

DECISION AUDIT FORM

For use by Assistant Directors in Exercising (Category 3) or delegated powers
- (Protocol for Officer Delegation)

NEIGHBOURHOOD AND HOUSING DIRECTORATE – PARKING OPERATIONS TEAM

DECISION: - Proceed with the making of the proposals to introduce parking controls in the parking zones N displacement areas.

Agree to:-

- Overrule the objections received and proceed with the making of traffic proposals to extend parking zone N and introduce parking controls in the following roads; Chailey Street, Chatsworth Road, Cornthwaite Road, Cotesbach Road, Daubeney Road (north of junction with Redwald Road), Fletching Road, Gilpin Road, Hillstowe Street, Lea Bridge Road (access road off main carriageway), Leagrave Street, Mandeville Street, Mildenhall Road, Millfields Road, Oswald Street, Otley Terrace, Overbury Street, Pedro Street, Rushmore Road, Redwald Road, School Nook, Thornby Road, Waterworks Lane and Wattisfield Road.

Reasons;

- 1 Parking Services carried out its duties to consult and introduce parking controls in the parking zone N displacement areas in line with the Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP) 2015 - 2020.
- 2 The proposals to introduce parking controls in the zones N displacement areas was based on two main reasons;
 - Feedback received from the 'combined' stage one and two consultations carried out between November and December 2016.
 - To protect the needs of the residents and businesses in the area from displacement parking which may be caused by the introduction of parking controls in nearby roads.
- 3 In line with our policies, the consultation feedback was analysed on a street by street basis and part street basis.
- 4 The feedback showed that the majority of displacement roads in the northern section of the zone N displacement area were in favour of parking controls.
- 5 In the displacement area located in the east the area, the feedback received was mixed. Although majority of the feedback from that section was not in favour of parking controls, Parking Services recommended for controls to be introduced in all roads in the area to create a logical boundary and protect the needs of the residents from undue parking pressure.

- 6 Excluding the eastern displacement area from parking controls would have resulted in the area suffering from high parking stress which could potentially lead to traffic flow and road safety problems as these roads would be the only area in the Lea Bridge and Kings Park wards without parking controls.
- 7 The Council's consultation process is not a referendum. It takes into account the needs of those who are experiencing parking difficulties and look at ways to resolve their parking by providing a logical solution.
- 8 Consultation leaflets and questionnaires delivered to residents and businesses provided detailed information regarding how the Council makes its decision on the introduction of parking controls.
- 9 Parking Services recognised that the introduction of controls in one area is likely to cause displacement parking in other nearby areas and have based its final decision on protecting the parking needs of the residents in those roads which were not in favour of controls.
- 10 The delivery of cycle hangar facilities in the area are based on requests received from residents. The hangars have been proposed in locations closest to where the requests have been received from in order to encourage ease of use.
- 11 When identifying locations we have to consider level of demand, length of time on the waiting list, a good borough distribution and parking stress. Facilities are only scheduled for installation once we are satisfied that it has reached an occupancy threshold and spaces are rented in advance for a year.
- 12 As car ownership in the borough continues to decrease and parking management improves to reduce commuter parking by non-residents, this enables the Council to redress the balance of parking allocation, to support alternative and more sustainable transport modes of transport. In this case we consider the hanger proposal to be of benefit to the local community, and that the loss of 2.5 metres of vehicle parking to be replaced by a cycle hangar has no detrimental impact on the availability overall of parking in the area.
- 13 The charging infrastructure for electric vehicles are not owned by the Council but by the operator of the Source London network, BluePoint London (BPL). Currently the charging infrastructure on Cornthwaite Road is outdated and does not conform to BPL's standards. BPL are keen to upgrade older charging infrastructure to newer ones to increase monitoring and improve customer experience.
- 14 Upgrading the EV bay on Cornthwaite Road to this new standard is not possible as it is impossible to connect this site to an internet access point, a necessary connection that enables the charging point and BPL to communicate and exchange information with one another. A new location on Wattisfield Road has been proposed as it the nearest alternative location to Cornthwaite Road which can support the new charging point requirements whilst also not causing too much inconvenience to the residents' parking needs.
- 15 Parking Services have proposed 8 metre to 10 metre junction protection at various junctions in the area to improve safety and visibility for all road users. This is in line with the Highway Code which requires vehicles not to be parked less

than 10 metres from a junction. This has been reduced at other location where it has been safe to do so.

- 16 Residents on Cotesbach Road were consulted on the proposed design for the area including the passing gaps and double yellow lines at the junction. Majority of the feedback (78%) from Cotesbach Road were in favour of the proposed design for the area.
- 17 Parking Services have proposed a passing gap on Cotesbach Road to improve visibility and free flow of traffic on the road. The passing gap would allow drivers a space to pull in when travelling down the road.

Background

The statutory consultation for the Traffic Management Order (TMO) proposals to introduce parking controls in the parking zone N displacement area commenced on 13th February 2017 with a three week objection period ending on the 6th March 2017. The notice was advertised in the local newspaper (Hackney Today). In addition, site notices were displayed on each street affected by the proposed changes.

A number of objections were received to the proposed Traffic Management Order proposals. Majority of the objections were received from residents in Cotesbach Road. One objection was also received from the eastern section of the N displacement area (Daubeney Road).

This report provides a background of the actions taken by the Council, outlines the objections raised and officers' recommendations

Parking Zone N Displacement area

Parking Services consulted displacement roads surrounding the existing parking zone N area between June and July 2015. This was due to requests and a petition received from the roads closest to the existing parking zone.

Based on the feedback of that consultation, parking controls were introduced in nearby roads to the current zone N displacement area who were in favour of parking controls in December 2016. As the roads in the displacement area were not in favour of parking controls, they were excluded from parking zone N.

Since the extension of Zone N, Parking Services received numerous requests and a petition from residents in the displacement areas requesting for parking controls to be introduced as they were suffering severe parking pressure due to displacement parking which was causing traffic flow and safety problems in their roads.

Based on this feedback received, Parking Services reconsulted the displacement roads in the northern and eastern sections of parking zone N that were previously not in favour of parking controls between November and December 2016.

Overall, majority (67%) of the feedback received from the area were in favour of parking controls.

When analysed on a street by street basis, the majority of roads in the north of Zone N except Otley Terrace were in favour of parking controls. Feedback from Lea Bridge Road was 50/50 in favour of controls.

In the displacement area to the east of Zone N, of the roads where parking controls can be introduced (public highway), support was received from a cluster of roads to the east of Mandeville Street and north of Redwald Road. However Mandeville Street, Oswald Street, Rushmore Road and Redwald Road were not in favour of parking controls. Not introducing parking controls in the roads that were not in favour of controls would result in those roads suffering severe parking pressure from displacement parking as they would be surrounded by roads which have parking controls.

Based on the feedback received as well as to create a logical boundary, Parking Services proposed to implement parking controls in all the Zone N displacement roads consulted. Please see the stage one and two delegated report for more information; [https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/parking-services/zone-n-disp/supporting documents/Stage 12 Delegated Authority Report Zones R S and N disp areas Jan 2017.pdf](https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/parking-services/zone-n-disp/supporting%20documents/Stage%2012%20Delegated%20Authority%20Report%20Zones%20R%20S%20and%20N%20disp%20areas%20Jan%202017.pdf)

Parking services have subsequently received objections from some residents in Cotesbach Road who are not in favour of the proposals to implement cycle hangars, a passing gap and extended double yellow lines on Cotesbach Road. In addition, an objection has also been received from a resident in the eastern displacement area who are against the introduction of parking controls.

Comments against TMO and Officer's response:

A summary of the objections received and officers' recommendations are provided below. Appendix 1 contains copies of all emails received against the TMO notice issued on 13th February 2017.

A number of objections using similar letter template were received from residents in Cotesbach Road. These objections were not against the introduction of parking controls on their road but rather aspect of the proposed parking design.

Those objections, which raise similar issues, have been grouped together and a response provided accordingly.

Objections received during the consultation period predominantly related to the following:

- The proposed cycle hangars outside numbers 15 and 23 Cotesbach Road as this would restrict parking spaces outside residents' properties.
- The proposed relocation of the electric vehicle bay from Cornthwaite Road to Wattisfield Road as the electric vehicle bay on Cornthwaite road is widely utilised by the residents in the adjoining roads.
- Proposed passing gap outside numbers 29 to 31 Cotesbach Road as the road is short and straight which means drivers can see each other clearly without the need for a passing gap.

- Proposed double yellow lines at all junctions on Cornthwaite Road as there hasn't been any issues with turning historically at those junctions after the yellow lines were implemented at the original length.
- The extension of parking zone N to include all roads in the eastern displacement area as the feedback from the area was not in favour of parking controls.

The objections raised in relation to these proposals have been considered and have been overruled. The reason for this has been explained in the conclusion section of this report.

Please see appendix 1 for detailed objections received.

Summary of Objections

Objection 1 – Cotesbach Road

Received from:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Residents on Cotesbach Road objected to the proposals below;

- The proposed cycle hangars outside numbers 15 and 23 Cotesbach Road as this would restrict parking spaces outside residents' properties
- The proposed relocation of the electric vehicle bay from Cornthwaite Road to Wattisfield Road as the electric vehicle bay on Cornthwaite road is widely utilised by the residents in the adjoining roads.
- Proposed passing gap outside numbers 29 to 31 Cotesbach Road as the road is short and straight which means drivers can see each other clearly without the need for a passing gap.
- Proposed double yellow lines at all junctions on Cornthwaite Road as there hasn't been any issues with turning historically at those junctions after the yellow lines were implemented at the original length.

Response:

Parking Services consulted displacement roads surrounding existing parking zone N on the introduction of parking controls between November and December 2016. This was due to requests and a petition received from residents in the area who were experiencing effects of displacement parking as a result of the introduction of parking controls in nearby roads.

The Council have proposed to introduce the cycle hangars outside numbers 15 and 23 Cotesbach Road based on requests received from addresses close to those locations.

In line with guidance outlined in the Local Transport Note produced by the Department for Transport, Local Transport Note (LTN) 2/08: Cycling Infrastructure Design; Cycling England's Design Guide; the London Cycle Design Standards; when conducting a site assessments to identify suitable locations for the secure cycle storage facilities we consider a number of criteria:

- Proximity to requests
- Parking stress levels
- Natural surveillance - This is to give security to the users, and to their bicycles, offering natural surveillance when selecting the appropriate location will encourage use and reduce the chance of theft
- Avoid obstructions – Street furniture is considered and we avoid siting hangers at the ends of roads and junctions
- Within the normal run of parked cars - The flow of parked cars soften the visual impact that the hangar has on the street scene

When identifying locations we have to consider level of demand, length of time on the waiting list, a good borough distribution and parking stress. Facilities are only scheduled for installation once we are satisfied that it has reached an occupancy threshold and spaces are rented in advance for a year.

Where possible we aim to locate units outside properties where the requests originate from, however this is not always feasible. In addition, ownership and tenancy may change over the course of time which once again would mean that the hangar is outside a home that did not request it or does not use it.

Due care and consideration has been applied to all our processes to ensure we engage with residents, we do this via letters to the proposed area, public notices in the street and published notices in the local papers. Our intention when making proposals in scheme notifications is to gain the support and feedback of the local community.

The Council's Parking Services has been involved in these proposals and reviewed proposed locations for cycle hangers based on parking demand in the area. As car ownership in the borough continues to decrease and parking management improves to reduce commuter parking by non-residents, this enables the Council to redress the balance of parking allocation, to support alternative and more sustainable transport modes of transport. In this case we consider the hangar proposal to be of benefit to the local community, and that the loss of 2.5 metres of vehicle parking to be replaced by a cycle hangar has no detrimental impact on the availability overall of parking in the area. The Council will continue to reallocate carriageway road space from private motor vehicles to cycle infrastructure provision, whether it be cycle parking or route provision.

In relation to the proposed relocation of the Electric vehicle bays, it is important to differentiate between the Electric Vehicle (EV) Parking Bay and the Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (or Charging Point).

Although the Council is responsible for and owns the public highway, on which the EV bay is situated. The charging infrastructure on the other hand is not owned by the Council but by the operator of the Source London network, BluePoint London (BPL). When BPL acquired the Source London network, they were keen to upgrade older charging infrastructure to their standards, which would increase the monitoring capabilities and costumer experience. Currently the charging infrastructure on Cornthwaite Road is outdated and does not conform to BPL's standards. However

upgrading Cornthwaite road to this new standard is not possible as it is impossible to connect this site to an internet access point, a necessary connection that enables the charging point and BPL to communicate and exchange information with one another.

In discussions with Hackney Council, it was decided that Wattisfield Road would serve as a replacement as well as expansion to Cornthwaite Road. Keeping an Electric Vehicle Bay on Cornthwaite Road would have meant the Electric Vehicle charging bay would have no associated charging infrastructure. This is neither logical or an optimum use of the public highway space and therefore it was proposed to remove the bay as the charging infrastructure was going to be removed.

The installation, maintenance and removal of charging infrastructure bears no cost to the Council, as BluePoint London owns the infrastructure and has agreed to cover all the costs. They also reimburse the Council for TMO processes and fees.

Parking services have proposed an 8 metre double yellow line on Cotesbach as a passing space in line with our design standard. Passing gaps are introduced in roads in order to aid traffic flow and minimise the build-up of traffic. Although Cotesbach road is a straight road, it is also quite a long road which allows traffic to travel in both directions and does not have any natural breaks (such as junctions) which could act as an informal passing gap.

As Parking Services have proposed parking bays on both sides of the road, there is only space for a single file of traffic to travel down the road. This increases the risk of vehicles travelling in both directions not being able to pass each other on the road and results unsafe manoeuvres being undertaken by vehicles. The passing gap has been proposed at the middle point in the road to ensure that vehicles are able to pass each other safely on the road.

Parking Services have also proposed passing spaces in all roads that run parallel to Cotesbach Road to improve the flow of traffic. No objections were received from the residents in those roads.

In relation to the extended double yellow lines at various junctions on Cotesbach Road, Parking Services have proposed between 8 metre and 10 metre junction protection at these junctions in order to improve safety and visibility for all road users. This is in line with our design standards as well as Highway Code which requires vehicles not to be parked less than 10 metres from a junction. This has been reduced at other location where it has been safe to do so.

However as all roads which run off Cornthwaite Road are quite narrow, it is necessary to implement between 8 metre and 10 metre junction protection to improve safety, this is regardless of whether there have been previous accidents at the junction.

It is also worth noting that residents on Cotesbach Road were consulted on the proposed design for the area as part of the consultation completed between November and December 2016. Majority of the feedback received from Cotesbach Road (78%) were in favour of the proposed parking design for the road and area.

We will however continue to monitor the restrictions in the area once they implemented to identify if the double yellow lines at the junctions can be reduced.

Objection 2 –

Received from:

[REDACTED]

The resident objected to the introduction of parking controls in roads within the zone N eastern displacement area. Overall the feedback was against the introduction of parking controls as only three roads out of seven roads were in favour of parking controls. In addition, some of the roads in favour (Pedro Street and Overbury Street) were only marginally in favour whilst roads against such as Daubeney Road were overwhelmingly (78%) against the introduction of parking controls.

Finally, there is a car park being built in the Hackney Marshes which will resolve the parking issues in the area.

Response

When deciding to implement parking controls in an area, Parking Services considers a number of factors including; feedback from each road consulted (on a street by street or part of street basis), traffic flow and supply and demand for parking as well as the ability to create a logical boundary.

In relation to the zone N displacement consultation, although majority of the roads in the eastern displacement area of zone N were not in favour of parking controls (four out of seven roads were not in favour), in line with our policies outlined in the PEP 2015 – 2020, Parking Services proposed to implement parking controls in all the roads in the eastern displacement area in order to create a logical boundary as well as protect the parking needs of the residents in the area.

As parking controls were supported and have been proposed to be introduced in the northern displacement area, if parking controls were not introduced in the eastern displacement area, there would be a significant increase in parking pressure in this area. This is because it would be the only displacement area offering free parking to hospital workers, visitors and residents who do not wish to buy a permit making it a “free car park”. This would also lead to traffic flow issues as the number of cars increase in the eastern section which would impact the safety of both pedestrians as well as motorists. The introduction of controls in all areas would ensure that the parking needs of all residents and businesses within these areas would be protected.

In relation to the car park being built on the Hackney Marshes, Parking Services have been in contact with the Parks team who are managing the construction of the new changing rooms and car park on the Hackney Marshes and they have advised that access to the car park will be restricted on weekdays and weekend evenings via a gate. Access will only be granted to drivers using the Hackney Marshes for sports and will not be a free parking space for all. As majority of the parking stress would be caused by residents who reside in nearby parking zones, and not visitors to the Hackney Marshes, the car park being built will not resolve the issue of increased parking stress in the area.

Equalities Impact Assessment

As part of the consultation process, the Council carried out an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure that the proposals made do not have an adverse effect on the parking needs of specific groups including disabled drivers.

The public consultation provides an open forum for all local users to have their say on the introduction and the design of local parking controls. The introduction of controls has a positive impact on all road users (motorists, pedestrians and cyclists) by creating a safer road environment and by creating parking scheme which meets the needs of local users.

Financial Implications

The estimated cost of this scheme is £90k. The scheme is fully funded from the capital costs budget for 2017/18.

Conclusions

Recommendation:-

After considering the objections to the publication of the proposals as part of the traffic management order, it is recommended to;

- **Overrule the objections received and proceed with the making of traffic proposals to extend parking zone N and introduce parking controls in the following roads;** Chailey Street, Chatsworth Road, Cornthwaite Road, Cotesbach Road, Daubeney Road (north of junction with Redwald Road), Fletching Road, Gilpin Road, Hillstowe Street, Lea Bridge Road (access road off main carriageway), Leagrave Street, Mandeville Street, Mildenhall Road, Millfields Road, Oswald Street, Otley Terrace, Overbury Street, Pedro Street, Rushmore Road, Redwald Road, School Nook, Thornby Road, Waterworks Lane and Wattisfield Road.

Approval

I have noted the contents of this summary and agree with the recommendations contained therein.



Signed.....

31.03.17

Dated.....

Aled Richards – Corporate Director Public Realm

Document Number: 18134131

Document Name: Decision Audit Report Zone N displacement

APPENDIX 1

Cotesbach Road

Objection: 1.1

Received from:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: London Borough of Hackney Traffic Notice T1197 of 13/02/2017

Sir

Whilst I am generally in favour of the extension of Zone N (Homerton) as previously consulted, having now had the opportunity to examine the proposed design and layout of the bays, cycle hangars, double yellow lines etc. in detail, I write to raise the following objections to certain aspects thereof:

1) Part 2e - Location of 2 bike hangars in Cotesbach Rd.

I object strongly to the proposed locations of these hangars, outside numbers 15 and 23, i.e. both on the same side of the road and only 4 houses (about 25m) apart.

Comparison with the neighbouring streets in the Zone N extension area show the proposed locations of bike hangars are much more widely distributed therein:

- Thornby Rd - 2 hangars, outside numbers 3 and 46, on opposite sides
- Fletching Rd - 2 hangars, outside numbers 42 and 72
- Mildenhall Rd - 2 hangars, outside numbers 38 and 125, on opposite sides
- Millfields Rd -No hangars on plan

I have no issue with the provision of these bike hangars. However, their proposed locations in Cotesbach Road are illogical, particularly so in comparison with the neighbouring streets. Therefore I would suggest that the hangars in Cotesbach Road are instead located and distributed in a similar fashion to those in the adjacent streets – i.e. more widely separated, with one near the top of the road on the even numbered side one near the bottom on the odd-numbered side (or vice-versa).

2) Part 2c - Removal of the existing electric vehicle bay in Cornthwaite Road

Document Number: 18134131

Document Name: Decision Audit Report Zone N displacement

I object on the grounds that this bay was only installed recently – at considerable expense - and is well used by people in the adjoining streets. Taking such an asset out again would be a costly and thoroughly retrograde step. Leaving it in place, in addition to the new EV bay/s in Wattisfield Road, would be a better and less costly option.

3) Part 2a - Short length of double yellow lines at mid span of Cotesbach Road (and others).

I object on the grounds that these are not necessary and remove one or more parking spaces in each of the affected roads.

I understand that the idea is to create passing places for vehicles travelling in opposite directions. Having lived in this road for 15 years I cannot say I have ever noticed a need for this. Whilst I can see it may be a problem on busier sections of Mildenhall and Millfields Roads, Cotesbach Road is short, straight, sloping - and lightly used - as are Thornby, Fletching and the western end of Mildenhall Roads. Traffic on all these roads is likely to lessen further once the parking restrictions are introduced. Common sense and the Highway Code (which gives vehicles going uphill the right of way) have proved sufficient until now and I therefore see no justification for providing these passing places. They should be deleted from the design.

4) Part 2a - Extended double yellow lines at road junctions

I object on the grounds that these are to be extended to an un-necessary degree. This will remove between six and eight parking spaces per junction.

I assume that the intention is to facilitate the passage of large vehicles such as dustcarts and delivery trucks. When I first moved here these vehicles often used to get stuck whilst trying to negotiate the various right-angled junctions and the cars parked near them. However, about five years ago the double yellow lines at these junctions were either added, repainted or extended, enforcement was beefed up and the problem was resolved. Extending the double yellow lines as proposed is therefore not necessary. They should be left at (or in some cases returned to) the length they were prior to the resurfacing of Cornthwaite Road in 2016.

I would be grateful if all of these objections could be considered when finalising the design and layout of the extended zone. I would be further grateful if you could provide a response on each one and explain your decision/s.

I look forward to hearing from you

Yours faithfully

Objection 1.2**Received from:** [REDACTED]

Dear Sir

I live at [REDACTED] and the parking Zone N is coming into effect from June 2017, I understand that there is going to be cycle rack placed outside no 15 and 23, I and the other resident living on this street are extremely disappointed that the bicycle rack are going to be placed in middle of our street and not in the end, the bicycle rack should be placed on end of the street like is placed on Thistlewaite road, we have visitors coming and the bicycle rack would take up the spaces.

If you look at our area the bicycle rack can be placed on Cornthwaite road and Wattisfield road as it would not affect any residents or end of Cotesbach road.

Can you please review the situation as it is not fair that in one street you place it at the end of the street and in our street you place the bicycle rack in middle of our street?

Thank You

[REDACTED]

Objection: 2**Received from:** [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

March 2, 2017

Dear Mr Cunningham,

I am writing in objection to the decision to implement the Parking Zone N Extension (Homerton), as announced in *Hackney Today* (13th Feb 2017) – TT1197 Waiting, Loading and Stopping Restrictions order 201 & Parking Places order 201.

I took part in the consultation pertaining to these new parking controls, which affect Daubeney Road, where I have lived for the past thirteen years. Earlier this month, we received the results of the parking consultation for the Zone N Extension. Like most people who responded in our part of the zone (the 'Eastern displacement area'), we were against permit parking: 74% of people from Daubeney Rd, 55% from Redwald Rd, 63% from Oswald St, 80% from Mandeville St, 80% from Gilpin Road...

I find it puzzling that the consultation describes this feedback as "mixed". The results from the Eastern displacement area are not unanimous, but surely that is as strong a democratic objection as you're realistically likely to find? 5 out of 8 roads were strongly against permit parking. It may be noted that on page 7 of the consultation, in a different context, 56% is described as "a high proportion of respondents"!

Of the three roads that voted in favour of permit parking, Pedro St and Overbury St were marginally in favour, while only three (3!) people from Millfields road responded (compared to 27 residents from the north end of Daubeney Road). The 66% of 'Yes' votes from Millfield Road (i.e. 2 properties) hardly balances the 74% of 'No' votes from Daubeney Road (20 properties), and the low number of respondents surely demonstrates that the people of Millfields Road did not feel strongly about the proposals either way. The

interpretation of these results as "mixed" involves a degree of creativity (if not, effectively, gerrymandering).

I am making a written complaint to register disapproval at the way the results have been interpreted, which seems to disregard results from the eastern extension. We own a car which is parked on Daubeney Road and, of course, have guests and visitors, including tradesmen who need to park outside our property. Finding spaces has very rarely been a problem, as we live in an effective dead end. In a worst case scenario, we have had to park in Redwald Road. Compared to this, the difficulty of descending thirteen floors to provide visitors with a scratch card is considerable. Have the council considered that many people in the eastern extension live on second or third floors (or higher in the area's two high rise blocks)? It is not quite as simple as 'popping outside' a Victorian terraced house, especially if you have young children at home.

It should also be observed that there is a new car park being built on Hackney Marshes as we speak, which should if anything alleviate the parking on Mandeville St, Oswald St, Pedro St and of course Millfields Road, where two respondents make up 66% of the 'Yes' vote.

Parking in the area is not broken; please can we not fix it? I can only see the proposed parking zone making life more difficult and more expensive, and a significant majority of residents in the eastern extension have told you that they do not want it.

Yours sincerely,

