



THE TEDDINGTON SOCIETY

From:- Brian Holder, Leader,
Roads and Transport Group,
99 Queens Road,
Teddington, Middlesex,
TW11 0LZ.
☎/fax 020 8977 1579
Brianholder99@aol.com

10th December 2008

Dear Neighbours,

TEDDINGTON CPZ REVIEW – WHY IT IS IMPORTANT TO SAY “NO” TO THE NEXT STAGE IN COUNCIL PLANS FOR CPZ EXPANSION ACROSS TEDDINGTON

1. Why are there so many empty parking spaces around the station?

Residents over a wide area surrounding the present CPZ around the station should have received a questionnaire about a “review” of the CPZ, which should have taken place in mid-September. When the CPZ was introduced on 16th June 2008, a deliberate decision was made by Councillor Trigg (presumably with full support from central Teddington Councillors) to maximise the amount of displacement from roads within the CPZ, by allocating 660 of the 695 available parking spaces to residents, with a view, we assume, to creating parking problems in surrounding roads to “encourage” residents in those roads to vote for a CPZ in their road. As can be seen from the CPZ chart overleaf, only 348 CPZ permits have been purchased, on a typical morning just over 200 residents’ cars remain parked on road within the CPZ, and over 400 spaces remain empty for much of the morning, and many remain empty for most of the rest of the day – especially on the west (Police Station) side of the station. This cynical decision has certainly succeeded in artificially manufacturing parking problems in nearby areas where residents had some parking problems (eg. Park Lane and Elmfield Avenue), but not sufficiently bad to justify the introduction of a CPZ with its associated costs, and disadvantages, including heavy fines and drive access problems (wardens will issue penalty notices, but will not remove vehicles blocking drives – the police will do both if the vehicle is not parked in a bay).

2. Why is the Wall to Wall CPZ policy masterplan still being pursued?

The consultation documents sent out are a great disappointment, and are clearly designed to prevent residents having any real say in what really should be a genuine review of the CPZ and its workings. They appear to have only one object in mind - to maximise displacement and implement the next stage of Councillor Trigg’s June 2007 masterplan for the whole of Teddington to become a CPZ. This masterplan, which was displayed at an exhibition in Teddington Library in June 2007, showed the planned location of every parking bay, every meter, every yellow line, and every sign - all before a single vote had been cast (see the masterplan and other documents on www.teddingtonsociety.org.uk). Some 2085 residents were consulted in June 2007, 1019 (48.9%) voted, YES 354(17%), NO 600(28.8%), No View 65(3.1%), and 1066(51.1%) did not vote - a comprehensive rejection of the Wall to Wall CPZ policy – these are figures that Councillor Trigg cannot ignore. In the December 2007 vote, 1120 residents were consulted, 545(48.7%) voted, YES 197(17.6%), NO 330(29.5%), No View 18(1.6%), and 640(57.1%) did not vote – 67% more NO votes than YES votes.

3. Were the voting figures high enough to justify introduction of a CPZ?

The Conservatives’ CPZ policy required that at least 33% of households consulted had to vote in favour of a CPZ, and that 33% had to be in the majority (over 50%) of the total votes cast, so a vote of 33% for a CPZ, with no votes against, would see a CPZ being introduced. The 2002 Teddington Study Residents’ Parking Report (also on Teddington Society Website) recommended that at least 51% of households had to vote to give a consultation credibility, thus reducing the minimum vote in favour to 25.6% - a more reasonable figure. Had either of these figures been in place – there would be not enough votes to put a CPZ in place in Teddington. The Cabinet removed all objective CPZ qualifying criteria at its meeting on 17th July 2006, thus giving Councillor Trigg a completely free hand to bring CPZs in almost at will – subject to a majority being in favour – but no definition of majority, so we now see CPZs in roads where less than one in seven households voted in favour – that, by any standards, is in our view, an abuse of the democratic process. The recent introduction of single road CPZs to destabilise parking patterns in adjacent roads is an unwelcome development designed to maximise the spread CPZs. The rights of the individual road are now regarded by the current administration, as more important than the rights of the Community as a whole – setting neighbour against neighbour in some parts of the borough.

4. Should re-consultation have taken place before a CPZ is proposed to be introduced into a road on the basis of “salami slicing” the vote and/or road – yes it should – but it hasn’t!

Salami slicing has happened in Clarence Road, Park Road and Waldegrave Road – none of which had a majority vote in favour of a CPZ. The Park Road Neighbourhood Watch Team have challenged the voting in Park Road and found that the voting did not accurately represent the views of those residents interviewed by the Team - particularly on the west side of the road which included old peoples homes. They were promised that the figures would be the subject of independent audit because of these anomalies, but neither they nor TeddSoc have seen the revised audited figures. Waldegrave Road voted “NO” overall, except for a small section of one side of the road, introduction of a CPZ on both sides of the road on the basis of just 8 YES and 19 NO votes from 82 properties, salami sliced to 8 YES (13.8%) and 3 NO from 58 properties, to produce a majority, was simply not democratic in the view of many residents - we agree.

5. What changes to the current CPZ does the Teddington Society propose?

- (i) Subject to a majority of residents inside the CPZ voting for their road to remain in the CPZ, no change to Teddington Society policy - all parking outside houses to remain residents' only parking.
- (ii) The present CPZ boundary either side of the station to remain unchanged, except that all of the west side of Park Road (the Police station side), and numbers 73 - 87 should be excluded from the CPZ, the boundary to finish at 71 (or Albert Road depending on the vote) – this will allow the 28 cars that used to park on the west side of Park Road to return from Park Lane back to Park Road (140 metres of kerbspace freed up). The artificial extension of the boundary to 87, which was strongly opposed by the majority of local residents, was to impose tighter parking and permit conditions on new RHP development. Please write **“Please remove Park Road (west side) from the CPZ”** in the comments box if you live on west side of station.
- (iii) If a majority of residents vote NO to a CPZ in Waldegrave Road, the CPZ should be removed – it was installed on a minority vote, not to solve a parking problem, but to impose tighter parking and permit conditions on new RHP building.
- (iv) Parking permits to be sold only to those actually living inside the CPZ area – to reduce evening/overnight parking problems in Field Lane and similar densely parked areas.
- (v) Five free one hour all-day turnover spaces by dentists in Adelaide Road to provide replacement of lost parking for doctor and dentist patients, and provide reserve overnight parking for residents.
- (vi) A few extra P&D spaces in Adelaide/Victoria Roads to meet demand for extra spaces from commuters
- (vii) Free turnover spaces outside church in Station Road to be made 9am to 5pm in line with High Street hours
- (viii) All Community Parking Spaces inside the CPZ to be converted to Free Turnover, or P&D, or uncontrolled parking to create shoppers' and some additional rail users' parking – to minimise displacement outside the zone.
- (ix) Free half pavement parking on the Bushy Park side of Sandy Lane for park users and commuters.
- (x) Removal of CPZ from Normansfield Avenue, Teddington, to provide free parking for all – it is almost empty most days.

6. EMPTY SPACES AROUND STATION – 0830am to 1030am

ROAD	*SPACES	Permits	9 th Oct am	13 th Oct am	Total	Spare
ADELAIDE	30		12		12	18
ALBERT	35		19		19	16
AVENUE ROAD	63		11		11	52
BLACKMORES	64			32	32	32
BRIDGEMAN	46			22	22	24
CEDAR ROAD	42			23	23	19
CHISTCHURCH	28			8	8	20
CLARENCE (part)	53		22		22	31
FIELD LANE	49			21	21	28
PARK ROAD (part)	80		12		12	68
STATION	107 [-25]			5	5	77
VICTORIA	61 [-10]		13		13	38
WALDEGRAVE	37			13	13	24
TOTAL	695 [-35]	348	89	124	213	447
LESS P&D/FT	35					
NETT TOTAL	660	348			213	447

7. CPZ VOTING IN TEDDINGTON – FOR TWO QUERIED ROADS

PARK ROAD											
YEAR	No. House s	No. Responses	Response rate	YES VOTE	% of Houses	NO VOTE	% of House s	No View	% of houses	No Reply	% of houses
2004 February	184	49	26.6%	14	7.6%	31	16.8%	4	2.2%	135	73.4%
2005 February	184	47	25.5%	21	11.4%	22	11.9%	4	2.2%	137	74.4%
2007(JUNE)	172	64	37.2%	22	12.8%	36	20.9%	6	3.5%	108	62.8%
East	172	20	11.6%	2		16		2			
North	172	44	25.6%	20		20		4			
2007(DEC)	172	58	33.7%	22	12.8%	31	18%	5	2.9%	114	66.3%
*1-87, 2-30	113	36	31.8%	17	15%	16	14.2%	3	2.6%	77	68.1%
89-173, 32-108	59	22	37.3%	5	8.5%	15	25.4%	2	3.4%	37	62.7%

*NOTE December 2007 (1-87 + 2-30) vote includes buildings etc. with off-road parking – more details required to prove majority

WALDEGRAVE											
YEAR	No. Hou	No. resp onses	Response rate	YES vote	% of Houses	NO Vote	% of house s	No View	% of houses	No Reply	% of house s
2004 February	268	68	25.4%	21	7.8%	36	13.4%	11	4.1%	200	72.6%
2005 February*	65	28	43.1%	19	29.2%	5	7.7%	4	6.1%	37	56.9%
2007(JUNE)	43	24	55.8%	12	27.9%	12	27.9%			19	44.2%
2007 December	82	29	35.4%	8	9.7%	19	23.2%	2	2.4%	53	64.6%
2007(DEC)** 1-69 2-8	58	13	22.4%	8	13.8%	3	5.2%	2	3.5%	45	77.6%

*Haymarket Motoring Publications still had an office in Waldegrave Road at this date

** Salami sliced from original NO vote – but not re-consulted on – installed for planning control purposes

8. Should you vote?

Yes – everyone should vote. Whether in favour of a CPZ or not, **but if in doubt vote NO** - to save the Teddington we know and love – and its shopping centres. The Society strongly opposes the expansion of the CPZ because removal of Park Road (west) from the CPZ, for example, will reduce parking pressures in Park Lane. Similarly, more spaces in Station Road should reduce pressures on Elmfield Avenue. Teddington has the highest car park fees outside Richmond, we have asked Councillors to negotiate a refund scheme with Tesco, also to reduce shopper pressures on Park Lane. They will not, but have asked Teddington Society to do it – and we will do our best to get Tesco to introduce such a scheme for everyone's benefit.