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BRIEFING NOTE

1. Recommendations

That Chiswick Riverside Ward Members consider the outcome of the proposed CPZ preliminary consultation carried out with residents and businesses within the Riverside Ward roads where parking controls are not in operation and agree that:

(a) The CPZ proposals be advanced for further ‘detailed design’ consultation stage to determine if there is support for the introduction of a singular zone in the Riverview ‘area’, consisting of Ernest Gardens, Grove Park Gardens, Grove Park Road (excluding the east to west arm), Grove Park Terrace, Hartington Road (North of the east to west arm of Grove Park Road), Herbert Gardens, Kinnaird Avenue, Magnolia Road, Loraine Road, Riverview Grove, Riverview Road and Thames Road;

(b) Subject to recommendation 1.1(a) being approved, CPZ proposals be advanced for further ‘detailed design’ consultation to determine if there is support for the introduction of a scheme in the Chiswick Station ‘area’, consisting of Bolton Road, Cavendish Road, Coniston Close, Devonshire Gardens, Grove Park Road (east to west arm), Hartington Road (excluding the length north of the east to west arm of Grove Park Road), Spencer Road, Station Approach Road. Station Gardens, The Lindens and Windrush Close;

(c) Further ‘detailed design’ consultation be undertaken with occupants in Burlington Lane, Russel Kerr Close, Sutton Court Road (part) and Wilmington Avenue to determine whether there is support for inclusion in the surrounding Grove Park CPZ;

(d) All residents and businesses within the preliminary consultation area be informed of the consultation results and subsequent decisions taken.

2. Background

2.1 In September 2015 the Council undertook a consultation on the introduction of parking controls with almost 3,000 residential and business properties within the Riverside Ward. The results of the consultation were reported to a special meeting of the Chiswick Area Forum in November 2015 at which members approved the extension of the Grove Park CPZ into Elmwood Road and roads east of Sutton Court Road and, due to resident support, the inclusion of Sutton Lane South in the statutory consultation for this amended scheme. This expansion was implemented and has been enforceable since late November 2016.

2.2 At that meeting, members also agreed that officers should proceed with a detailed design CPZ consultation for a new ‘stand-alone’ CPZ with residents and businesses of Area 1, now known as Strand on the Green CPZ. Due to support this area was progressed further to statutory consultation, subsequent implementation and became operational in Jan 2018.

2.3 It was further agreed to re-consult residents and businesses of Area 2, subsequently referred to as the Fauconberg Road ‘area’ CPZ, due to the proposed progression of CPZ consultations in neighbouring roads. The Fauconberg Road ‘area’ received continued support following the detailed design and statutory consultations respectively, and was implemented in March of this year.
2.4 Members also resolved that no further action should be taken in respect of the proposals for a CPZ in Areas 3, 4 and 5 (the remaining Riverside Ward roads) and that residents and businesses be notified accordingly.

2.5 Following the implementation of the Strand on the Green CPZ the Fauconberg Road ‘area’ CPZ, the council has received representations from some residents of the remaining Riverside Ward roads concerning indiscriminate parking occurring in their roads with subsequent petitions being received requesting the introduction of parking controls. This parking issue is being attributed to the possible displacement of vehicles from the introduction of CPZ’s in neighbouring roads.

3. Consultation

3.1 As a result and following discussions with local ward councillors, it was agreed that consultation should be undertaken with residents and business in the remaining uncontrolled roads to determine whether there was majority support for parking controls. Accordingly, a consultation information letter detailing the proposals was produced and delivered to residents and businesses within the roads listed at paragraph 3.2 informing them of the online consultation.

3.2 The roads consulted, included private roads, extended to Bailey Mews, Bolton Road, Cavendish Road, Chadwick Mews, Chiswick Quay, Chiswick Staithe, Coniston Close, Crofton Avenue, Devonshire Gardens, Ernest Gardens, Grove Park Gardens, Grove Park Mews, Grove Park Road, Grove Park Terrace, Hartington Court, Hartingdon Gardens, Hartington Road, Herbert Gardens, Ibis Lane, Kinnaird Avenue, Loraine Road, Magnolia Road, Ranelagh Gardens, Redcliffe Gardens, Riverview Grove, Riverview Road, Spencer Road, Station Approach Road. Station Gardens, Thames Road, Thames Village, The Lindens and Windrush Close.

3.3 A total of 1826 properties in the area were included in the consultation which extended between 29 June and 23 July 2018. The consultation documents are included with this briefing note at Appendix A. A total of 580 online responses were received which represents an overall response rate of 32%.

3.4 It is to be noted that the consultation letter stated that residents of private roads would not be eligible for permits if a CPZ was to be progressed, but were still encouraged to respond to the consultation.

3.5 The responses have been analysed in detail and it was found that 6 duplications have been submitted (same name, address and email address). A further 32 representations have been made by residents either not identifying an address, or from those within neighbouring CPZ’s or located outside of the borough. This then brings the responses down to 542 responses within the consultation area. It has also been noted that multiple responses have been received from a number of addresses, and detailed investigation has identified these to be separate individuals in the same household and therefore these responses have been retained within the results table.

4. Consultation Results

4.1 Question 1 asked residents if they experienced any difficulty in parking in their road with Question 2 asking whether residents were in favour of their road being included in a CPZ. The responses to question 1 & 2 are detailed in Table 1 provided at Appendix B and summarised below.

4.2 As can be seen from table 1 at Appendix B, the responses to Question 1 indicated a majority, 284, indicated experiencing parking difficulties whilst 161 and 97 respondents respectively have no or occasional parking difficulties. On a street by street basis, those with a majority response indicating parking difficulties are Burlington Lane, Ernest Gardens, Grove Park
Gardens, Grove Park Road, Grove Park Terrace, Herbert Gardens, Kinnaird Avenue, Magnolia Road, Riverview Grove, Riverview Road, Strand on the Green (those residents fronting the river), Sutton Court Road (part) and Thames Road (part). The remaining roads have provided a majority response indicating either no or occasional parking issues.

4.3 In response to Question 2, those roads identified at paragraph 4.2 where parking difficulties are experienced have also indicated support for the introduction of a CPZ. It is noted that the majority of those roads in support of parking controls are located to the north of the consultation area and, as highlighted at paragraph 2.5, it is likely that these difficulties can be attributed to displaced parking following the introduction of the adjacent Strand on the Green CPZ. Majority support for a CPZ has also been received from respondents within Sutton Court Road (south of Lawford Road) and in Burlington Lane which could be attributed to displacement from the adjacent Grove Park and Fauconberg Road area CPZs expansion. Equally, parking pressure in these roads is likely to be increased due to the close proximity to Chiswick Station.

4.4 The remaining roads consulted, where parking difficulties are either not experienced or only experienced occasionally, have either indicated clear opposition to the proposed CPZ or marginal majority for or against the scheme respectively. Those roads with clear opposition to the proposed CPZ are indicated in red on the attached results table whilst those where there is marginal majority either for or against the CPZ are highlighted in yellow.

4.5 To provide a simplified overview of the results to Question 2, a map has been provided at Appendix C highlighting the roads where there is majority support (in green), majority opposition (in red) or where there is marginal majority for or against the scheme (in yellow). It is also noted that no responses have been received from residents of Grove Park Mews (Private), Huntingdon Gardens (Private), Loraine Road, Ranelagh Gardens (Private), Redcliffe Gardens (Private), Station Approach Road and Staveley Road. The distribution list has been reviewed and includes these roads, therefore, it is difficult to explain the lack of response.

4.6 Separately, it should be noted that the consultation letter distributed to residents identified that “The proposed CPZ does not include Bailey Mews, Chiswick Quay, Chiswick Staithe, Crofton Avenue, Hartington Court, Hartingdon Gardens Hartington Court, Ibis Lane, Redcliffe Gardens and Thames Village, as these are private, unadopted roads. Residents of these roads are encouraged to respond to the consultation, but should note that they would not be eligible for parking permits if a CPZ is progressed. Windrush Close is also unadopted, but as it falls under Hounslow Housing, it would be included in the proposed CPZ.

4.7 As a result of this information, it is possible that residents located within those private roads may not support the parking proposals. The reasoning for this stipulation is that parking within those private roads is limited to its residents and associated visitors only and cannot be used by occupants of other (adopted) roads in the area. However, following further investigations and reviewing the feedback provided from this consultation officers are of the view that parking demand from these private roads is likely to be limited and would, therefore, not cause considerable strain on the parking provisions available on the adopted public highways. In light of this, Members may be minded to allow permit eligibility to occupants of these private roads if the CPZ proposals are progressed in the surrounding (adopted) roads.

4.8 Question 3 asked residents to identify what operational days they would support if a CPZ was to be introduced in their road. 3 options were provided with these being Monday-Friday, Monday-Saturday and Monday-Sunday. The responses to this question indicate that Monday-Friday was unanimously supported by residents with 432 responses in support (80%). The remaining options received 39 (Monday-Saturdays) and 71 (Monday-Sunday) responses in support respectively.

4.9 Question 4 focussed on the potential operational hours of a CPZ if it were to be progressed. A variety of options were included in the consultation, as can be seen at Appendix B – Table
2, compromising of ‘split day’, ‘part day’ and ‘full day’ hours. The response to this question indicated a substantial majority in support of a part day scheme with 10am – 2pm (186 responses in support) and 11am-2pm (130 response in support) being the favoured options. There was some support for a split day scheme with 85 responses in support of a 10-11am & 5-6pm although this is notably less than the total number favouring some form of part day operational hours.

4.10 Question 5 asked those residents who were not in support of a CPZ whether they would reconsider if the roads around them showed support. Of the 13 roads which have indicated opposition to the CPZ proposals at question 2, only Wilmington Avenue respondents have indicated they would change their opinions (16 to 14 in favour) if the surrounding roads supported a scheme. It should be noted that of these 13 roads opposed to the introduction of a CPZ, 7 of these are private roads where it was initially identified that they would not be eligible for permits if a scheme was progressed. The full results to Question 5 can be found at Appendix B – Table 3.

5 Recommendations

5.1 The response to the consultation indicate that there is clear support for the introduction of a CPZ in the north-western section of the consultation boundary, referred to as the Riverside ‘area’ in this briefing note. The response also indicated support for a part day scheme which operates Monday through to Friday. In light of this support, it is recommended that further ‘detailed design’ consultation be undertaken with residents of Ernest Gardens, Grove Park Gardens, Grove Park Road, Grove Park Terrace, Herbert Gardens, Kinnaird Avenue, Magnolia Road, Loraine Road, Riverview Grove, Riverview Road and Thames Road to determine whether there would still be support once in receipt of the proposed scheme design and, if so, to determine the operational times of a CPZ.

5.2 The responses received from the south-eastern section of the consultation indicate that the support for a CPZ is considerably more marginal than that identified in the Riverside ‘area’. However, if Members are minded to progress further consultation in the Riverside ‘area’, it is recommended that further consultation is undertaken in the Chiswick Station ‘area’ to determine whether is support for a CPZ in light of the initial positive support received in the adjacent area.

5.3 It is further recommended that, if the CPZ proposals are advanced to the ‘detailed design’ consultation stage in the Riverside and Chiswick Station areas respectively, Members may be minded to allow the private roads within the area eligibility for permits should either or both scheme be progressed to implementation. Following a review by officers in the light of this consultation it is anticipated that the parking demand from these such roads could be accommodated on the public highway if schemes are introduced. As with the Riverside ‘area’, if a scheme is progressed for further consultation in the Chiswick Station ‘area’, the proposals should focus on either a split or part day scheme operational Monday through to Friday. The precise operational hours included in any future consultation would be agreed following discussion with local ward councillors.

5.4 In relation to those roads adjacent to the existing Grove Park CPZ, namely Burlington Lane, Russell Kerr Close, Sutton Court Road (part) and Wilmington Avenue, officers recommend that these roads be advanced for further ‘detailed design’ consultation on the proposed inclusion in the adjacent Grove Park CPZ, which currently operates between 10am-Noon, Monday-Friday.
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