

Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens, Isleworth – Extension to Spring Grove Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Detailed Design Consultation

Isleworth and Brentford Area Forum
21 January 2016

Caroline Stanyon, Senior Engineer
Developments & Parking, Traffic and Transport
caroline.stanyon@hounslow.gov.uk

BRIEFING NOTE

1. Recommendations

That Members:-

- (a) Note the results of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) detailed design consultation;
- (b) Agree to allow officers to proceed to statutory formal consultation on an amended Permit Holder Past this Point (PHOPTP) scheme as an extension of the Spring Grove CPZ into Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens;
- (c) Agree that the residents of Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens be notified of the consultation results and this Area Forum's decision.

2. Background

- 2.1 Following receipt of petitions from residents of and around the Thornbury Road and Ridgeway Road neighbourhoods asking for a residents' parking scheme, the Council undertook an initial informal consultation to assess support for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in April 2015.
- 2.2 The results of that consultation showed support for a CPZ from certain roads closest to the existing Spring Grove CPZ including Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens.
- 2.3 As a result, at the July 2015 meeting of the Isleworth and Brentford Area Forum, approval was given for officers to proceed with a detailed design consultation with residents of Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens.

3. Review Consultation

- 3.1 The detailed design consultation, in the form of a letter, plan and questionnaire was undertaken in late November 2015 with consultation packs being delivered to a total of 48 properties.
- 3.2 After discussion with ward Members and given the geographical proximity of Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens to the existing Spring Grove CPZ, residents were asked to indicate if they were in favour of their road becoming an extension of this CPZ rather than a new 'stand-alone' CPZ. They were also asked to indicate if they were happy with the draft scheme design provided.
- 3.3 A pre-paid return envelope for completed questionnaires was provided with the consultation documents, although, residents were also offered the opportunity to respond to the consultation on-line.

- 3.4 By the closing date of 14 December 2015 and allowing for receipt of late paper responses up to and including 16 December 2015, a total of 18 responses, 14 paper and 4 online, had been received, giving a response rate of 38%.
- 3.5 In response to Question 1, overall 10 (56%) of these 18 respondents answered that 'Yes' they were in favour of their road becoming a CPZ. However, on a road by road basis, although 8 of the 10 respondents from Naseby Close supported the introduction of a CPZ the majority of respondents from Ravenswood Gardens, 6 (75%) of 8, were opposed.
- 3.6 Question 2 asked residents for their views on the draft scheme design. Overall the majority 13 (72%) did not approve of the scheme design. Most respondents were concerned that would not be enough parking bays to satisfy residents demand, made worse by no longer being able to park partly on the footway.
- 3.7 In a 'traditional' CPZ all kerbside space is marked out with parking spaces where it is safe to park. Yellow line waiting restrictions are then placed everywhere else where parking is not be permitted during the operational hours, or for longer periods if considered necessary for safety and access reasons. However, in recent years, in some residential streets, particularly cul-de-sacs, Central Government has allowed these 'traditional' CPZ conditions to be 'relaxed'.
- 3.8 Signs at the entrance to the street indicate that parking is reserved for permit holders only past this point (PHOFTP). Residents can then park in the positions that they think appropriate i.e. across their own driveways or on footways, providing they do not impede pedestrian access without the pressure of commuter parking, increasing the on-street parking supply.
- 3.9 In a PHOFTP area bays are not marked on the road and repeater signs are erected using existing street furniture to minimise the impact of the CPZ. As a result, because signage is very limited, they work best in small, contained areas and not on extensive through-route road networks.
- 3.10 It is considered that a PHOFTP would alleviate many of the concerns raised by residents over the scheme design, particularly those received from Naseby Close. Despite the negative response received from residents of Ravenswood Gardens, given the likelihood of displacement parking into unrestricted roads, such a scheme should not be pursued for Naseby Close without the inclusion of Ravenswood Gardens.
- 3.11 Consequently, it is recommended that officers should proceed to statutory formal consultation on a revised PHOFTP scheme as an extension of the Spring Grove CPZ into Naseby Close and Ravenswood Gardens.
- 3.12 Residents to be notified of the consultation results and this Area Forum's decision

BRIEFING NOTE ENDS

Appendix A

ROAD	Q1. Are you in favour of your road becoming part of the Spring Grove CPZ?	
	Yes	No
Naseby Close	8	2
Ravenswood Gardens	2	6
TOTAL	10 (55%)	8 (45%)

ROAD	Q2. Are you happy with the proposed parking scheme design for your road?	
	Yes	No
Naseby Close	4	6
Ravenswood Gardens	1	7
TOTAL	5 (28%)	13 (72%)