CHISWICK AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11th April 2002

CHISWICK MALL PROPOSED PARKING SCHEME – TRAFFIC ORDER OBJECTIONS

Report by: Director of Environmental Services

Summary

The report presents all the objections received during the Formal Consultation period attached to the advertising of the Traffic Orders for the above scheme.

1.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That no Public Inquiry be held.

1.2 That the Area Committee agrees the recommendations and financial arrangements.

1.3 That the Committee agree that £32,000 of the Chiswick Park Deed of Variation money can be used to fund the expenditure incurred in 2001/02.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 On the 4th September 2001, the Chiswick Area Committee agreed to progress this scheme to Formal Traffic Order stage. For ease of future reference, both parts of this proposal are now referred to under one title, The Chiswick Mall Area.

3.2 The Notice of Intent to make Traffic Orders for this proposal was advertised on 30th November 2001 in the London Gazette as well as the local weekly publication 'The Brentford and Chiswick Times'. Copies of the Order were available for public inspection at the Civic Centre, Hounslow and in the reference section of Chiswick Library. These Orders contained the usual 21-day public comment period.

3.3 Some 9 objections were received during the formal consultation period. In addition two other letters are on file regarding a) a petition request for the scheme to be expanded by residents of Burlington Lane and b) the Old Chiswick Preservation Society making a few comments/requests but stating they support the introduction. Copies of all objection letters will be available for Members' examination prior to the meeting. It is necessary for the Committee to now consider these objections in accordance with the requirements of The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and decide how the scheme should proceed.

4.0 COMMENTS & OBJECTIONS

4.1 Of the four objections received from the business community, the main concerns and objections are summarised below:-

1) Lack of sufficient business spaces to accommodate their workforces. They request a greater share of the allocation of bays to be made available for shared-use or some bays exclusively for business permit holders. Some fear they could loose part of their skilled workforce if adequate parking is not made available nearby to their premises.

Example- When all the houses along Pumping Station Road have their own off-street parking there is no need for 'residents only' spaces, therefore making the whole of the road triple usage with the exception of one or two meter-only spaces would allow the business and resident permit holders the maximum opportunity to park.'

Example- 'A number of employees have expressed serious doubt at their ability to continue working for us due to the new scheme. Is it fair that your proposals will effectively terminate the employment of some of these people.'

2) The pricing structure, particularly the business permit costs for either the company to find or in other cases their staff to pay. Also the associated costs to accommodate their UK and European client/visitors.

Example- 'Is it acceptable to ask a customer who may have travelled across the UK or Europe to have to pay to visit a supplier?'

Example- The annual business parking permit fee of £450 per vehicle is unreasonable. It is up to six and half times more expensive than a residential pass, which we view as very prejudicial against the business community. It is another form of taxation against business in this area, with no explanation in how the will be used to better the community.'

3) Travel to work issues including location, cost of travel and lack of public transport to this area.

Example- The Church Street area is not served by regular or reliable bus services and is a considerable walking distance from mainline or underground railway stations. The additional cost of public transport on top of car running costs increase the financial burden on employees of the company.

4) Safety issues particularly regarding female staff.

Example- 'In light of recent serious sexual assault in this area to expect female drivers to 'walk the streets' and potentially through a poorly lit graveyard to Pumping Station Lane parking spaces is unacceptable.'

5) Request free time-period gap in the operational day in order to accommodate visiting personnel, clients and sales representatives.

Example- 'We have many employees who regularly attend the site for short periods of time- sales representatives, Area Managers, Surveyors and others, and it would greatly help us to have a time window during the day when they can attend without the disruption and worry of having to pay and display.'

4.2 Another objection has been received from Chiswick Lodge, which is a long-term NHS hospital for elderly mentally ill patients. Their objection is based upon the pricing structure and the impact this will have on a non-profit making organisation.

Example-'As you will be aware recruitment and retention of clinical staff is a particular problem within London especially with nursing and even more so in this less glamorous psychiatric elderly care field. Since the NHS is a non-profit making organisation this means we will either have to pass these costs on to our staff or reallocate it from money that would otherwise be used for patient care. The letter continues on: - *'What I would propose is that 20 of the 139 bays earmarked for business is provided free for our staff. If the permits for these bays were not car registration specific then they could be passed between shift staff.'*

4.3 Four objection letters have been received from residents of the area. The summary of their objections is: -

a) That the scheme does not guarantee residents parking – *'Since the scheme is a mixed schem as I could come back to the area and find all the spaces have been occupied.'*

b) Safety issues- the yellow lines on the corners will mean the resident's car can not be seen from their property. They state –*'However, the yellow line will make it easier for the juggernauts to and from the brewery to manoeuvre to the A4. If it was that dangerous the Highway Authority would have already acted with their own yellow lines*.'

c) The differential pricing policy across the Borough. They state –'*it is simply inequitable that residents should pay different sums for the same service in different parts of the Borough. What is the legal and financial basis for such a difference in charges? Is there provision for a higher authority, within the Council or independent of it, to set a uniform charge for all parts of the Borough.'*

d) Several objection issues from one resident- to any shared or business bays being allocated to their cul-de-sac. Perceived lack of sufficient spaces for the number of houses in the cul-de-sac and finally objecting to '*the painting of yellow lines in the cul-de-sac which would be an eye-sore giving it the appearance of a Council Estate. Just put a sign in the unmarked areas that state 'Residents Only'.*

e) An objection to the location of two bays in Chiswick Mall. The letter states –'*these bays would by reason of their location prevent access to the two off-street car parking spaces that front Walpole House parallel to and behind the footway.* The letter carries on to acknowledge there is no formal

dropped kerb to these spaces but states *'the area concerned has been used for occasional but regular parking'*.

4.4 Two other non-objection items were received during this time.
1.The first a letter and petition from 22 residents of the Burlington Lane Residents' Association requesting consideration for Edensor and Grantham Roads as well as parts of Burlington Lane to join the CPZ. (However, it is noted that all the signatures were from residents of Burlington Lane and non from residents of the other streets mentioned.)
2. The second from the Old Chiswick Preservation Society supporting the scheme but commenting on a few points that have no bearing on the Traffic Orders.These comments relate to their approval of the sign schedule, flexibility of the scheme and consultation on the review exercise.

5.0 REPLIES/COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 For (*4.1.1)* **Allocation issue** - The total bays available on-street is 393 plus some free motorcycle bays. Of this 393, some 36 % is allocated to 'triple-use' bays, at which a business permit is valid. The percentage for this category of bay is the highest within any of the LBH parking schemes. The normal allocation is usually between 20 –25%. However, should this higher figure need changing in the future, an opportunity will arise when the scheme is reviewed.
Location issue- it is not always possible to place the business allocation next to their premises; normally these bays are usually distributed throughout the scheme. As this scheme is fairly small in area, the business community may have to accept the fact that they may have to walk slightly further than at present.
Policy issue- it is the Council's and Government policy to seek to reduce car commuters by controlling parking availability so that public transport becomes a viable option for the majority. Therefore in light of the above responses: -
Recommendation: - To over-rule these objections as the allocation is considered to be fairly proportioned.

For *(4.1.2)* the pricing structure of all LBH CPZ's permits and meter fees are agreed and set by the Sustainable Development Committee under the Pricing Policy report.
Recommendation: - To over-rule this objection in light of the Traffic Order. However, to pass on these comments to the Sustainable Development Committee for consideration when the Pricing Policy report is next reviewed.

For *(4.1.3)* ***Transport*** **issues**- LBH is actively seeking to negotiate an increase in bus services around this area with London Buses and other bus operators. Some of these negotiations have resulted in recent improvements to the E3 service that runs from Greenford to Edensor Road, W4. This service has been increased from 12 minutes frequency to every 6 mins. The other local service the 190, runs down Chiswick Lane to over Chiswick Bridge and operates every 20 mins.
Recommendation: - To over-rule these objections, as ultimately tube and bus operators are not under the control of LB Hounslow.

For *(4.1.4)* **Pedestrian safety issues**- these are relevant to both genders, not just females. Since the case of the recent attack in the Churchyard, action has been taken to improve the street environment by adding extra lights, pruning the trees and regulating parking infront of the paths and steps to the Churchyard. This action was incorporated into the necessary traffic management measures that were required by the Fire Service to improve access to numerous properties, located near the rear of the Churchyard, by removing the obstructive parking from this area.Employees in this area may already have to walk throught several streets to find a parking place.
Recommendation: - To over-rule this objection in light of the recent street environmental improvements.

For *(4.1.5)* **Operational hours issue**- A free gap in the operational day is **not recommended** for this scheme because flexibility on any spare capacity needs to be maintained in order to cope with the displaced parking from The Mall, when the river rises and regularly floods this area. If a gap is allowed,

as in Central Chiswick scheme, this window of opportunity would be taken up by 'free-parkers' and any flexibility lost. As Members will know, not all residents of the Central Chiswick scheme are happy with the free time-gap. Many of these residents write expressing their frustrations and petitions have been received asking the Council to reconsider this aspect of their scheme
Visiting personnel can use the pay and display bays or even cross the A4 subway and park for free during the afternoon gap period in the Central Chiswick scheme.
Recommendation: - To over-rule these objections for the reasons given. .

For (4.2) **Key workers issues**-The recruitment and retention of essential staff is an issue very relevant to the Council. However, in the 21st century with this area being located in the London conurbation free on-street daytime parking is rapidly becoming unrealistic and a thing of the past.
Having examined the Council's current policy there is no scope for free spaces or permits being offered to NHS staff. All employees of any business or charity are all treated equally and with the same consideration in relation to spaces on the public highway.
Recommendation:- to refuse the request for free parking spaces.

For *(4.3a)* **Guaranteed space**- no parking scheme on the public highway can guarantee a space for a named individual. Only private parking facilities can do that. Therefore if this resident wishes a guaranteed space they should rent /buy a private garage or other private space.
Recommendation:- to over-rule this objection as considered immaterial.

For *(4.3b)* **Yellow lines on corners**- The Highway code rule 140 states that no vehicle should park within 10 metres of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. The proposed scheme is only reinforcing this rule .This rule is designed to improve visibility both for vehicles and pedestrians.
Recommendation:- to over-rule this objection as considered immaterial.
For *(4.3c)* Differential pricing policy – Again this policy is set by the Sustainable Development Committee(SDC). As Members may be aware this issue has been referred back to SDC for justification resulting in no change in current policy.
Recommendation:- to over-rule this objection in light of the Traffic Order. However, to pass on these comments to the Sustainable Development Committee for consideration when the Pricing Policy report is next reviewed.

For *(4.3d)* **Allocation and provision issues**- As the majority of the properties in this cul-de-sac have their own off-street parking, the amount of bays provided will be ample for the residents' daytime parking needs. There are only 5 shared bays , which are located at the beginning of the road along side a high flank wall at which business permits may be entitled to park as well as residents. These bays are not directly located outside the frontage of any resident's properties. As explained previously there is no guarantee of a space on the public highway and it is shared facility, not just for the exclusive use of one group In the adjoining road there is also a surplus of bays in comparrision to the number of properties located there.
No parking scheme is legal without the appropriate road markings and signs.
Recommendation:- to over-rule this objection as considered immaterial.

For *(4.3e)* **Crossover issue**- as no formal crossover exists the Highway Section were asked to investigate.The reply stated '*the guidelines for parallel parking state that a minimum depth of 3.8 metres and a minimum width of 6.5 metres of hard-standing must be provided in a parking area. The property currently has a hard-standing depth of 2.4 metres and width of 11.8 metres. A crossover should only be granted if the owner is willing to remove part of the front wall which may require planning permission.'*
Recommendation:- to over-rule this objection for the following given reasons.

Insufficient depth of hard-standing area, coupled with the probability of non removal of the wall and railings and finally that this property does have sufficient land and rear access to park several cars within its boundary.

With referrence to 4.4.I- When this scheme has been implemented and sufficient funds are generated, then consultation will take place with residents of roads on the edge of the boundary i.e. Edensor,

Grantham Roads and Burlington Lane in relation to expanding the scheme. However, contact and negotiations will have to be entered into with Transport for London regarding Burlington Lane.

With referrence to 4.4.2- Signs within the scheme will be kept to a minimum, where possible, to preserve the look of this conservation area and stay within buget restraints. However sufficient signs must be placed on street to allow this scheme to be legally enforced.
Comments and suggestions reagrding the scheme, received after implementation, will be held on the review file and investigated at the monitoring period. This is usually at least one year after implementation and dependant on staff resources. Any changes proposed at the review time will be subject to the normal formal public consultation period in the advertising of the required Traffic Order.

5.0 FINANCIAL COMMENTS

5.1 The total estimated costs of implementation, including current expenditure and fees, is £112,000.

5.2 While it is not possible to predict the exact income that may be raised from this scheme, a projection, based on a combination of other existing schemes has been used as a guide. This projected estimated income figure is £161,000 in a full operational year.

5.3 However, in order to operate this CPZ scheme additional expenditure will need to be incurred. The formula for agreeing this additional expenditure was agreed by the Committee of the Council on 11th September 2001. The additional expenditure for PCN issuing, PCN processing permit processing, coin collection and machine maintenance will total some £33,821.

5.4 The implementation costs are required to be added to the operational costs and this total deducted from the projected income figure before viability can be established.

5.5 The Head of Finance comments that £32,000 of the estimated £112,000 implenentation costs have been incurred in 2001/02. There is no identified funding for this expenditure. The only source of funding available is the S106 money that will become available when the Chiswick Park Deed of Variation is signed. Members are asked to authorise this source of funding (see recommendation 1.2).
The remaining £80,000 of implementation costs will be incurred in 2002/03. If the scheme is operational for at least six months in 2002/03, costs do not exceed the £80,000 estimate and the income estimates are correct, then there will be sufficient resources to implement this scheme. Officers within the Traffic Section need to monitor the implementation to ensure the scheme is introduced as planned. Members and Senior Management need to be informed immediately of any financial problems..

6.0 SUMMARY

The Committee is recommended to agree:-

a) To proceed with the scheme in the present format and implement as soon as practically possible in order to meet the income targets and budget restraints.
b) That due to the small number of businesses within this scheme to instruct officers to utilise the utmost flexibility in the allocation of business permits.
c) That if Members agree to implement this scheme that it takes priority over any other Chiswick CPZ work, in order to meet the income and budget restraints.

7.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

7.1 Within the operational hours of the proposed scheme, wheelchair users, the blind and those with restricted mobility should find junctions and dropped kerbs unobstructed. The usual exemptions from parking restrictions apply to Orange/Blue Badge Holders.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The introduction of the parking scheme in these streets should greatly improve the enviroment by reducing the level of obstructive parking; freeing up street corners of parked vehicles; improving sight-lines for drivers, general road safety and the street environment.

Contact: Gail Chatt, Traffic Section.

Telephone: 020 8583 4882

Background Papers: 1) Env. Services Committee –Parking Policy and Priorities for Schemes. (27/4/1999) 2) Chiswick Area Committee –13/6/2001. Proposed Chiswick Mall & Expansion Area Parking Scheme. 3) Chiswick Area Committee- 4/9/2001 Chiswick Mall & Expansion Area Proposed Parking Scheme- Update.	**This report has been considered by:**
This report is relevant to the following wards/areas: Chiswick Homefields, & Chiswick Riverside.	