

**Contact:** Mohsen Nekouzad  
**Tel:** 020 8583 4864  
**E-Mail:** mohsen.nekouzad@Hounslow.gov.uk

Chiswick Area Committee (Planning) - 9 February 2010

### GROVE PARK & STRAND ON THE GREEN POSSIBLE CPZ - REVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESULTS

**Report by:** Director of Environment

#### **Summary**

This report contains the review of the results of a preliminary consultation carried out in Grove Park and Strand on the Green. Two separate revised areas are proposed for further consultation.

## **1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 It is recommended that the Committee:

- (a) Notes the results of the consultation undertaken;
- (b) Notes the views expressed at the 2 November 2009 public meeting;
- (c) Agrees that a detailed design consultation be carried out in the western cluster shown at Appendix E.
- (d) Agrees that a detailed design consultation be carried out in the eastern cluster shown at Appendix E.
- (e) Agrees that the remaining area of the preliminary consultation, outside the eastern and western clusters shown at Appendix E be also included in the consultation;
- (f) Agrees that shopper parking facilities in the shopping areas be considered as part of the possible residents' parking scheme and the traders be consulted on such proposals.
- (g) Agrees that the detailed design consultation be funded from Planning s106 contribution for Scheme 289 and
- (h) Authorises officers to notify the frontages in the preliminary consultation area of the outcome of the consultation and the Committee's decision.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Chiswick Area Committee (Planning) at its meeting of 15 September 2009 considered a report concerning the results of a preliminary consultation on a possible Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Grove Park and Strand on the Green. Concern was expressed by members relating to the wording of the questionnaire. In view of the high public interest, the Committee decided to defer their decision on recommendations c, d and e (see Appendix A) until a public meeting could be arranged to provide a further opportunity for the local community to convey their views and to inform the consultation process.
- 2.2 The Committee also noted the results of the consultation and noted the two petitions against parking controls and agreed that the lead petitioners be advised of paragraph 3.8 and the decisions of the Committee.

- 2.3 The public meeting took place on 2 November 2009 at the Strand on the Green School and it is estimated that around 200 people were in attendance. Members and a council officer were on hand to deal with questions and concerns raised. The meeting was chaired by Paul Lewis, a local resident and member of Strand on the Green Association.
- 2.4 A comment and question(s) sheet was also available at the meeting and 10 of these were filled in and returned by the attendees. One letter was also submitted at the meeting. This letter from a resident of Ibis Lane together with the officers' response have been previously copied to the Committee members and are shown at Appendix B. Nine emails and three additional letters were subsequently received and replied to by officers. The comments sheets submitted at the meeting contain mainly questions about how the CPZ would operate, how evening parking associated with local businesses will be deterred, how many parking spaces will be provided and what income will the scheme generate. Only three of these have expressed a view about the desirability of a scheme. Two are in favour and one is against. The correspondence received following the meeting indicate support for parking controls with five for and three against including one who cites the 'tightly drawn' eastern cluster for his opposition. There are a number of comments regarding the inadequacy of publicity for the public meeting amongst the respondents. A number of telephone calls and complaints about the lack of publicity for the public meeting were also received. The public meeting's comment sheets and the correspondence will be available at the meeting.

### **3.0 Consultation results**

- 3.1 Members will recall that question 2 of the consultation questionnaire (see Appendix C) directed the respondents who replied 'No' to the question to skip questions 3 and 4. It is acknowledged that the wording of question 2 did make the analysis of the questionnaire complex and the results more difficult to grasp. It is advised that in analysing the results question 5 was used in parallel with question 3 to gauge the level of support. Almost all of those who had responded 'No' to question 2 have answered this question. The summary of the responses is shown at Appendix D.
- 3.2 It has been suggested that those who had answered 'No' to question 2 would have also ticked the 'No' box of question 3, had they been given the option. This viewpoint is not supported by the responses to questions 2, 3 and 5. Experience shows that some of those who do not have a parking problem may still be in favour of a CPZ also demonstrated in this consultation. Similarly, not all of those who are experiencing parking problems are always in favour of parking controls. Additionally, the analysis of the individual responses adds more weight to the conclusions of the 15 September 2009 report than can be drawn from the summarised response table shown at Appendix D.
- 3.3 In view of the comments and views expressed by members and some residents and businesses at the public meeting it is recommended that the roads not in favour of parking controls be dropped from the proposals at this stage. What remains would be the roads where support for parking controls has been demonstrated. Appendix E shows the revised areas of the two clusters that could be considered for a possible scheme detailed design consultation.
- 3.4 Within the confines of the revised western cluster, there is clear cut support for parking controls in Geraldine Road, Hearne Road, Pymont Road and Spring Grove. Support

in the remaining three roads is marginal, but also taking into consideration those who would be in favour if the roads around them indicated support, there would be a clear majority in favour in each case. Additionally, in view of their proximity to the roads in favour, it is recommended that they also be included in the detailed design consultation. A short section of Thames Road between Strand on the Green and Brooks Lane, not in favour, is also recommended for inclusion at this stage because of its location.

- 3.5 The revised eastern cluster includes only three roads that are clearly in favour of a scheme, Chesterfield Road, Elmwood Road and Park Road. Eastbourne Road and Milnthorpe Road respondents have indicated support for parking controls if the roads around them show support. Sutton Court Road respondents are not in favour but the section north of Chesterfield Road has been included because of its location in relation to the other roads within the cluster. The desirability of a scheme in the eastern cluster is less pronounced and members may wish to consider dropping it from further consideration. On the other hand further consultation may prove conclusively if a scheme here is wanted, especially in view of the high level of support from Elmwood Road, Park Road and to a lesser extent, Chesterfield Road. It is recommended that the frontages within the revised eastern cluster be given a further opportunity to decide.
- 3.6 At the public meeting a number of residents mainly in the area not in favour of parking controls requested that they be included in any future consultation that may be agreed. It is therefore recommended that the roads in the area outside the two clusters but within the preliminary consultation area be also included in the second consultation. This would provide these residents and businesses with a further opportunity to decide whether they wish to be included in the possible scheme. In the interest of economy it is recommended that no detailed design be undertaken in the roads outside the two proposed clusters if further consultation is agreed.
- 3.7 The respondents as a whole are in favour of providing short term 'pay & display' parking for shoppers in the local shopping parades. At the 2 November 2009 public meeting there was a request to consider the shopper parking issue separately. If members are minded to proceed with further consultation there would not be any advantage to pursue the shopper parking issue separately and as it would not be a cost effective exercise it is not recommended.
- 3.8 The responses to the other main points raised at the public meeting are summarised below.
- 3.8.1 Times of operation - Consultation so far indicates that a two hour, Monday to Friday scheme is favoured. If further consultation is agreed various options can be included in the questionnaire.
- 3.8.2 Effectiveness of a two hour scheme - A two hour scheme would deter all day commuter parking and parking by full-time local workers. The majority of the spaces would be earmarked for the sole use of residents and their visitors during the operational times. Outside the restricted times the residents' spaces may be used by anyone without the need for a permit.
- 3.8.3 Shopper parking - There would be 'pay and display' spaces, mainly near the shops and businesses that could be used by shoppers and visitors to the businesses in the area. The 'pay and display' spaces would also have the pay for parking by telephone facility. These spaces could have longer hours of operation (e.g. 8.30am to 6.30pm) together

with a maximum stay of 2 or more hours to achieve a turnover of parking spaces and to discourage all day parking.

- 3.8.4 Parking arrangements for Strand on the Green School - Shared use (residents, business and 'pay and display') spaces will be provided in the vicinity of the school for short term parking by parents and visitors as part of the scheme, if agreed. Additionally, the introduction of a CPZ, if agreed and implemented following further consultation, would deter commuter parking. As a result, there would be far more parking space available compared with the prevailing conditions. Consequently parking congestion at school arrival and dispersal times would be reduced significantly.
- 3.8.5 Reduction in parking capacity - Parking spaces can only be provided where it is safe to do so and where they would not be obstructive. Double yellow line waiting restrictions would be placed at junctions to assist access and visibility. Additionally there would be single yellow line waiting restrictions across lowered kerbs (driveways) to deter obstructive parking. These yellow lines would only be in force during the operational times of the CPZ. It is worth noting that once parking controls are introduced, the majority of spaces are likely to be unoccupied during the operational times of the CPZ. If a second consultation is agreed, site surveys will be carried out and detailed plans will be exhibited locally and on the council's web site. These will show the proposed location of the yellow line waiting restrictions as well as the location and number of possible residents' and shared use parking spaces. A survey has been carried out in Elmwood Road in order to provide a rough guide. There are existing double yellow line waiting restrictions at the eastern end of the road. Similar restrictions would be placed at the other end and these will be in accordance with the requirements of The Highway Code. There would also be single yellow line waiting restrictions across the lowered kerbs outside numbers 9 and 60 and outside the lowered kerbs of the two corner properties at the Sutton Court Road end. These would only be in force during the operational times of the scheme. As a result the remaining kerb space could accommodate 98 cars and this is likely to be the number of possible parking spaces that could be provided in Elmwood Road if a scheme is agreed. The loss of legal parking spaces would be nil, but assuming parking is taking place where the yellow lines would be placed, the net loss of parking would amount to five or six parking spaces or under 6%.

Parking displacement - If a scheme is agreed and introduced, it is likely that some parking will be displaced to roads on the edge of the zone but some will go elsewhere or people will use other modes of transport. In order to minimise the displacement of parking to the fringes of the zone the provision of 'pay and display' spaces at strategic locations will be investigated. There seems to be no scope for parking improvements at the two railway stations in the area. The Head of Transport is in frequent contact with South West Trains and advises as follows:

"South West Trains has no customer car parking space at Kew Bridge station and only a small customer car park at Chiswick station, for which a fee is charged. There are no practical opportunities to gain additional off-street commuter parking spaces and even if the fee at Chiswick station was lowered or removed the effect on car parking provision would be negligible. The increased demand for commuter car parking near these stations stems from the improvements to the South West Trains service in recent years and the gradual loss of free car parking at other stations across the South West Trains network in south west London."

3.8.6 Further, to deal with any parking displacement that may transpire the zone will be extended or modified accordingly when it is reviewed and additional reviews will also be needed as travel patterns change over time.

3.8.7 Parking across driveways - The council's current parking policy does not permit residents to park across driveways during the operational times of the CPZ. This is because enforcement difficulties arise from such a scheme and they can create tension between neighbours (e.g. a neighbour may choose to park partly across your driveway even though he/she should not). Some local authorities are allowing residents to park across their driveways in some of their schemes. This option could also be offered in the second consultation if agreed.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

4.1 There is high confidence that the proposed two clusters shown at Appendix E reflect the views and aspirations of the local community. Full consideration has also been given to those roads clearly not in favour of parking controls even if the neighbouring roads show support. Members are therefore requested to agree that officers proceed with the detailed design consultation in the two possible zones and the ward councillors be consulted on the consultation documents before circulating to the properties in the suggested consultation areas. It is further recommended that the roads in the area outside the two clusters but within the preliminary consultation area be also included in the second consultation but the detailed design is to be confined only to the roads within the two proposed clusters. The design will take into consideration the sensitivity of the conservation area as far as regulations in respect of the signing and lining of CPZs permit. The results of the consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee.

#### **5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The cost of preparing detailed design proposals and consultation on these is estimated at £10,000. This can be funded from the Planning Section 106 contribution for the development at 162-170 Chiswick High Road (Scheme 289) for which there is £14,906 currently available.

#### **6.0 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE**

6.1 The Director of Finance comments that funding of £14,906 in respect of the S106 agreement (Scheme 296) is available to meet the costs of the detail design proposals and consultation.

#### **7.0 COMMENTS OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR**

7.1 The Borough Solicitor concurs with the recommendations and only comments on the future possible option of parking across driveways. Parking adjacent to a dropped kerb at an access to premises can cause inconvenience and obstruction to drivers trying to enter or leave the premises. The Highway Code advises drivers "DO NOT STOP OR PARK..... where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles, or where it would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities ...except where forced to do so by stationary traffic" A change of policy to allow parking across a driveway should have the consent of the occupiers of the property affected and not put vulnerable road users at any risk.

## 8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

8.1 If the parking proposals are implemented, they will be open and accessible to everyone in the community. Therefore, the proposals will not impinge on the council's equality policies.

## 9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 CPZs help to enhance the local environment by discouraging certain car journeys, reducing the level of obstructive parking, improving sight-lines for all road users and generally improving the street environment and residential amenity.

## 10.0 NETWORK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The Traffic Manager comments that creation or extension of the Controlled Parking Zones would have no adverse affect on traffic flows or congestion on the borough's, Transport for London's or adjacent boroughs' road networks. Officers should ensure that appropriate measures are undertaken to minimise disruption to traffic flows during the implementation phase.

<b>Background Papers:</b>
Chiswick Area Monitoring Committee - 12 September 2007
Chiswick Area Monitoring Committee - 16 March 2009
Chiswick Area Planning Committee - 15 September 2009
Record of the proceedings of the public meeting held at Strand on the Green school on 2 November 2009
<b>This report has been or is due to be considered by:</b>
Chiswick Area Planning Committee
<b>This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:</b>
Chiswick Riverside