

To: Michael Potter, Parking Policy Manager
CC: Cllr J Millard; Cllr R Brown; Cllr P Fleming

I am writing to raise significant concerns about the current consultation on Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Zone X in Hampton Wick. As it stands, the consultation materials appear to be incomplete, unclear, and in some cases misleading. We believe the consultation is not fit for purpose and should be withdrawn and reissued once the documentation has been corrected, clarified and expanded.

1. Limited information provided

The consultation webpage provides very limited / insufficient information:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/hampton_wick_cpz_review_zone_x

Notably, the letter sent to residents is not published online. Without an accompanying explanation of what is being proposed, residents cannot reasonably be expected to understand or assess the changes. We believe that some local residents did not receive a paper copy and, anyway, most would expect to find all the relevant documentation together online.

2. Illegible Plan

The plan provided online is extremely difficult to read. Even when enlarged, key details are unclear. Although a physical copy might be available in the library, it would have been far more helpful to publish a set of clear, high-resolution maps or multiple large-format PDFs online where most people would expect to be able to review the detail of a proposal.

3. Incomprehensible Plan

The proposal includes widespread conversion of *Resident/Business Bays* into *Permit Bays* but there is no explanation of what distinguishes a *Resident/Business Bay* from a *Permit Bay*. Residents cannot be expected to interpret the implications without this most basic information.

With limited information and without legible plans or clear explanations, residents simply cannot understand what is being proposed and therefore cannot be expected to provide meaningful feedback.

4. Misleading “Calculation of Parking Bays” Summary

The second document—a spreadsheet entitled “Calculation of the number of Parking Bays in the CPZ” - is problematic.

For example, it shows 16 “Additional / converted spaces” on St John’s Road, described as “*New Permit Bays*,” with only two “Removal of Spaces.”

A reasonable reader would conclude there is a net increase of 14 parking spaces.

In reality, **all** parking spaces on St John’s Road (other than two Pay & Display/RingGo bays and one former e-scooter bay) are currently Residents’ bays or Residents’ / Business bays. If these are being reclassified as Permit Bays, this needs to be clearly stated. Presenting them as “additional” or “new” without acknowledging the corresponding removal of existing Residents’ bays is plain misleading.

This is just one example – we haven’t had time to check every one of the 17 streets affected.

Residents are being asked to comment based on misleading information.

The summary refers only to “parking bays” which is a nicety that ignores the parking amenity of off-peak parking on single yellow lines. Of the 17 areas annotated on the plan, 16 refer to the conversion of single yellow lines to double yellow lines (without any quantification of either metres or spaces lost for off-peak parking). Some of these changes will no doubt be necessary but others will not and will represent a loss of parking. For example: there will be a loss of at least six off-peak parking spaces on Park Road but this is mentioned **nowhere** in the consultation documentation. We are therefore left wondering how many other spaces are being lost on the other 15 or 16 roads affected by these changes from syls to dyls – there is no mention.

Residents cannot be expected to give meaningful feedback when major losses of usable off-peak parking are omitted from the documentation.

Conclusion

In its current form, the consultation does not provide the information required for residents to make an informed response. The plans are unclear, the terminology is undefined, and key changes—particularly losses of existing parking amenity (off-peak)—are not quantified or properly explained.

For these reasons, we believe the consultation is not fit for purpose and should be withdrawn and reissued with accurate, intelligible, and complete documentation.

Regards

Fraser Wilson
Chairman
Hampton Wick Association