

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCILTRANSPORT COMMITTEE – 21ST SEPTEMBER 2023EXECUTIVE – 25TH SEPTEMBER 2023

Report by the Director of Environment and Community Services on the outcome of a consultation with residents in the Dover House Estate area, SW15 (West Putney) to ask for their views on the possibility of introducing a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) there to alleviate reported parking problems.

SUMMARY

In July 2022 a petition was presented by one of the Ward Councillors to the Council seeking a formal consultation with residents on the Dover House Estate area regarding the possible introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to address reported parking difficulties throughout the area.

Authority was obtained to carry out a consultation with residents and businesses in all roads within the area commonly referred to as the Dover House Estate area: Crestway, Dover House Road (between Crestway and Upper Richmond Road), Elmshaw Road, Gibbon Walk, Greenstead Gardens, Hawkesbury Road, Henty Walk, Hobbes Walk, Huntingfield Road, Hutton Mews, Laneway, Lysons Walk, Newnes Path, Parkstead Road, Pleasance Road, Putney Park Lane, Sunnymead Road, Swinburne Road, The Footpath, The Pleasance, Torwood Road, Upper Richmond Road and Vanneck Square, to ask for their views on the present parking conditions and on whether they would like a CPZ to be introduced on the highway roads.

The outcome of the consultation undertaken during February/March 2023 showed that the majority of respondents did not agree that a CPZ should be implemented in the area. Respondents from five highway roads were in support, however these streets do not form a coherent area in which a scheme could be introduced. Having considered the views expressed by residents, including the concerns about the costs associated with a CPZ and all other relevant factors, the report recommends that a CPZ is not introduced at this time.

The Director of Finance comments that there are no financial implications arising from this report.

GLOSSARY

- CPZ - Controlled Parking Zone  
RTRA - Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984  
SO83(A) - Standing Order No. 83(A)

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The Transport Committee are recommended to support the recommendations in paragraph 3.
2. If the Transport Committee approves any views, comments or additional recommendations on this report these will be submitted to the Executive or to the appropriate regulatory or other committees for consideration.
3. The Executive is recommended to:
  - (a) note the outcome of the parking consultation carried out in the Dover House Estate area;
  - (b) agree that a CPZ is not supported by local residents and should not be introduced;
  - (c) instruct the Director of Environment and Community Services to:
    - (i) write to the residents and businesses to inform them of the outcome of the consultation;
    - (ii) publish the results on the Council's website; and
  - (d) instruct the Chief Executive and Director of Administration to write to the lead petitioner informing them of the outcome.

## **BACKGROUND**

4. The above-named roads are located in the west of the Borough, and form part of the Dover House Estate Conservation Area. For reasons of brevity, the area will be referred to here as the Dover House Estate area. A plan showing the extent of the consultation area is provided as Appendix A. The area is a network of uncontrolled roads with the Putney CPZ to the East and the Roehampton CPZ to the South. The Putney CPZ, A3 sub-zone has been in operation since 2001 and has no direct road link to the Dover House Estate area. The Roehampton CPZ, R2 sub-zone, operates in the roads immediately south of Crestway and was introduced in June 2016 to address parking problems said to be caused by hospital staff and visitors associated with the nearby Queen Mary's University Hospital as well as students at Roehampton University.
5. Since parking on the highway in the Dover House Estate area is free and unrestricted, it is reported that many of the parking problems currently being experienced in the Dover House Estate area are caused by the same groups of drivers who are now parking in the next available uncontrolled area. In particular, residents of Crestway and the southern section of Huntingfield Road have reported parking difficulties due to staff from and visitors to Queen Mary's University Hospital and also staff at Granard Primary School (located within the Putney A3 sub-zone to the East), who park in these roads on a daily basis.
6. The limited off-street parking facilities in the area means that most residents have no alternative but to park on the highway. The carriageway in most of the roads is too narrow to allow full-carriageway parking on both sides of the road and maintain the

free flow of traffic. However, since the footway is sufficiently wide in many locations to accommodate either full or partial footway parking, and still leave a minimum of 1.2 metres of clear footway, parking bays were marked by the Council in 2005 to advise drivers where footway parking is permitted.

### **PETITION**

7. A petition was presented by one of the West Putney Ward Councillors at the Council Meeting in July 2022. The petition was in the following terms:

“Petition calling for a consultation on the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone on the Dover House Estate.

We call on Wandsworth Council to formally consult residents on the Dover House Estate regarding the introduction of a controlled parking zone.”

8. The petition which contained 190 signatures had been organised by Wandsworth Labour in response to concerns raised by residents of the area with their local Councillors.
9. In line with the Council’s agreed policy for considering petitions relating to traffic management and parking matters, the Assistant Director of Environment and Community Services (Traffic and Engineering) discussed the circumstances relating to this petition with the Cabinet Member for Transport. It was agreed that given the petition, other correspondence and requests from residents to their Ward Councillors, that the Council’s SO83(A) procedure should be used to obtain approval for the resources and costs to undertake a consultation with residents and businesses throughout the Dover House Estate area.

### **CONSULTATION**

10. In late February 2023 a consultation letter and an information leaflet – ‘How Does a CPZ Work’, were hand delivered to all residential and business addresses within the Dover House Estate area. The documents explained the reasons for the consultation, the practical implications, costs involved and provided a link to an online questionnaire. The letter also provided information about how to obtain a paper-based questionnaire and postage-paid return envelope for those who did not have internet access or who simply preferred to complete a hard copy questionnaire.
11. The consultation opened on 27 February and closed on Sunday 26 March 2023, with an additional two-weeks being allowed for the return of any hard copy questionnaires.

### **ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

12. **Appendix B** shows the consultation results. In Summary for the whole area these show:
  - Of the 1450 properties consulted, responses were received from 541 households - a response rate of 37% of households which is considered good.

- In response to the main question – “**Do you agree or disagree that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) should be introduced in your area?**”, 317 households (59%) indicated ‘Disagree’, 210 households (39%) indicated ‘Agree’ and 14 households (3%) indicated ‘Don’t know / No opinion’.
- Residents were invited to provide the reasons for their response to the main question above. The most popular reason provided by 229 (42%) respondents was “**I have a car and don’t want to pay for a permit**”, with the second most popular reason indicated by 207 (38%) respondents being “**Visitors/non-residents need to be able to park**”.
- In response to the question “**If a CPZ were implemented, what days would you prefer it to be in operation?**”, 318 (59%) respondents indicated Monday to Friday, 24 (4%) Monday – Saturday, 80 (15%) Monday to Sunday and 119 (22%) indicated ‘Don’t know / No opinion’.
- In response to the question “**If a CPZ were implemented, what hours would you prefer it to be in operation?**”, 263 (49%) indicated ‘One-Hour e.g. 10am-11am or 11am- 12 noon’, 100 (18%) ‘All-Day - 9.30am to 6.30pm’, 66 (12%) All-Day – 9.30am to 4.30pm’ with 112 (21%) indicating ‘Don’t know / No opinion’.

### **ASSESSMENT BY OFFICERS**

13. Across the whole area, most respondents, 317 households (59%) do not support the introduction of a CPZ.
14. Residents were asked to give the reasons for their response to the question “Do you agree or disagree that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) should be introduced in your area?”. The most popular reason provided by 229 (42%) respondents was “**I have a car and don’t want to pay for a permit**”, with the second most popular reason indicated by 207 (38%) respondents being “**Visitors/non-residents need to be able to park**”.
15. It is clear that across the whole area the majority of respondents do not support the introduction of a CPZ, do not want to pay the cost for parking permits and that many residents feel that visitors and non-residents should be able to park.
16. Residents comments also indicate that whilst finding a parking space can be difficult in some streets, spaces can be found relatively nearby in an adjacent street.
17. However, of the 24 roads within the consultation area, there were 5 highway roads and one private mews, where the majority of respondents were in support. The responses from these 6 streets together with brief officer observations are provided below:

Crestway – Of the 86 households in the road responses were received from 45 giving a 52% response rate, 28 (62%) were in support and 17 (38%) against.

This highway road is split East/West by Dover House Road and both sections are immediately south of the existing Roehampton R2 zone. Most of the homes on the southern (odd numbered) side have driveways providing access to off-street parking, whilst those on the Northern (even numbered) side do not, although the western side has a section of estate access road which provides limited off-street parking. The

westernmost end has a direct pedestrian access to Queen Marys Hospital and from the eastern end pedestrians can access the nearby Granard Primary School.

Parking occupancy levels in Crestway are high with few spaces available during most of the day, due in part to parking by staff from Queen Marys Hospital and at the Eastern end staff from Granard Primary School. Despite the high parking occupancy levels only 45 households (52%) responded to the Council's consultation with 28 households indicating support for a CPZ and 17 being against. 16 households indicated that they were unable to park near their home.

Hutton Mews - 27% response rate, 2 (67%) in favour, 1 (33%) against. This is a private gated mews of 11 houses with off-street parking. Responses were received from 3 households with only one more in favour than against.

Parkstead Road – Of the 59 households, responses were received from 43 giving a 73% response rate. 28 (65%) in favour, 13 (30%) against. This is a highway road towards the southern part of the estate with footway parking on both sides of the street. 26 respondents indicated they were unable to park near their home and 11 indicated they didn't mind paying for a permit if it meant they could park more easily.

Pleasance Road – Of the 81 households, 52 responded - a 64% response rate. 33 (63%) in favour, 18 (35%) against. This is a highway road to the north of Parkstead Road with parking in inset bays on one side and on the footway on the other. 26 respondents indicated they were unable to park near their home, although only 4 indicated that they didn't mind paying for a permit.

The Footpath – Of the 18 households, 9 responded - a 50% response rate. 5 (56%) in favour, 4 (44%) against. This consists of two narrow cul-de-sacs, one off Huntingfield Road and the other off Parkstead Road and a connecting footpath that are maintained as highway. The narrow carriageway and adjacent footways in both cul-de-sacs mean that any parked vehicles would either prevent vehicles turning at the end of the cul-de-sac or if parked on the footway would force pedestrians to walk in the road. 4 respondents indicated they were unable to near their home, 4 that there is no parking problem and 4 indicated that they didn't want to pay for a permit.

Torwood Road – Of the 21 households, 7 responded – a 33% response rate. 4 (57%) in favour, 3 (43%) against. This is a narrow highway road with parking on one side of the street only. 3 respondents indicated they were unable to park near their home,

18. In response to the question **“If a CPZ were implemented, what days would you prefer it to be in operation?”**, 318 (59%) respondents indicated Monday to Friday, 24 (4%) Monday – Saturday, 80 (15%) Monday to Sunday and 119 (22%) indicating ‘Don't know / No opinion’. The unusually high number of responses indicating ‘Don't know/No opinion’ perhaps reflecting that most respondents did not agree that a CPZ should be introduced, so preferred not to indicate a preference.
19. In response to the question **“If a CPZ were implemented, what hours would you prefer it to be in operation?”**, 263 (49%) indicated ‘One-Hour e.g. 10am-11am or 11am- 12 noon’, 100 (18%) ‘All-Day - 9.30am to 6.30pm’, 66 (12%) All-Day – 9.30am to 4.30pm’ with 112 (21%) indicating ‘Don't know / No opinion’.

20. A variety of comments were provided in the free text box. The two most frequent comments concerned the costs associated with a CPZ e.g. that they did not want to pay for permits and that a CPZ was not warranted in the area.
21. It should be noted that the consultation process is not binding and the Council is not obliged to act on the wishes of the majority of residents alone but to take all relevant factors, which includes residents' views, into account when arriving at a decision. The following assessment is made having taken the obligations of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 into account. Council officers' visits to the area have shown high parking occupancy levels in some streets, especially those closest to the existing R2 zone, such as Crestway. Having said that, spaces remain throughout the area and parking becomes easier in the evening and at the weekend which may be evidence that a proportion of those parking are not residents. It is reasonable to conclude that some non-residents are taking advantage of the free parking facilities within the area to work at or visit local amenities such as the hospital and the university. Regardless of the origin of these vehicles, the introduction of a CPZ could help to deter non-residents parking.
22. Introducing a CPZ is expected in most cases to improve drivers' ability to access their driveways, where these exist, and reduce obstructions to drivers' sightlines and facilitate the free movement of vehicular traffic. This is because, the number of parked vehicles is reduced and those vehicles which are parked are required to park within delineated bays keeping access points and sightlines free from obstruction including at road junctions. Vehicular traffic volumes can be reduced and the flow improved, as those who were regularly parking in the road when it was uncontrolled, may choose to park elsewhere.
23. Problems of this kind were not identified as major issues during the visits or from the comments provided by respondents to the questionnaire. Overall, drivers appeared to park sensibly, perhaps because the number of properties which require access to off street parking are few, inset bays are available in many roads and the Council has previously marked parking bays on the footway in some roads to regulate parking and facilitate the safe flow and free movement of traffic. Any problems associated with obstructive parking could be alleviated with the introduction of limited waiting restrictions rather than a CPZ. Therefore, any improvement on these issues afforded by a CPZ is likely to be minimal and hence using them as a reason to recommend a CPZ would be a difficult to justify. There are a very limited number of uncontrolled off-street parking spaces on the estate land. Some residents expressed concerns that a CPZ would result in non-residents seeking to utilise these spaces to avoid the CPZ controls, creating further difficulties for residents. However, given the very limited off-street parking in the area, a CPZ is not likely to be effective in encouraging drivers to park off street.
24. In a CPZ all kerbside space is marked as a parking bay (where parking is considered to be safe and appropriate) or a yellow line (where parking is considered to be dangerous or obstructive). This can mean that the existing pattern of parking is not replicated, and it is possible that the number of parking places marked might represent a reduction in the existing overall parking capacity. Due to the narrowness of the carriageway and to allow traffic to flow, many residents regularly park fully on the footway and the Council has formalised this by marking bays in some roads. Although the footway is sufficiently wide in most cases to allow this practice to continue were a CPZ to be introduced, in order to maintain the free passage of pedestrians, it may be

necessary to remove parking in some instances, where obstruction could occur. Some residents may also be in the habit of parking close to road junctions. This practice would not be permitted under a CPZ scheme as yellow line waiting restrictions would be introduced close to junctions. However, the Council always seeks to maximise the amount of safe parking available to residents when designing the CPZ parking bay layout and any loss in parking capacity is expected to be compensated by the reduction in the number of parked vehicles belonging to non-residents seeking to park in the area. On balance, based on introducing CPZs in other parts of the borough, this normally only means a small adjustment to parking habits for some residents and overall an improvement in parking conditions for the majority.

25. Introducing a CPZ would also mean additional costs for residents as they would be required to purchase permits for their own vehicles and for any visitors. This has emerged as a major issue among residents, with 229 (42%) respondents indicating that they had a car but did not want to pay for a parking permit. Many of the comments provided referred to the current cost of living crisis and that they felt the CPZ was simply another form of tax.
26. The Local Authority must also consider any other matters which appear to be relevant. The introduction of a CPZ can lead to parking over spilling into any adjacent residential roads. Many residents felt that if a CPZ were to be introduced it would need to operate throughout the whole of the Dover House Estate area and not just in some streets. Officers agree that the nature of the Dover House Estate area with its interconnecting network of narrow roads means that if a CPZ were to be introduced in some streets and not others, the likelihood of parking overspilling from one road into the next uncontrolled road is high.
27. The Authority is required to consider the effect on the amenities of any locality likely to be affected by the introduction of a CPZ. The local amenities in the area most likely to be affected would be the shopping parade on Upper Richmond Road to the North, Queen Marys Hospital, and the university to the South. Should a CPZ be approved, all day parking free of charge without time limit would not be possible. However, were it to operate for only one hour a day, Monday to Friday, the effect on local amenities would be limited as visitors would continue to be able to park for free for the majority of the day during the week and all day at the weekend.
28. A reduction in the number of cars from outside the area and their associated emissions would be expected to have a positive effect on air quality in the immediate area. However, some will simply park elsewhere. A one-hour control would allow those who work locally to continue to park and re-park to avoid the one-hour control. This could arguably lead to an increase in congestion and resulting emission levels.
29. Whilst the majority of residents do not support the introduction of a CPZ, there was support for a CPZ from respondents in five highway roads as listed earlier in this report. However, the results for The Footpath and Torwood Road show only one more response 'in support' than 'against'. Officers have considered the possibility of forming a smaller area within the larger consultation area where a CPZ could be introduced but a coherent area could not be made based on the limited support received.

## **CONCLUSION**

30. The overall response rate (37%) to the consultation is considered to be good. The majority of respondents have indicated that they do not support a CPZ. There is a strong view from residents that if a CPZ were to be introduced, it would need to operate throughout the area and not just in some streets as this would simply worsen parking conditions in the remaining uncontrolled roads. Many respondents have raised concerns about the charges for permits associated with a CPZ and have highlighted the current cost of living difficulties.
31. The Council undertook its own assessment of the parking conditions in the area, including several visits. In many roads, parking occupancy levels were observed to be high, but vacant spaces could still be found. Whilst there is support for a CPZ in five highway roads, these do not form a coherent area and due to the nature of the roads, any CPZ scheme would need to operate throughout the whole area or not at all. Whilst a CPZ could make parking easier for some residents, it would be difficult to justify introducing one throughout the area, given most respondents have indicated they are not in support.
32. Any obstruction problems caused by parked vehicles, which was not identified as a major issue, could be alleviated without a CPZ by increased enforcement and the introduction of waiting restrictions, if necessary. Residents would be advised to raise any issues such as these with the Council in the usual way. Officers are therefore of the view that, at present, a CPZ should not be introduced.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

33. Having considered all matters that are relevant as outlined in this Paper, including the outcome of the consultation, and the assessment against the obligations imposed by the RTRA 1984, it is recommended that a CPZ should not be introduced in the highway sections of the Dover House Estate area.

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

34. The Director of Finance comments that there are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

The Town Hall  
Wandsworth  
SW18 2PU

PAUL CHADWICK  
Director of Environment and Community Services

19 September 2023

### **Background Papers**

There are no background papers to this report.

All reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committees, regulatory and other committees, the Executive and the full Council can be viewed on the Council's website ([www.wandsworth.gov.uk/moderngov](http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/moderngov)) unless the report was published before May 2001, in



which case the Committee Secretary (Michael Flowers, 020 8891 7275; email Michael.Flowers@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk) can supply it if required.