

APPENDIX C – Detailed Responses to Consultation

Objections received: 8

Neutral: 1

Partly Support: 1

Ref	Type	Respondent Comments	Officer Response
1	Object	I understand the need to keep pedestrians safe however I don't believe there is an issue here that needs to be fixed. I do not support the removal of a vital residents parking space on this road. We have a major parking issue on this street because a nearby mechanic (Palace Motors based on Park Road) parks their cars (up to 10-15 cars) on our street. They then move the cars between the restricted hours of 10am-12pm (to a street that has restrictions 2pm-4pm) and then back again after 12pm. Therefore our resident spaces are hugely limited and 90% of the time we have to park far up on Barrington Road. We have a young child and due another baby very soon so this does cause us issues whenever we drive the car. Therefore I strongly oppose this proposal which will be making this problem even worse.	The Council notes the objector's concerns about parking pressures and the reported misuse of residential bays by a nearby business. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) is required to improve visibility, pedestrian safety and cycle access at this location. Although the objector believes no safety issue exists, the Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide adequate sightlines or suitable cycle accessibility. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The issue regarding the use of residential bays by a nearby business has been noted, however it falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the reallocation of one disabled parking bay,

			maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
2	Object	I fail to understand the benefit to those living locally, particularly those with accessibility needs and a desire to make the pathway a better shared space. The proposals do none of this. pulling the kerb out (but putting in place a kerb where now it drops) cannot be considered a option for those with walking impairments or accessibility issues (for example those in wheelchairs) as they will need to navigate the kerb on this side of Palace Road and the other. If that was the aim simply remove the parking from there end of the pathway? Although that doesn't fix the other side (although a bit further along the kerb is dropped for a driveway). Plus only yesterday I observed a local with two walking sticks find a gap in the parked cars sufficient to Palace Road. We have the ground floor flat at the end of the terrace so we have a good view of the path and Palace Road. I have seen similar people crossing and there is a big gap there right now. If the objective is to hinder cyclists with a kerb, that will not work. Many cyclists I have observed are already on the path on Palace Road, using one of the drop kerbs so they will just use that - such diversion would be more of a hindrance to those walking on the pavement along Palace Road as cyclists will be occupying the pathway more frequently. The idea of a shared space and additional signage to remind cyclists to take care will, in my personal opinion and experience, make no difference. I have been struck several times by cyclists, usually coming from the Lynton Road direction too fast and turn the corner by the garages with no clear line of sight. Thankfully I was OK on each occasion but other, particularly those with difficulty walking or perhaps residents in the homes at that end of the pathway, will perhaps not fair so well. I would welcome another set of asymmetric parallel barriers at that end as well along with signs asking cyclists to dismount as well to try and manage this shared space. However I am sure there are those who cycle who will complain about that. I support the controlled zone and managing parking. However we struggle at the moment and reductions through additional kerb drops and restrictions for the emergency gate has reduced the parking availability further. We often now leave our car in Barrington Road or further away from our property due to space. This will only make things worse for no clear upside (as far as I can see). Plus any works will by their nature take spaces away. With the view we have over Palace Road and from the corner and going it is clear that a good number of the vehicles on Palace Road at any one time are from Palace Motors, on Park Road. They come and move them for the controlled times and then return. Whilst I am happy they	The Council acknowledges these comments and clarifies that the proposed build-out includes a dropped kerb with tactile paving to ensure full accessibility for all users, including those with walking impairments or wheelchair users. This build-out would create a safer, dedicated entrance for cyclists and pedestrians into the shared path between Nos. 35 and 37. Furthermore, it would improve visibility and sightlines, making it easier for pedestrians to see oncoming traffic and cross Palace Road safely. The issue regarding the use of residential bays by a nearby business has been noted, however it falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering

		are doign well that they dont have enough forecourt space, it should not come at a disadvantage to residents. Finally it is unclear as to the disruption to those at 35 and particularly us at 37 with regards access to our properties with work on the pavement and the gully / drain relocation. That cannot be of any significance - we need to come and go from our property when we need to. As I said at the top - none of the proposals seem to address accessibility or the use of the pathway as a shared space.	necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence. The Council assures residents that during the implementation phase, access to properties would be maintained at all times. Any works will be managed by the contractor to minimise disruption to the immediate area.
3	Object	We as a residential street cannot afford the loose any more park spaces - parking is difficult for residents as the street is used by local Crouch End businesses and the public to park so limited space is available for the actual palace road residents	The Council notes the objector's concerns regarding parking pressures and the reported misuse of residential bays by a nearby business. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) is required to improve visibility, pedestrian safety and cycle access at this location. The Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide adequate sightlines or suitable cycle accessibility. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The issue regarding the use of residential bays by a nearby business has been noted, however it falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced.

			The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
4	Object	"My objections are as follows; -The current access point has no issues and doesn't need improvements. - By making it easier for bikes and electric bikes to go through at speed you are increasing the risk of crime. We have multiple muggings around the park and this will aid their getaway. -It also will make this section of pavement increasingly dangerous for small children, older people, and women with buggies as they have no need to decrease their speed as they cross the pavement. - You will remove two essential parking spaces from an overly busy road due to the local garage parking their cars down the road. Haringey seem quite happy to take our £250 and not offer any parking availability. They still haven't removed the redundant 'permit number only' disabled parking bay from outside my house. The permit holder died over a year ago. - The pavements and road on our street are full of holes wouldn't that be a better use of funds. "	The Council notes the objector's concerns regarding parking pressures and the reported misuse of residential bays by a nearby business. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) is required to improve visibility, pedestrian safety and cycle access at this location. Although the objector believes no safety issue exists, the Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide adequate sightlines or suitable cycle accessibility. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. It should be noted that the existing chicane barriers on the shared use path between Nos. 35 and 37. are being retained as part of this proposal. These barriers coupled with the proposed build out will help to manage cyclist speeds and reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflict, addressing concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians, children, and those with buggies.

			The issues regarding the poor condition of footways and the road surface and the use of residential bays by a nearby business have been noted, however they fall outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
5	Object	I have written to Harringay numerous times about the parking situation on palace Road, the garage move all there cars and take all our spots so to remove another 2 is insanity when we can not park our own cars outside even though residents parking charges are it through the roof. On top of that why remove the barriers, prior park is constantly having thefts of mobile phones and this just gives another opportunity to exit the area quicker. Plus no doubt there will be e bikes and scooters using it. Instead of wasting your money there why don't you fix all the paving in palace road. And let the residents parking be longer than 2 hrs in the morning. To give us a opportunity to park closer to our houses.	The Council notes the objector's concerns about parking pressures and the reported misuse of residential bays by a nearby business. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) is required to improve visibility, pedestrian safety and cycle access at this location. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero.

			It should be noted that the existing chicane barriers on the shared use path between No. 35 and 3. are being retained as part of this proposal. These barriers coupled with the proposed build out will help to manage cyclist speeds and reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflict, negating concerns that the proposal would assist criminals to escape the area faster. The issue regarding the poor condition of footways and the use of residential bays by a nearby business have been noted, however they fall outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
6	Object	I am writing to formally object to proposal 2025-T37 Palace Road N8 – Path Access, currently subject to public consultation. The proposal involves the removal of an existing parking bay and the construction of a pavement build-out into the carriageway. I strongly object to this scheme for the reasons set out below. 1. Loss of Parking Capacity and Network Impact Parking stress in this location is already high. The permanent removal of an existing parking bay will materially worsen an established shortage, adversely affecting residents, visitors, deliveries, and servicing. Both Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007; updated 2021) and the London Plan require that highway interventions demonstrate proportionality and a clear net benefit. No parking stress survey, displacement analysis, or evidence has been presented to justify the permanent loss of	The Council acknowledges the objectors concerns regarding parking pressure and the unclear safety benefits of the proposed scheme. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) is required to improve visibility, pedestrian safety and cycle access at this location. Although the objector believes no safety issue exists, the Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide suitable cycle accessibility, therefore increasing the potential for cycle/pedestrian conflict at the entrance to the shared path between No. 35 and 37. The build out would provide a safe and direct way for cyclists to access the shared path and make it easier for

	parking capacity at this location, nor to demonstrate compliance with the council's Network Management Duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to minimise disruption to the road network. 2. Limited and Unclear Safety Benefit The safety rationale for the proposed pavement build-out is not clearly evidenced. There is already a demonstrably safer crossing point approximately 20 metres along Palace Road, outside No. 29 where a dropped kerb is provided and where the road effectively functions as a dead end with negligible through traffic. This location already accommodates pedestrian crossing movements with minimal vehicle conflict and is far safer than encouraging pedestrians and cyclists to cross at the point between 35 and 37 Palace Road. In this context, it is unclear what additional safety benefit the proposed build-out provides, or why existing highway conditions at this safer crossing point are considered inadequate. Manual for Streets makes clear that physical interventions should be evidence-led and address an identified risk; no collision data or site-specific risk assessment has been published to justify the intervention at the proposed location. 3. Failure to Address the Primary Risk The principal safety issue at this location is cyclists entering the lane at speed, particularly from The Grove N8, while pedestrians are present. The proposed pavement build-out does not meaningfully mitigate this risk. This approach is inconsistent with LTN 1/20 (Cycle Infrastructure Design), which emphasises the importance of managing cycle speeds and reducing conflict where pedestrian interaction occurs. Narrowing the carriageway without addressing approach speed does not meet this guidance and risks creating a false sense of safety. 4. More Appropriate and Compliant Alternatives If additional safety measures are considered necessary, more appropriate interventions would include speed-reducing or deflective measures at the entrance to the lane at the bottom of The Grove N8, such as slalom-type barriers or other physical calming features. These would directly address cyclist speed and pedestrian conflict and are consistent with the principles set out in LTN 1/20, without removing parking or displacing vehicles into surrounding streets. 5. Asset Condition, Accessibility, and Equality Considerations The condition of pavements and carriageways in the	pedestrians to cross Palace Road directly opposite the shared path, as they will be able to see oncoming traffic. The proposal would therefore support the Council's road safety obligations and it aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. It should be noted that the existing chicane barriers on the shared path between Nos. 35 and 37 are being retained as part of this proposal. These barriers coupled with the proposed build out would help to manage cyclist speeds and reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflict. Furthermore, this maintains existing constraints on the path and addresses concerns that the proposal would facilitate faster egress from the area. The issues regarding the poor condition of footways and carriageways in the surrounding area and suggested additional safety measures have been noted. Footway and carriageway resurfacing falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider issues such as these as part of separate work programmes. The Council would continue to monitor further issues, such as cycle speeds on the shared path between The Grove and Palace Road as part of ongoing monitoring, if an issue is reported then further mitigation measures may be considered. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as
--	--	--

		surrounding area remains poor, with uneven surfaces and potholes presenting ongoing hazards. Under the Equality Act 2010, highway authorities have a duty to consider the needs of disabled and mobility-impaired users, for whom poor surface condition is a significant barrier to safe movement. Prioritising a pavement build-out over essential maintenance and repair raises concerns about value for money and alignment with statutory duties. Conclusion In summary, the proposal results in the permanent loss of valuable parking capacity, delivers limited and unsubstantiated safety benefits, and fails to address the primary source of risk at this location. It does not clearly demonstrate compliance with Manual for Streets, LTN 1/20, or the council's Network Management and equality duties. I therefore strongly object to the proposal as currently designed and urge Haringey Council to reconsider both the removal of the parking bay and the overall approach to safety improvements on Palace Road.	part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
7	Object	As a near-neighbour of the proposed 'buildout' I strongly object. I have been using the shared pedestrian/cycle path between 35 and 37 Palace Road almost daily for 40 years and have no problem at all with accessibility and safety (and I am 89 years old). Indeed I think that safety for all road and path users would be compromised by extending pedestrian and cyclist access into the roadway and in the process losing a parking space that actually by its position helps keep the path safe. This proposal, I submit, is an unsafe and unnecessarily complicated solution to a non-existent problem!	The Council acknowledges the objector's concerns regarding the unclear safety and accessibility benefits of the proposed scheme. Although the objector believes no issue exists, the Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide suitable levels of pedestrian or cycle accessibility. The removal of the existing crossover would eliminate the footway imperfections at the entrance to the path, making it more accessible for all users, including those with mobility impairments and wheelchair users. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) and construction of the build-out would provide a safe and direct way for cyclists to access the shared path and make it easier for pedestrians to cross Palace Road directly opposite the shared path, as they will be able to see oncoming traffic. The proposal therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on

			Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
8	Object	I am writing as the [REDACTED INFORMATION] to formally object to TMO reference 2025-T37 relating to the proposed build-out between Nos. 35 and 37 Palace Road. The proposal involves the permanent removal of an existing parking bay and the construction of a pavement build-out extending into the carriageway. I strongly object to this scheme. Parking pressure on Palace Road is already high. Removing an established parking space will materially worsen an existing shortage and will have a direct impact on residents, visitors, carers, deliveries, and servicing. Palace Road sits within a Controlled Parking Zone, and the purpose of the CPZ is to manage competing demands fairly and to protect residential amenity. The loss of a parking bay runs directly counter to that objective. No parking stress survey, displacement analysis, or evidence of spare capacity has been provided to justify this removal, nor has it been shown that vehicles displaced from this location will not simply be pushed into surrounding streets. The safety justification for the proposed build-out is also unclear. There is already a safer and more logical crossing point approximately 20 metres along Palace Road outside No. 29, where a dropped kerb is provided and where the road effectively functions as a dead end with very limited vehicle movement. Pedestrians already cross at this point with minimal conflict. Encouraging crossing between Nos. 35 and 37, where visibility is poorer and vehicle movements are more complex, does not appear to offer a clear safety improvement. No collision data, safety audit, or site-specific risk assessment has been published to explain	The Council notes the objector's concerns regarding parking pressures and the perceived lack of safety and accessibility benefits of the proposed scheme. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The proposed removal of approximately one residential permit holder bay (CE A) and the construction of the build-out would provide a safe and direct route for cyclists to the shared path and make it easier for pedestrians to cross Palace Road, as they will have clearer sightlines of oncoming traffic. The measure, therefore, supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The Council recognises that parking

		why this intervention is necessary at this particular location. In practice, the main safety issue here is cyclists entering the lane at speed, particularly from The Grove. The proposed build-out does not address that behaviour. Narrowing the carriageway at a single point does not slow approach speeds and risks creating a false sense of safety for pedestrians. Haringey's transport policies, in line with national guidance, emphasise reducing conflict and managing speed rather than simply reallocating space. In my view, this proposal fails to do that. If further safety measures are considered necessary, a more appropriate and effective approach would be to focus on the entrance to the lane from The Grove, where cyclist speeds are highest. Speed-reducing or deflective measures at that point would directly address the actual risk, would be consistent with the council's own cycling and transport objectives, and would avoid the unnecessary loss of parking within the CPZ. I am also concerned about the wider implications of introducing a carriageway build-out at this location. No information has been provided to show that refuse vehicles, delivery vans, or emergency vehicles can safely manoeuvre without increased risk of obstruction or delay. This is particularly important on a residential street that relies on on-street parking and regular servicing. Finally, the condition of pavements and carriageways in this area is already poor, with uneven surfaces and defects that present real hazards, particularly for disabled and mobility-impaired users. Under the Equality Act, the council has a duty to consider these users. Prioritising a new build-out over basic maintenance and repair raises concerns about proportionality, value for money, and whether genuine accessibility issues are being properly addressed. No Equality Impact Assessment has been made available to demonstrate that these matters have been considered. For all of these reasons, I do not believe the proposal represents a proportionate, evidence-based or policy-compliant intervention. It removes valuable parking within a CPZ without justification, delivers unclear safety benefits, and fails to address the primary source of risk at this location. I therefore formally object to TMO 2025-T37 and ask that Haringey Council reconsider both the removal of the parking bay and the overall approach to safety improvements on Palace Road.	availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence. The proposed build-out would only extend as wide as the existing parking bay, therefore, the manoeuvrability of emergency or refuse vehicles would not be impacted. The issues regarding the condition of footways and carriageways in the surrounding area, along with suggested additional safety measures, have been noted. Footway and carriageway resurfacing falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council will consider these as part of separate work programmes and will continue to monitor cycle speeds on the shared path between The Grove and Palace Road. Should further issues be reported, additional mitigation measures may be considered.
9	Neutral	I am concerned about losing another parking space as Palace Road has several Disabled spots and also Palace Motors uses Palace Road as their parking area so it is often impossible to park in the road and we end up having to park in Barrington or Carysfort Road. Is it possible to check that all the disabled spots are necessary and if any circumstances for the badge holders have changed? And also lengthen the hours of the	The Council notes the concerns regarding parking pressures and the perceived lack of safety and accessibility benefits of the proposed scheme. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled

		parking restrictions so that Palace Motors can not leave cars for 22 hours at a time? The majority of cars in the road do not belong to residents and they are the people who are paying for their parking spaces.	parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide adequate sightlines or suitable cycle accessibility. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The issue regarding the use of residential bays by a nearby business have been noted, however it falls outside the scope of this specific TMO. The Council would action this as part of a separate work programme. Any potential changes to CPZ restrictions or hours would require a separate review and statutory consultation to ensure the needs of the wider community are balanced. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
10	Partly support	I support anything that improves the environment for cyclists and pedestrians. However I do not see the need to remove a parking space. Spaces are already at a premium and surely removing one here can be avoided.	The Council notes the support for improvements to the environment for cyclists and pedestrians. In response to reports from some residents regarding an unused disabled bay on Palace Road, a separate review was undertaken by the Parking Team. The conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay (CA-E) has since been approved and is scheduled for implementation. This will offset the parking space removed as part

			of the proposed scheme, resulting in no net loss of resident parking provision on Palace Road. The Council's assessment has identified that the current layout does not provide adequate sightlines or suitable cycle accessibility. The measure therefore supports the Council's road safety obligations and aligns with borough-wide policies, including the 2018 Transport Strategy, the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, and Vision Zero. The Council recognises that parking availability is important to residents, however, the adjustments proposed as part of this scheme, combined with the approved conversion of the disabled parking bay outside No. 62 Palace Road to a resident permit parking bay, maintains overall parking provision while delivering necessary improvements to road safety and accessibility. Under the parking permit conditions, a permit allows parking within the CPZ but does not guarantee a space directly outside a residence.
--	--	--	--