



Mark Merrington
Vice-Chairman
Hampton Wick Association
2 Baygrove Mews
Glamorgan Road
Hampton Wick
KT1 4HD

info@hamptonwick.org.uk

16 August 2026

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Civic Centre

44 York Street

Twickenham

TW1 3BZ

Mick.Potter@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

By e-mail only

Cc.

Carl.Gellard@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

C.RobertsWray@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

ParkingPolicy@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

Cllr.H.Baxter@richmond.gov.uk

Cllr.J.Millard@richmond.gov.uk

Cllr.L.Tidhar@richmond.gov.uk

Dear Mr Potter

Hampton Wick Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), Zone X Review – Proposed Operational Amendments

Thank you for your e-mail dated 14 August 2026.

Whilst we remain disappointed that the low number of consultation responses com was not picked up by either officers or Councillors before the decision dated 9 July 2026, we commend you on taking the actions set out in your e-mail.

As you say, the key thing now is to ensure that all responses submitted to the consultation (including those not included in the original report) are reviewed and an updated report published which includes consideration of all feedback received. We note that you expect to carry out and complete this exercise in the next 7-10 days.

With that in mind, we would like to share with you further information collected by the Hampton Wick Association ("HWA") relating to responses not included in the original report. Of course, this cannot be assumed to be an exhaustive list as these are only the responses

that HWA has been made aware of. However, it may help you confirm that all the missing responses have been found and are included in the new report.

Accordingly, a bundle of anonymised material is appended to this letter.

In summary:

- Although the appended material relates in the main to missing online responses, there is one instance of an email response which may have gone astray: see page 4 – so e-mail responses may need to be checked also.
- Many of the representations not included in the original report focussed on the rationale for, and impacts of, replacing single yellow lines with double yellow lines – usually in specific areas.
- Some of the representations appear to have focussed on specific changes to parking bays in Vineyard Row.
- Other representations made other specific points in respect of:
 - St John's Road
 - Park Road
 - Vicarage Road
 - Seymour Road
 - Station Road
 - Glamorgan Road.

And in more detail:

Page	Description	Notes
1-3	E-mails dated 25 and 26 March 2026 and screenshot of confirmation of submission of response	E-mails between two residents of Park Road, each e-mail recording their separate online responses. Responses raise a number of matters, including double yellow lines. Screenshot relates to the online

		response detailed in the e-mail dated 26 March 2026.
4	E-mail dated 26 March 2026 to parkingpolicy@richmond.gov.uk	E-mail response from another resident of Park Road. Response raises a number of matters, including double yellow lines.
5-5A	E-mail dated 4 August 2026 to Carl Gellard (LBRuT) enclosing copy of response	Relates to online response by another resident of Park Road. Resident says they know at least a dozen of their immediate neighbours who “had objected on numerous grounds”. Response raises a number of matters, including double yellow lines.
6-8	E-mail chain concluding on 4 August 2026	Between HWA officer and two HWA members, both of whom confirm that they made responses which the original report did not include. One HW member suggests that, “[u]pon further discussion with Park Road residents . . . there’s more like 20 people who responded” to the consultation. The other HWA member is a High Street business.
8A	E-mail dated 4 March 2026 to HWA officer	Relates to online response by another resident of Park Road. Resident says they are aware also of others in Park Road, Vicarage

		Road and [Vineyard] Row who made representations which the original report did not include.
9	E-mail dated 5 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by a resident of Seymour Road. Resident recognises some of their comments (made by e-mail) in the original report (although they dispute the accuracy of the summary). They say, however, that they made also an online response raising other matters which the original report did not include. Online response raised a number of matters, including double yellow lines and matters specific to Seymour Road, Station Road and Glamorgan Road,.
10	E-mail dated 5 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by a resident of Becketts Place. Resident is unsure whether the original report included their response.
11	E-mail dated 6 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by a resident of Vicarage Road. Response raised matters specific to Vicarage Road.
12	E-mail dated 7 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by a resident of Vineyard Row who attaches text of an e-mail sent to Carl Gellard (LBRuT). Response raised matters specific to

		Vineyard Row.
13	E-mail dated 8 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by another resident of Vineyard Row. Response raised matters specific to Vineyard Row.
14-15	E-mail dated 9 August 2026 to HWA	Relates to online response by a resident of St John's Road and attaches confirmation of submission of response. Response raised matters specific to St John's Road.
16	E-mail dated 11 August 2026	Relates to online response by a resident of Baygrove Mews. Response related to double yellow lines.

This suggests that there are at least 14 local residents or businesses whose consultation responses were not included in the original report. Those responses raised matters not raised by the seven responses which were included in the report.

In addition, HWA has been given the names of a further 13 local residents who, we believe, may have made consultation responses which were not included in the original report. We believe that the majority are residents of Park Road. This accords with suggestions separately made by various local residents: see e-mails at 5, 6, 8A and 12.

As noted above, the responses we have referenced should not be considered an exhaustive list of all the missing responses.

We hope this further information is helpful.

Thanks again for your assistance in this matter which is appreciated.

Yours sincerely



Mark Merrington