Original Feedback Date	Responder Type	Address Line 1	Post Code	Feedback Categories	Order Support
03/23/2026 14:22:06 +00:00	Resident	Keston Road	N17 6PJ	Parking	Object
03/22/2026 15:28:24 +00:00	Resident	Curzon Road	N102RA	Parking	Object
03/20/2026 19:12:56 +00:00	Resident	Risley Avenue	N17 7HN	Parking	Object

03/18/2026 18:25:30 +00:00	Resident	Risley Avenue	N177ER	Parking	Object

FeedbackText
In response to the letter posted through my door regarding "Proposed Dedicated Disabled Bay - Batch DPB 2025-04" - The application for adisabled parking bay outside 59 Keston Road N17 is no longer required, as the individual for whom it was designated has passed away
We already have limited parking spaces on Curzon Road as well as a designated disabled parking space. The council have added an escooter docking station on our road without our consultation, added 2 electrical car charging points (which are empty 90% of the time) as well as extending double yellow lines, at leat 3 car parking spaces wide, on the corners of roads. It is infuriating that residents of Curzon Road can rarely get parking spaces in close proximity to their houses, especially the elderly and people with small children. The council need to conduct an in depth consultation on
I am submitting this objection as a local resident and request anonymity due to neighbourhood sensitivities. I strongly oppose the proposed installation of a dedicated disabled parking bay for property 132 Risley Avenue, N17 7ER. My property resides on a row of terraced homes between numbers X to X, so thirty households and approximately kerb space that fits a maximum of twenty-two parking spaces,. A whopping six (ie 27%) of those 22 car spaces are already designated or dedicated disabled bays. The proposed seventh bay would mean that this is disproportionately increased to almost one-third of the street's total parking becomes restricted to specific households, which has a disproportionately negative impact on all other residents. There are evidently plenty of existing disabled bays for this resident to make use of. Given the above and the relative kerb space between the mentioned house numbers, parking near any house is now consistently difficult for everyone due to extreme scarcity of space. The applicant is therefore not uniquely disadvantaged, and granting another exclusive bay would unfairly reduce general parking availability further. Why can't they use one of the existing generously offered bays?? they are all quite close and are loads around!!! I understand Haringey's dedicated bays are installed specifically for one nominated vehicle, usually within twenty metres of the applicant's home. This effectively removes a shared space for the exclusive use of a single household. In an overburdened street like ours, the loss of even one general parking space has a significant impact on neighbours and visitors . I understand Haringey's own process involves identifying the "nearest unrestricted location" after a site visit, but i would be severely perplexed how the Council can satisfy itself the rest of us would not be severely disadvantaged here. Given the existing disproportionate number of disabled bays as it is, i am flabbergasted how any further ones can reasonably be granted by the Council and ask for derailed scrutiny and subsequent refusal of this application. Further, within the range of door numbers that i have cited, i would like to strongly urge the Parking Projects Team to urgently review the legitimacy and continued justification of the existing six disabled bays shared between us. On the entire strip of this road, there is no other cluster of houses

I am writing to formally object to the proposal to introduce additional disabled and ambulance bays in the vicinity of my property.

Over recent years, our section of the road (between the Tower Garden Allotments and Tower Garden Park) has already seen a significant increase in designated disabled bays, with approximately 6–7 currently in place. Notably, at least two of these remain unallocated and could be utilised if required, without the need to introduce further restrictions.

Within this stretch of approximately 24 houses, there are only around 14 parking bays available within reasonable proximity to residents' homes. This shortage is further exacerbated by the presence of a traffic island, which has reduced parking capacity by an estimated six spaces. As a result, the ratio of available parking to households is already insufficient, even before any additional bays are considered.

Furthermore, should the proposal to introduce additional disabled or ambulance bays proceed, I would strongly request that the council considers mitigation measures to offset the already limited parking capacity. In particular, the removal of the existing traffic island could help to restore several lost parking spaces and make the proposal more balanced and acceptable for residents.

While I fully appreciate the importance of providing accessible parking for those who require it, the current balance is disproportionately affecting other residents. Many households are already unable to park near their homes, despite relying on their vehicles for daily life.

Safety is also a significant concern. I frequently return home late due to work commitments and am often forced to park several minutes away and walk alone. This is particularly worrying given the nature of the area and undermines the practical and financial reasons for owning a vehicle.

Additionally, there are existing bays that could be reviewed before introducing new ones. For example, the disabled bay outside No. 144 has remained in place for many years despite the