BRIEFING NOTE

1. Recommendations

1.1 The Osterley & Spring Grove Ward Councillors consider the outcome of the detailed design consultation results in the Thornbury Extension ‘area’ agree that:

(a) The CPZ proposals in Kilberry Close, Moreton Avenue, Oakley Close, St Christopher’s Close and Thornbury Road (the unrestricted section) be advanced to the formal (statutory) consultation stage for the making of a Traffic Management Order (TMO) and subsequent inclusion in the adjacent Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ controlled parking zone (CPZ) as identified at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2, subject to there being no unresolved objections;

(b) That, where possible, officers resolve any objections received to the formal (statutory) consultation and implement the scheme and, in the event of any objections remaining unresolved, agree that these objections be determined through Chief Officer Delegated Authority in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors;

(c) Those consulted be informed of the consultation results and subsequent decisions taken.

2. Background

2.1 Following the introduction of the Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ and Burlington Road ‘area’ CPZs respectively, the Council began receiving an increasing number of complaints regarding indiscriminate and obstructive parking occurring in the remaining uncontrolled roads located between the 2 schemes. Subsequently, a petition was received signed by a number of local residents requesting the introduction of parking controls to alleviate the difficulties being experienced.

2.2 In response to the concerns raised and petition received, and following discussions with local ward councillors, it was agreed that consultation be undertaken with residents of Davies Walk (private), Kilberry Close, Moreton Avenue, Oakley Close, St Christopher’s Close and Thornbury Road (part) to determine whether there was majority support for parking controls.

2.3 Subsequently, the detailed design consultation commenced in February 2019 by means of the following being distributed to every address within the proposed zone: a covering letter identifying the Council’s proposals and reasons for these, a plan showing the proposed scheme design, information relating to the CPZs such as costs, etc. and a paper questionnaire for consultees to complete and return to the Council. Consultees were also given the alternative option of responding to the consultation via the Council’s online survey provider, Citizen Space.

3. Consultation Results

3.1 The Thornbury Extension ‘area’ consultation, which incorporated the roads referenced at paragraph 2.2 above, received a total of 65 responses from the 277 properties consulted which represents a response rate of 23%. The lower response rates for Kilberry Close (14%) and Thornbury Road (16%) could be attributed to the presence of off-street, private parking provisions which may deter some residents from responding.
3.2 The questionnaire associated with the consultation asked 4 questions; 1) Are you in favour of your road being included in a CPZ, 2) If a CPZ were to be introduced, what scheme would you support inclusion in, 3) Are you satisfied with the scheme design, and 4) If you are not in favour of a CPZ, would you reconsider if the roads around you showed support. The full results are available at Appendix A and are summarised below.

3.3 The response to question 1 indicated that a majority of 51 to 13 support the introduction of parking controls in their road with 1 respondent not identifying a preference either way. On a road by road basis, all roads indicated majority support for parking controls; Kilberry Close, 5 to 1 in support; Moreton Avenue, 6 to 1 in support; Oakley Close, 15 to 8 in support; St Christopher’s Close, 17 to 1 in support; Thornbury Road 6 to 2 in support.

3.4 Question 2 asked consultees which existing scheme they would prefer to join if a CPZ were to be introduced, with the options of the Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ CPZ or Burlington Road ‘area’ CPZ available (both of which operate between Monday-Friday, 10am-Noon). An overwhelming majority (50 to 9) indicated a preference for inclusion in the adjacent Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ CPZ. Support for inclusion in that CPZ was also identified on a road by road basis with all roads consulted indicating majority support for that option.

3.5 The response to question 3, which asked consultees whether they are satisfied with the proposed CPZ design, indicated that a majority of 40 to 24 approve of the proposed design. A number of comments were submitted as part of the consultation in relation to the proposals which include, but are not limited to, requests to extend the proposed double yellow lines on the south side of Moreton Avenue (from its junction with Thornbury Road) and outside No.94 Thornbury Road respectively, both with the intention of removing the obstructive parking that currently occurs.

3.6 Comments were also received from some occupants of St Christopher’s Close, where the petition requesting parking controls originated, requesting the introduction of an ‘all-day’ CPZ, e.g. Monday-Friday, 9.30am-5.30pm, due to concerns that the proposed Monday-Friday, 10am-Noon operational times would be insufficient in alleviating the parking difficulties being experienced.

3.7 The response to question 4, asking whether respondents would reconsider if they did not support a CPZ but the surrounding roads did, is somewhat immaterial as the overall response per road at question 1 indicated support for parking controls. The results to this question can, however, be viewed at Appendix A.

4. Recommendations

4.1 In light of consultation results, it is recommended that the proposal to include Kilberry Close, Moreton Avenue, Oakley Close, St Christopher’s Close and Thornbury Road (part) in the Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ CPZ be advanced to the formal (statutory) consultation. If the scheme is subsequently progressed to implementation, the existing Thornbury Avenue ‘area’ CPZ would be extended to incorporate these roads. In that instance, all valid permit holders would be entitled to park in any road within that CPZ.

4.2 The formal (statutory) consultation, which would extend for 21 days, would allow all those affected by the CPZ proposals an opportunity to submit objections or representations. Any objections or representations that remain unresolved would be subsequently reported to local Ward Councillors (or the Isleworth & Brentford Area Forum if called in) for consideration and resolution. If Members are minded to progress the recommendation, consultees within the Thornbury Extension ‘area’ would be notified in writing of progression to the formal (statutory) consultation, the reasons for doing so and the process for submitting objections or representations. Consultees will also be informed that, if there is substantial opposition to the introduction of parking controls, this is the final opportunity to raise objections before any decision to introduce the CPZ or otherwise is made.
4.3 It is also recommended that, where possible, officers resolve any objections received to the formal (statutory) consultation and implement the scheme and, in the event of any objections remaining unresolved, agree that these objections be determined through Chief Officer Delegated Authority in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors unless called in to the Isleworth & Brentford Area Forum.

4.4 Should Members be minded to approve the scheme to the formal (statutory) consultation, officers will review the CPZ design to ascertain whether alterations can be made to accommodate the comments and concerns raised during the detailed design consultation stage. It should be noted however, that it is officers view that the proposed operational times of Monday-Friday, 10am-Noon would be adequate to remove the ‘all-day’, non-residential parking that is occurring and, therefore, ensure sufficient parking provisions become available for residents and their visitors. In light of this, the requests for an ‘all-day’ CPZ should not be considered at this time, however, in the event of parking controls being introduced in the area, the Council will undertake a review of the scheme approximately 12-18 months (or sooner if necessary) after implementation to determine the effectives of the CPZ and whether changes are required. This would also include a review of the CPZ operational times.
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