

## APPENDIX 5

### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE ABOUT CAR PARKING AND GARAGE PROPOSALS.

The following table provides a summary of specific responses to the parking and garage consultation received from tenants, leaseholders and freeholders, comments respond to proposals in the Cabinet report regarding garages and all other feedback will be taken into consideration as part of the detailed options appraisal for car parking.

Proposal	Proposal	Comment Received
<b>Parking Proposal 1</b>	<b>Introduction of a parking permit scheme at annual charge of £119</b>	<p>A total of 285 residents commented on the proposal to introduce a parking permit scheme at an annual charge</p> <p>74 residents who currently rent individual bays wanted to retain them. The main reasons were personal security, the security of their car, reduced insurance premiums and the problems of finding a space. An elderly residents said he would find it difficult to walk further if he could not park in his current bay and a parent noted that they would find it difficult with children if they had to walk further.</p> <p>85 objections were raised by residents who do not pay to park, do not want to pay, or consider the charge is too high. Some asked if they could pay in instalments.</p> <p>A large number wanted a restriction of one permit per household to stop abuse of the system. A number raised questions asking what would happen on small estates or blocks with few spaces but large number of dwellings.</p>

		<p>There was an acceptance that paid-for visitor parking was fair although many enquired as to the likely charges. There was agreement that current designated bays for visitors were regularly misused.</p> <p>A number of elderly residents raised the issue of parking for carers and some sheltered residents wanted to retain their parking for visitors and doctors.</p> <p>Contractor and staff parking was a key issue with many complaints that the current arrangements were being abused with cars or vans left all day and in some cases overnight in resident bays.</p>
<b>Parking Proposal 2</b>	<b>The provision of an effective enforcement service</b>	187 people commented on this proposal and the majority (154) were in favour. The trend in from comments was that residents wanted enforcement during the evening, on football match days and on those estates close to venues such as Hammersmith Apollo. Enforcement was also requested at weekends to stop shoppers taking resident parking, especially close to Westfield.
<b>Garages Proposal 1</b>	<b>Increase the weekly charge for a garage and motorcycle garage to a level nearer the market rate</b>	Around 151 residents commented on this proposal and the majority were in favour (97) of a realistic charge but were concerned it was not market rent, as they considered high property values in the borough would make the garage rents unaffordable.
<b>Garage Proposal 2</b>	<b>Improve the condition of lettable garages</b>	122 residents commented and the vast majority (105) wanted improvements, those that did not tended to already rent a garage in good condition.
<b>Proposal 1 Fulham Court and Lancaster Court Estates</b>	<b>To include the estates in the local Controlled Parking Zone</b>	Very few residents responded, 36 of a possible 550. There were 18 objections mainly from residents that rented individual bays and wanted to keep them or that they do not want to pay for parking. There was one concern about increased traffic and the safety of children on the estate. 12 residents supported the proposal

<b>Proposal 2 Fulham and Parking Lancaster Court Estates</b>	<b>The provision of an effective enforcement service</b>	Residents considered that the controlled zone hours were not long enough and football fans would regularly take up spaces on the estate.
--	--	--

### **Other feedback on parking proposals**

#### **TRA and Area Forum meetings**

Officers attended a number of Tenant Resident Association meetings and area forum meetings to present proposals and capture feedback.

#### **Queen Caroline estate TRA meeting**

**Feedback:** Residents requested parking on the estate to be restricted to residents and visitors to prevent visitors to venues such as the Hammersmith Apollo from parking on the estate and taking resident parking.

#### **Lancaster Court AGM**

##### **The meeting wanted the following points noted:**

Residents of Lancaster court did not agree with CPZ proposal and requested that for the current system remain in place. Residents also did not want non-residents parking on the estate residents, wanted council to investigate bye laws to see if enforcement could be done that way.

They did not like the idea of first come first serve allocation of permits and were concerned enforcement would not work and people not entitled would still park on the estate.

#### **William Church TRA**

Officers presented the proposals and took questions on options presented. There were no formal concerns raised at the meeting.

### **Robert Owen estate TRA**

**Feedback:** residents felt that the £119 payment is too high and suggested that half the cost would be better. Residents also suggest that locked gates could be provided as an alternative.

A question was raised as to whether the income from permits would be used to pay for CCTV and residents requested that there be transparency of the money collected how it will be used. i.e. income from permits , enforcement and how much is invested in parking

Residents felt that paying for parking would put further pressure on their finances.

In relation to the permitting system residents felt that if they paid for parking, they should be able to park anywhere in the borough and that permits should be limited to permits per household.

### **Maystar Resident Association (a multi landlord estate including Cheesman Terrace and Alice Gilliat)**

Residents submitted a petition opposing the proposals to introduce parking charges for estate parking. The letter received raised six questions regarding the operation of the potential new parking enforcement arrangements should Cabinet approve the recommendations. A response to these questions was sent to the lead resident on the 02 April 2013.

Feedback from the Maystar residents Association 15 May 2013

#### Parking

Permits issued to estate residents should cover all H&F estates, rather than being estate specific.

A permit system is a money making scheme by the Council

They had concerns over visitor permits and bays under a new system

The introduction of a permit system would result in hardship for low income households

Households that have more than one permit to park should continue to keep them under the new arrangements

### Garage proposals

Long term garage tenants who had never been in arrears should be protected from increases in garage rents  
Waiting lists should prioritise residents on estates over private applicants.

**Comment:** The proposal relating to garage charges is to simplify the charge into two fees. One for motor cycle and one for vehicle garages this would be applied consistently across the borough, with vacant garages allocated on a first come first serve basis if all criteria are met.

### Wood Lane Residents Association

Wood Lane Residents Association would like to retain their individual bays as there are 35 spaces and 144 dwellings.

### South Area Forum

#### **Feedback:**

Residents were generally positive about the proposals, were aware of inconsistencies between estates and wanted the same scheme for all. Residents supported Blue Badge Holder proposals.

Residents appreciated the consultation exercise and that the council had written to every resident to seek their views

Residents supported a flat fee of £119 as it would be consistent with charges for street properties.

There was consensus that garages needed to be improved and that there should be a short, medium and long term programme.

Residents wanted contractors to pay for parking on estates as there were 16 vans on the Clem Atlee taking up resident spaces.

Residents felt that in general they only want residents of the estate to park on the estate.

**Comments:** Feedback from the forum is in line with the proposals recommended to Cabinet for garage investment.

### **South Fulham Leaseholders Forum**

**Feedback:** the forum raised concerns that the proposal to increase garage rent in line with market rates would result in a significant increase in rental costs and that market rates may differ from area to area across the borough.

The forum was also concerned about differential charges between leaseholders and tenant for garages. The forum understood that leaseholders currently pay a higher charges compared to council tenants.

the forum wanted to ensure that the parking space lining work would be completed as part of any new parking arrangements and that this would be of a suitable quality similar to on the public highway.

**Comments:** the proposed changes to garage rent will mean that costs are standardised across the borough and the charging system will be simplified to two payments – one for cars and one for motorcycles. The proposed monthly/annual charge remains below the market rate and compares favourably with neighbouring boroughs costs.

### **Sample of general comments**

Not all comments are reproduced.

The following is a brief example, again not comprehensive, of general comments that demonstrated either positive or negative views about the car parking and garage proposals.

#### Positive comments

“It appears inevitable that general parking charges will be introduced as some motorists are already paying such a charge. That being so, it is only fair that we all contribute to the same degree.”

“We accept that charging to park is almost inevitable. Can resident permits be limited ... The system to renew estate permits has to be improved.”

“Anything to make it fairer – at present some of us pay and display a permit for parking on the Springvale estate yet many use the estate as a free car parking facility- including people who don’t even live on the estate, which is very unfair.”

“The proposal is fair. I agree with it”.

“Proposals to charge seem fair and if implemented then parking enforcement must be run in tandem”.

“I believe all people parking on the estate should pay the same charge as street parking... All garages should be offered to current occupants at full market rates, many of the people are subletting them at these rates. Why should people getting subsidised housing get a subsidised garage as well? Or, if they are in bad condition they should be sold at auction to the free market.”

#### Negative comments

“To levy a charge for parking on the estate is just another ploy to generate additional income for the local authority and it is totally unacceptable in this difficult economic climate.”

“Having rented a parking space for over 30 years and not having to drive around looking for a parking space I would not like any changes to the current parking on Sullivan Court”

“The current arrangements are more than adequate and fair. I do not want to lose my parking space.”

“...Your letter indicates residents would be provided a ‘first come first serve ‘ option, but this has been abused on our estate by some households registering 2 or 3 cars... This has caused issues for other residents, and needs to be limited to one permit per household with clear penalties for abuse of this system”.

“The SMART visitor permit is still too expensive. I have a carer, they need to come everyday and park for at least 5-6 hours.”