageable and view evening or overnight pressures as more significant; however, the proposal to extend the Hornsey North East CPZ has primarily arisen from sustained resident pressure, particularly from streets where households have repeatedly requested daytime controls to address displacement from neighbouring zones and to achieve consistency with surrounding controlled areas. While not all residents experience the same levels of daytime impact, the Council must balance these differing experiences with the clear and ongoing demand from those who have actively sought inclusion in the CPZ and whose concerns align with the strategic purpose of daytime parking management.</p>
<p>Parking Pressure Attributed to Existing CPZs Multiple respondents argue that parking stress is a knock-on effect of prior CPZ implementations (e.g., Beechwood Road, Rectory Gardens, Nightingale Lane, Hornsey North/East phases), which displaced vehicles into their streets. Several state pressures did not exist or was manageable until the CPZ was introduced and pushed drivers into North View, South View and Hawthorn Road.</p>	<p>Displacement from existing CPZs is a recognised and anticipated consequence of incremental parking controls. Leaving individual streets unmanaged can exacerbate displacement and create inequities between neighbouring roads. The proposed extension seeks to manage parking more coherently and consistently, rather than perpetuating unmanaged pockets of free parking.</p>
<p>Financial Impact and Affordability A consistent theme is concern regarding the additional financial burden introduced by resident and visitor permits. Respondents highlight affordability challenges, particularly in the context of the current cost of living pressures. Specific concern is raised regarding graduated permit charges, with some residents indicating they were unaware of emissions based pricing at the non statutory consultation stage.</p>	<p>Officers acknowledge concerns regarding the affordability of permits, particularly in the context of wider cost-of-living pressures. Permit charges are set in accordance with the Council's agreed parking permit framework and apply consistently across the borough. Concessions and exemptions—such as for Blue Badge holders and eligible residents—remain available. Managing demand for limited kerbside space necessarily involves regulation and pricing, and current charges are</p>

	consistent with those applied across other CPZs in the borough.
<p>Impact on Visitors, Carers, and Tradespeople</p> <p>Numerous objections reference the potential adverse impact of permit controls on daytime access for visitors, carers, childcare arrangements, tradespeople, and clients. Respondents state that restrictions and visitor permit costs could disrupt family life, caring responsibilities, and home-based businesses, particularly for residents who do not own vehicles but rely on occasional access for others.</p>	Officers recognise that CPZs introduce additional requirements for visitor parking. However, provision exists through visitor permits and short-stay parking arrangements. Comparable schemes operate successfully across the borough, including in areas with high levels of care provision. Officers consider the proposed arrangements to strike a reasonable balance between controlling non-resident parking and maintaining access for legitimate visitors and service providers.
<p>Perception of Revenue Led Decision Making</p> <p>A number of respondents express the view that the CPZ extension is motivated primarily by income generation rather than by a demonstrable parking management need. This perception is frequently linked to permit charging structures, length of restriction, and the progression of the scheme despite local opposition.</p>	Officers note residents' perceptions but emphasise that CPZs are implemented as traffic management measures under relevant legislation. Any surplus income generated through parking operations is legally ring-fenced for transport-related purposes, including highways improvements, road safety, and sustainable transport initiatives. Revenue generation is not a determining factor in decisions regarding CPZ implementation.
<p>Objections to Proposed Hours of Operation (4 hours)</p> <p>Strong representation is made against the proposed four-hour daily restriction. Respondents argue that shorter controls (one or two hours) would be sufficient to deter long-stay non-resident parking while reducing impacts on residents and visitors. Comparisons are frequently drawn with neighbouring streets operating shorter control periods.</p>	Officers acknowledge the representations requesting shorter operating hours of one or two hours; however, the proposal relates specifically to an extension of the existing Hornsey North East CPZ, which already operates with a four hour control period. As this is not a new standalone CPZ but an expansion of an established scheme, there is no option to introduce alternative operating times without creating a separate CPZ. Doing so would require a full new public engagement process, would delay implementation significantly, and would create operational inconsistency and enforcement complications within what is intended to function as a single, coherent parking zone. For these reasons, and to ensure parity with the existing HNE CPZ area, the extension must retain the same four-hour operating period.
<p>Loss of Parking Capacity and Scheme Design</p>	Officers acknowledge that formalising parking through bay marking and enforcement can reduce informal parking

<p>Objections are raised regarding the perceived loss of parking capacity associated with CPZ design, including the marking of bays, restrictions at crossovers, and removal of informal parking areas (e.g. cul-de-sacs).</p>	<p>capacity. Nevertheless, CPZ layouts must comply with highway safety standards, protect junction visibility, maintain driveway access, and ensure unobstructed access for emergency vehicles. Any reduction in informal capacity is necessary to deliver safe, clear, and enforceable parking arrangements.</p>
<p>Permit Parking Area as an alternative</p> <p>Some respondents advocate consideration of a Parking Permit Area (PPA) as a less restrictive alternative.</p>	<p>Alternative options, including Parking Permit Areas, have been assessed. Based on street layout, parking demand, and proximity to existing controlled zones, officers consider a conventional CPZ to be the most appropriate and effective solution. PPAs are typically more suitable for streets with different physical characteristics and demand patterns.</p>
<p>Displacement to Adjacent Streets Outside the Consultation Area</p> <p>Many respondents outside of the proposed HNE CPZ extension area highlight the risk that extending the CPZ will displace parking into neighbouring streets outside the proposed zone, exacerbating parking pressure elsewhere. Some residents request wider area consideration or additional consultation with adjacent roads likely to experience increased demand as a result of the proposal.</p>	<p>Officers recognise concerns about potential displacement to nearby streets not included within the scheme. The residents concerned with parking displacement were consulted in the original Hornsey North CPZ public engagement in 2021 but didn't want to be included in a CPZ. The consultation area was determined using previous consultation feedback and existing CPZ boundaries. Parking conditions in neighbouring streets will continue to be monitored, and further engagement may be undertaken if sustained displacement or parking stress is observed.</p>
<p>Equity and Special Circumstances</p> <p>Several respondents question the overall fairness of the scheme, citing variations in household circumstances, including multi-car households, flats without alternative parking options, and residents with mobility or health needs. Suggestions include free or discounted permits, different charging structures, and specific exemptions.</p>	<p>The Council's parking permit policy aims to balance equity, consistency, and administrative simplicity. While individual circumstances vary, a consistent borough-wide framework ensures fairness for all residents. Statutory and policy-based concessions - such as those for disabled residents - remain available where appropriate.</p>
<p>Accuracy and Transparency of Consultation Data</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about the accuracy and transparency of consultation data. Several felt that support for general parking controls was conflated with CPZ support, and that key information—such as permit costs and emissions-based charges—was not clearly disclosed, undermining trust in the process.</p>	<p>Officers confirm that all responses received during the public engagement and statutory consultation period have been logged, analysed, and reported in line with established Council procedures. The consultation figures reflect validated responses submitted within the timeframe, and officers are satisfied that the results provide a robust basis for decision-making. A link to the Haringey web page detailing parking permit costs was included on the statutory consultation</p>

	letter. In future, this will also be included on the public engagement materials.
--	---

- 7.7. The Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) records over 300 registered properties on North View Road. The 30 objections received from this road during the statutory consultation (including partial objections) represent approximately 10% of households expressing opposition to the proposed Hornsey North East CPZ extension.
- 7.8. Having carefully considered the objections submitted during the statutory consultation, and following discussions with Hornsey ward councillors, the recommendation is to proceed with the implementation of the Hornsey North East CPZ extension. Officers recommend that no amendments are required to the proposed boundary or the operational hours of the new parking controls for the reasons set out below.
- 7.9. While 41% of respondents objected to the proposed CPZ extension, officers consider that the statutory consultation feedback, when assessed alongside the earlier public engagement findings and the responses set out in Tables 1–3, provides a justification for implementation. Many of the objections relate to operational preferences—particularly the desired length of control hours - rather than opposition to the principle of parking management. Officers have reviewed these concerns in detail and do not consider them sufficient to outweigh the established need for consistent controls across the area or the risk of continued unmanaged displacement should the scheme not proceed. When balanced against the wider transport, access, and amenity considerations summarised in Section 8, officers conclude that the extension represents a proportionate and necessary measure to manage parking demand effectively and maintain fair access for residents.
- 7.10. The Council considers that excluding North View Road from the proposed CPZ extension would create significant unintended consequences for residents. If the road remains outside the zone, it would become the only street in the surrounding area offering unrestricted, free parking, drawing displaced vehicles from neighbouring roads where new controls are being introduced. This would increase parking saturation, reduce visibility, slow traffic flow, and lead to more vehicle circling, adding to congestion and affecting road safety. Although 55% of North View Road respondents opposed inclusion during public engagement—and 30 objections were received during statutory consultation, including 12 partial objections requesting shorter operating hours - officers note that ward councillors have expressed the view that leaving the road uncontrolled would exacerbate rather than alleviate local parking stress.
- 7.11. In considering whether to extend the Hornsey North East CPZ, the Council must also have regard to its duties under Section 122 of the RTRA 1984, which requires it to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic and provide suitable and adequate parking facilities having regard to securing and maintaining access to premises, preserving or improving the amenities of the areas, national air quality, facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and safety and convenience of people using such vehicles as far as practicable.
- 7.12. Officers consider that the extension of the CPZ will maintain reasonable access to premises by reducing parking congestion and ensuring residents can park near their homes. It will preserve and improve the amenities of the locality by addressing complaints about unrestricted parking by non-residents. Officers have also considered other relevant matters including the need to prevent displacement parking that would otherwise create undue pressure on adjacent streets.
- 7.13. More specifically, excluding North View Road would risk undermining the duty by concentrating parking pressure on a single uncontrolled street, worsening congestion and diminishing residential amenity. For these reasons, the Council believes that not including North View Road in the CPZ extension would ultimately worsen parking conditions for residents.

- 7.14. Section 45 of the RTRA 1984 gives the Council specific power to introduce CPZs with permits. As set out in section 45(3), in applying this power it is necessary to have regard (amongst other factors) to:
- (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic;
 - (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises; and
 - (c) the extent to which off-street parking accommodation, whether in the open or under cover, is available in the neighbourhood or the provision of such parking accommodation is likely to be encouraged there by the designation of parking places under this section.
- 7.15. The extension will assist in maintaining the free movement of traffic by reducing congestion caused by vehicles circulating to find unrestricted parking. It will also maintain reasonable access to premises by ensuring residents of Hawthorn Road, North View Road and South View Road can park close to their homes rather than being displaced by commuter or long-stay parking. Officers have also considered the extent of on-street and off-street parking availability in the area and consider that the extension of the CPZ is necessary to manage **demand and prioritise residents' parking needs.**
- 7.16. Officers consider overall that the extension of the Hornsey North East CPZ achieves a proportionate balance of the factors in sections 45(3) and 122 of the RTRA 1984.
- 7.17. The extension of the Hornsey North East CPZ does not trigger the requirement for a public inquiry pursuant to regulation 9 of LATOR, although the Council has the discretion to hold a public inquiry if it considers it necessary. For the reasons set out above, officers do not **consider it necessary to exercise the Council's discretion under Regulation 9 of LATOR to hold a public inquiry.**

8 Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 8.1. Parking supports Corporate Delivery Plan Theme 2: Responding to the climate emergency. Those measures will prioritise parking for residents, improve road safety, and enable improved kerbside space management whilst promoting sustainable forms of transport.
- 8.2. Controlled parking zones align with the Council's agreed Transport Strategy and support its objectives which include:
- Improved air quality and a reduction in carbon emissions from transport and
 - A well-maintained road network that is less congested and safer.

9 Carbon and Climate Change

- 9.1. Parking controls contribute positively to carbon emission reduction and mitigate climate change in the following ways:
- 9.2. **Reduced vehicle emissions** - managed parking reduces congestion. Parking controls including controlled parking zones will help ease congestion, leading to a decrease in emissions and therefore decrease in carbon footprint.
- 9.3. **Modal change:** Managed parking arrangements can also support modal change. When motorised access is restricted, motorists may choose alternative transportation modes, reducing the number of vehicles on the road and associated emissions. Over time, this can lead to a shift in commuting habits with lasting environmental benefits.

10 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

- 10.1. This report seeks Cabinet approval for the implementation of the Hornsey North East Controlled Parking Zone extension.

- 10.2. The full cost of this scheme is estimated to be £24k, including community engagement, design and implementation. This will be funded from the Council's approved Capital Programme as approved within the 2025/2026 Parking Investment Plan.
- 10.3. Once implemented, future operational costs will be funded from the existing service revenue budgets.

11 Comments of the Director of Legal Services and Governance

- 11.1 The Head of Highways and Parking is asked to approve the recommendations in paragraph 3 of this report and consider the representations received following statutory consultation and officer responses to those representations, and decide whether to approve the extension of the Hornsey North East CPZ to include Hawthorn Road, North View Road and South View Road.
- 11.2 **The Head of Highways and Parking is authorised to make this decision under the Council's Constitution (Part 3, Section E) as delegated to them within the Director of Environment & Resident Experience's Scheme of Authorisation dated October 2024.**
- 11.3 **The Council's powers in relation to the making of TMOs** for the purposes of a CPZ mainly fall under sections 6, 45, 46, and 124 and Schedule 1 of the RTRA 1984. Officers have **considered the Council's statutory duties pursuant** sections 45 and 122 of the RTRA 1984 in paragraphs 7.11 and 7.16 above before recommending that the TMOs be made to extend Hornsey North East CPZ.
- 11.4 Before deciding whether to implement the proposals in this report, the Council must undertake consultation in accordance with the LATOR. Officers have carried out statutory consultation as set out in paragraph 7 of this report. The Head of Highways and Parking must take into account the consultation responses before deciding whether to implement the measures and make the necessary TMOs.

12 Equalities Comments

- 12.1. The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 12.2. The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.
- 12.3. Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.
- 12.4. This report relates to the statutory consultation carried out between 10th December 2025 and 9th January 2026, on the introduction of new controlled parking measures in the Hornsey area.
- 12.5. There is a small negative impact for elderly residents as they will be required to purchase visitor permit for family, friends and tradesmen during the hours of operation. Although there is a small impact on elderly residents as a result of the introduction of the controlled hours managed parking from 10am to 2pm, the benefits of being able to buy visitors

permits at concessionary prices and utilising the permits on offer as well as expected easing in parking pressure will go a long way to address and mitigate any potential negative impacts.

- 12.6. Carers of vulnerable groups may be impacted but there are permits available to them to mitigate these proposals. Carers in the community have access to two permit types that enable them to undertake visits to fulfil their required service. The first one is an essential service permit (ESP) which allows those people providing public personal services to residents to park in a residential or shared use bay within a controlled parking zone. The ESP scheme supports local authority services, NHS health professionals, charities and not-for-profit organisations who provide healthcare, counselling or social care to Haringey residents. The second permit type is a carer's permit which is provided to cater for the needs of those caring for residents in their own home. Residents who live in a controlled parking zone can apply for a carer's permit if their medical practitioner, nurse or social worker has completed and signed the declaration in the application form. Nannies and care providers for young children are also eligible for carers permits; the cost of this permit is dependent on the emission level of the vehicle being used in the application.

13 Use of Appendices

- 13.1. Appendix 1 – Plan showing proposed controlled parking zone extension in the Hornsey North East area
- 13.2. Appendix 2 - Statutory notification letters delivered to affected frontages
- 13.3. Appendix 3 – Notice of Proposal

14 Background Papers

- Public Engagement Delegated Authority Report - [Decision details on public web site](#)
- Parking Schemes – Resident Engagement Policy April 2023.

-