

Appendix C – Summary of Comments (Area 2)

METHODOLOGY

Officers reviewed community feedback (from members, residents, and businesses) regarding e-bike parking bay locations. The following **safety and functional criteria** were considered when assessing community comments:

- **Obstructions to Vehicular Movements:** Bays should not significantly impede the flow or movement of vehicles in the area, for instance by narrowing the carriageway compared to their former use.
- **Sightline Issues for Vehicular Traffic:** Bays should not worsen sightlines for drivers, compared to their former use (typically vehicle parking), which is crucial for road safety.
- **Safety of Bike Users:** Bays located in high traffic areas or at junctions should not pose unacceptable risks when retrieving/parking bikes.
- **Impact on Pedestrian Flow:** Bays should not disrupt pedestrian ‘desire lines’ or cause crowding in high-footfall areas.
- **Environmental Concerns:** Any potential impact on local greenery, drainage, or nearby wildlife habitats must be considered.
- **Utilization:** Consistently high utilisation may suggest the need for an additional bay in the vicinity. However, if a bike bay shows consistently low usage*, this has also been reviewed to see if relocation/removal of the bay might be warranted. This needs to be carefully balanced against whether this would have a detrimental impact on the overall e-bike parking network and user confidence in the scheme. In these cases, a longer period of assessment may be appropriate.

**Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a month (July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review & monitoring.*

Recommendations have been made regarding the outcome for each parking bay:

- Retain the bay (i.e. transition from experimental to permanent)
- Relocate the bay (within the ward)
- Remove the bay (without relocation)
- Add a new bay (due to demonstrable parking demand and pressure on the bay or to plug existing gaps in network coverage)

THEMED COMMENTS

Similar comments have been grouped into the following themes:

1. **Traffic safety or flow**
2. **Vehicle Parking**
3. **Mis-parked bikes**
4. **Anti-social behaviour / noise**
5. **Bay utilization**
6. **Service impacts**
7. **Lime operations**
8. **Docking station request**
9. **Consultation**

The table below provides officer responses to these comments. General comments related to e-bike operations, such as mis-parked bikes, noise complaints, anti-social behaviour, etc. tend not to be site-specific as these can occur in any parking bay. As such, they were not considered reasons to remove/relocate a bay, unless there were site specific considerations.

#	Theme	Description	Officer Comments
1	Traffic safety or flow	Lime bike bay blocks sightlines, narrows the carriageway, causes congestion or other traffic issues	The parking bays were installed after careful engineering analysis and site visits to consider all relevant safety and functional criteria, as outlined on page 1 above. Where any bays received comments or concerns related to safety/traffic flow, these were again assessed against these criteria. Where no issues were identified, the bay was retained. Where warranted, the section below outlines site-specific responses to safety concerns, explaining the reason for retention. Where issues were identified, these bays have been identified for relocation or removal.
2	Vehicle Parking	Loss of vehicle parking spaces for residents, visitors, and/or businesses	<p>The e-bike scheme is part of Hounslow's Kerbside Strategy, which is in turn part of the Council's ambitious plans for a healthier, greener and safer Hounslow. The Kerbside Strategy reimagines our streets for the benefit of more residents, businesses and visitors, providing a comprehensive overview of all transport priorities in Hounslow. Reallocating select vehicle parking bays to e-bike parking bays meets the Kerbside Strategy objectives of providing more sustainable mobility, improved health and wellbeing, and improving accessibility and inclusion. Vehicle parking pressures and utilization were considered and weighed against other selection criteria when choosing e-bike parking locations.</p> <p>It should be noted that e-bike parking bays were introduced in response to the unauthorized 'free-floating' scheme previously operated by Lime in the borough. Dedicated parking bays are necessary in order to combat the nuisance and hazard that dockless rental e-bikes can cause on footways, particularly for people who have impaired vision or are using wheelchairs or buggies. In order to accommodate the number of bikes that are in circulation in the borough, e-bike parking bays need to be at least the size of a car (one car parking space is five metres – providing space for ten dockless e-bikes). Most footways in the borough are not wide enough to accommodate a bay. Consequently, most e-</p>

			bike bays need to be on the carriageway, usually in existing marked car parking bays. This reduction in car parking is thus necessary in order for the e-bike operators and users to park the e-bikes in ways that do not obstruct the footway.
3	Mis-parked bikes	Bikes left outside of parking bays, causing obstructions and aesthetic concerns	<p>Hounslow officers work closely with Lime to monitor operations. Scheme monitoring shows that 95% of trip ends are parked compliantly. Users who do not park within a bay at the end of their trip face a fine, the level of which increases after each use, before they are ultimately banned from the scheme. We regularly review fine levels with Lime to ensure that the fine increments that are applied after each incident are having the desired impact on rates of repeated non-compliance after the first fine has been issued.</p> <p>Lime are very open that there is always likely to be a degree of user error that will be difficult to eliminate completely given the volume of trips starting and ending in the borough. Nonetheless, we continually push Lime to review their processes to see what further improvements can be made and raise any issues with them, whilst undertaking our own independent checks on parking compliance to inform these discussions.</p> <p>Our agreement with Lime sets out operator response times dictating how quickly Lime is expected to respond to issues such as mis-parked or damaged bicycles. Where a Lime bike is damaged/not operational (but not causing an obstruction), it must be removed within 24 hours from the time of receipt of notification and repaired before returning to the fleet. Where a Lime bike presents a danger or obstruction, it must be removed within 2 hours from the time of receipt of notification. Council staff monitor response times and to date Lime has been meeting the required timelines. Lime have also recently increased the number of operations staff they have working in Hounslow to help re-distribute mis-parked e-bikes into the marked bays.</p>
4	Anti-social behaviour / noise	Users gathering at parking bays, talking/shouting, property damage from bikes falling onto vehicles	<p>General comments related to e-bike operations, such as mis-parked bikes, noise complaints, anti-social behaviour, etc. tend not to be site-specific as these can occur in any parking bay. As such, they were not considered reasons to remove/relocate a bay, unless there were site specific considerations.</p> <p>Both the Council and operator strongly condone vandalism and antisocial behaviour associated with Lime bikes. Lime work very closely with local boroughs, police and schools to address these issues.</p>
5	Bay utilization	Bays have too many or too few bikes	<p>The borough has access to utilization data provided by Lime, showing usage data for each parking bay. This was considered as part of this review, along with several other key metrics, to help determine whether a particular bay is under- or over-utilized. This analysis is not based on observations of whether a bay is empty or full at a given snapshot in time. In general, different bays experience varying levels of use at different times of the day/days of the week depending on location context and usage patterns – for example, a bay near a tube station may be full of bikes in the morning when people commute in to connect to public transport, and then it may be empty in the evening as commuters come off the train and complete their last-mile trip home on a shared e-bike.</p> <p>Lime’s operations team rebalances e-bike bays across the borough (meaning they pick up bikes from congested areas and redistribute them to empty bays as</p>

			needed). If there are ever issues with bays that are persistently empty or overcrowded, the Council will work with the operator to address this concern.
6	Service impacts	Impacts to services such as rubbish collection or emergency services	The parking bays were installed after careful engineering analysis and site visits to consider all relevant safety and functional criteria, as outlined on page 1 above. This includes assessing impacts on services. If any issues are identified, the Council will work between departments to address these issues.
7	Lime operations	Noise from operator vans rebalancing bikes, problems with app, issues with Lime customer service	<p>General comments related to e-bike operations, such as mis-parked bikes, noise complaints, anti-social behaviour, etc. tend not to be site-specific as these can occur in any parking bay. As such, they were not considered reasons to remove/relocate a bay, unless there were site specific considerations.</p> <p>Where operator issues are site-specific, the Council will work with Lime to mitigate the issue. Where there are issues with the Lime App or customer service, the Council will work with Lime staff to address the issue.</p>
8	Docking Station	Request for docked bike share system instead of dockless	<p>Implementing an e-bike scheme with physical docks is not operationally or financially feasible in Hounslow at this time. Docked e-bike share systems are very expensive to install and also require agreement and investment from other boroughs across London to implement. This is because on a practical level, shared e-bike users do not pay attention to borough boundaries – they want to travel to destinations across London, meaning bikes are constantly crossing borough boundaries. As such, bikeshare in Hounslow cannot operate in isolation – it needs to be considered at a regional, London-wide level.</p> <p>Transport for London funded the initial installation and subsequent expansion of the docked bikeshare scheme in Central London. However, due to high costs, there are currently no plans for Transport for London to fund further expansion into Hounslow. The newer GPS-enabled dockless bikeshare systems – like the one operating in Hounslow – enables schemes to be implemented for far less capital investment than a docked system. Most new e-bike share systems being implemented around the world are dockless.</p>
9	Consultation	Lack of consultation re. installation of parking bays	<p>The e-bike scheme is part of Hounslow’s Kerbside Strategy, which was approved on 16 July 2024. Read the Cabinet report here. Appendix 2 of the Cabinet Report includes a Consultation Report.</p> <p>The parking bays were implemented through an experimental traffic management order (ETMO) for an initial six months, with the possibility of extension to up to 18 months. As part of the ETMO process, the Council is required to collect feedback for the first 6 months of the trial, at minimum. However, the Cabinet report above recommended that the e-bike trial be extended so that data for a full 12-month period could be evaluated in each of the three e-bike areas. This gave residents the opportunity to try using the e-bikes across all seasons and provide feedback on the scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council’s website provides a full overview of the scheme, including links to Cabinet Reports and Chief Officer Decision reports.</p>

DETAILED COMMENT SUMMARY

Comments received for each parking bay are summarized below. Where a response is covered by a themed response from the section above, the corresponding theme number is referenced. Where a site-specific response is warranted, this has been provided below.

As of 19 September 2024, each area of the e-bike scheme has been active for over 12 months. Although the Council continues to welcome feedback on the e-bike scheme, comments received after 19 September are not included in the community comment summary below. Comments received after that date will instead be recorded and assessed separately as part of ongoing scheme monitoring, with further scheme changes made where appropriate.

AREA 2

Hounslow Central

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Bristow Road, adjacent to 37 Inwood Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Ellington Road (o/s 94)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Elmsworth Ave, adjacent to 133 Lampton Road</u>	Mis-parked bikes, anti-social behaviour, traffic safety (potential for accidents), concern about borough-wide pedestrian safety; requested relocation	See Themed Response 1, 3, 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. This location has been reviewed to maintain its functionality within a busy residential street while ensuring accessibility and safety for both e-bike users and other road users. The placement aligns with 	Retain

		operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards.	
<u>High Street Hounslow, Adjacent to Argos, o/s 135</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Lampton Road, opp Central House</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Lampton Road, opp to Hounslow Central Station</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Laurence Road close to the junction with the High Street</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Queens Road, adjacent to 53 Lampton Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Prince Regent Road, o/s the Gym Group</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Tiverton Road, adjacent to 100 Kingsley Road</u>	Mis-parked bikes, traffic flow/safety, anti-social behaviour, litter	See Themed Response 1, 3, 4	Retain
<u>Tiverton Road adjacent to 2 Denbigh Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Whitton Road o/s 14 to 16</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Hounslow East

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>The Drive, at the junction of Worton Way</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>North Drive o/s 1-76 Aces Court</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>London Road at the junction Star Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Pears Road, o/s 103 Hyde House</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Stanborough Road opp 137</u>	Parking loss, traffic flow/safety (blind corner), anti-social behaviour, mis-parked bikes	See Themed Response 2, 3, 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been carefully assessed against the reported safety concerns. Whilst it is near a junction, visibility studies indicate that the line of sight for approaching drivers remains within acceptable safety thresholds for the posted speed limit. Additionally, the presence of traffic calming measures in the area naturally reduces vehicle speeds, mitigating potential accident risks. Importantly, the e-bike bay replaces an existing vehicle parking space, ensuring no additional obstruction is introduced, and maintaining the established parking and traffic flow dynamics of the area. 	Retain

Hounslow Heath

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Albert Road, adjacent to 84 Hibernia Road</u>	Prioritization of e-bikes over street cleaning, anti-social behaviour, preference for docked e-bike schemes	See Themed Response 4, 6, 8	Retain
<u>Cromwell Road o/s 255</u>	Mis-parked bikes, parking loss; requested relocation	Bay to be removed	Remove due to user safety concerns
<u>Grove Road, o/s Grove Court</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Grove Road, junction with Cromwell Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Midsummer Avenue opp 112</u>	Parking loss	See Themed Response 2	Retain
<u>Parkside Road, adjacent to 1 St Stephen's Road</u>	Traffic safety/operations (proximity to junction); requested removal	Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. At the junctions there remains sufficient lengths of existing double yellow lines ensure the junctions remain unobstructed, Furthermore, the road is satisfactorily wide enough to accommodate large statutory vehicles, ensuring smooth traffic flow and access for delivery vans or cabs turning into the road. 	Retain
<u>Wellington Road South o/s 243</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Rossindel Road, adjacent to 112 Cromwell Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

<u>St Stephen's Road</u>	Traffic safety/operations (proximity to junction), aesthetic concerns, lack of consultation (conservation area), preference for docked e-bike schemes; requested relocation	See Themed Response 3, 8, 9 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. • At the junctions there remains sufficient lengths of existing double yellow lines ensure the junctions remain unobstructed, Furthermore, the road is satisfactorily wide enough to accommodate vehicles, ensuring smooth traffic flow and access for vehicles turning into the road. 	Retain
<u>Munster Ave. adjacent to 430 Staines Road</u>	Mis-parked bikes, questioning demand for bikes, lack of consultation	Bay to be relocated	Relocate to footway on Staines Rd
<u>Station road adjacent to 75Aa Whitton Road</u>	Parking loss (and reduced service levels for permit holders), mis-parked bikes, aesthetic concerns; requested relocation	See Themed Response 2, 3	Retain
<u>Vickers Way, rear of 1-8 Raglan Close</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Wellington Road South (191) - outside Hounslow Meat Store</u>	Noise, anti-social behaviour	See Themed Response 4	Retain

Hounslow South

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Arnold Crescent,</u> <u>along flank wall of</u> <u>248 Whitton Dene</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Atcham Road,</u> <u>in jct with Heath</u> <u>Road.</u>	Parking loss, traffic flow/congestion, mis-parked bikes; requested relocation	See Themed Response 2, 3 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. 	Retain
<u>Central Ave o/s</u> <u>146 to 148</u>	Mis-parked bikes (causing obstructions), parking loss; requested relocation	Bay to be removed	Remove due to network analysis and bay rationalization
<u>Chatsworth Cres.</u> <u>adjacent to 198</u> <u>Heath Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Eaton Road,</u> <u>adjacent to 128</u> <u>Ellerdine Road</u>	Parking loss, litter, traffic safety	Bay being relocated	Relocate south-eastward by 3 metres (creating space at junction)
<u>Essex Avenue,</u> <u>adjacent to 5</u> <u>Abinger Gardens</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain (need to remove from TMO and re-consult on retention due to spelling error in current TMO)
<u>Lyncroft Gardens</u> <u>adjacent to 17</u> <u>Central Avenue.</u>	Noise complaints	N/A	Remove bay due to placement concerns
<u>Maswell Park</u> <u>Road opp 15,</u> <u>outside Hounslow</u> <u>Train Station</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

<u>Norbury Avenue, adjacent to 100 Central Ave</u>	Parking loss	See Themed Response 2	Retain
<u>Sussex Avenue, at the junction of Woodlands Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Whitton Dene, Adjacent to 305</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Hounslow West

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Basildene Road Opp Basildene House</u>	Lime operations (frustration with bike removal process); requested relocation	See Themed Response 7	Retain
<u>Bath Road o/s 364 to 366</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Relocate to adjacent inset due to positioning of seasonal Christmas tree
<u>Bath Road (opp 11, Phoenix House / Heart of Hounslow Health Centre)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Bath Road, on f/w west of Hounslow West underground</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Relocate to inset area currently occupied by telephone kiosk (subject to planning consent)
<u>Cambridge Road, adjacent to 134 Martindale Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Cranbrook Road, adjacent to 335 Staines Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Dene Avenue, junction with Sutton Lane</u>	Mis-parked bikes, traffic flow/safety, property damage, anti-social behaviour, fear of reduced property values	See Themed Response 3, 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. 	Retain

<u>Francis Road, opp 59 along flank wall of 3 Manor Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hussar's Close, adj to 26 Heathdale Ave</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Laurel Gardens, junction Barrack Road</u>	Mis-parked bikes (obstruction), noise complaint, property damage	See Themed Response 3, 4	Retain
<u>Martindale Road, 85</u>	Lime operations (poor responsiveness), noise complaints, anti-social behaviour, mis-parked bikes (obstruction), consultation, parking loss; requested relocation or removal	See Themed Response 2, 3, 4, 7, 9	Retain
<u>Rosemary Avenue, Adjacent to 15</u>	Mis-parked bikes (obstructions)	See Themed Response 3	Retain
<u>Staines Road o/s 577 to 579</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Staines Road 23/59, Trinity Square</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Isleworth

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Braddock Close</u>	Traffic flow/safety	<p>Bay assessed for safety concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing double yellow lines (DYLs) at the junction are of sufficient length to accommodate a vehicle turning into the road and safely waiting for oncoming traffic to pass. As with many residential roads where parking is permitted, the available width allows for a single lane of moving traffic, requiring two-way traffic to stop and give way regardless of whether it is bikes or cars parked at the current location. It is noted that this location was previously a permit bay, and the installation of the bike bay has not introduced any new obstructions. The road experiences limited through traffic as it is a short cul-de-sac providing access to two car parks serving 30 flats and a nursing home. 	Retain
<u>Mogden Lane opp 23 to 25</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>North Street, opposite the junction with Parthenia Drive</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>South Street</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Summerwood Road, to the side of Mogden Lane flats</u>	Traffic flow/safety (junction concerns); requested relocation	Bay to be relocated	Relocate bay to Mogden Lane, beyond Ambulance Station

<u>Cleveland Road, at the junction of Twickenham Road</u>	Traffic flow/safety/congestion, mis-parked bikes; requested relocation	See Themed Response 3 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. 	Retain
<u>Twickenham Road, o/s Isleworth Town School</u>	Mis-parked bikes (obstruction), traffic flow/safety, anti-social behaviour, noise complaints	See Themed Response 3, 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footway provides sufficient access for pedestrians, including wheelchair users and individuals with pushchairs. • The bike bay is 2 metres in width, leaving ample space on the footway for pedestrian movement. • After the bike bay, approximately 3.5 metres of footway remains available, accommodating safe navigation for all users, including those with mobility aids or pushchairs. • Following a review, this location is not considered a risk to pedestrian safety. 	Retain
<u>Worple Avenue junction with Dawes Avenue</u>	Mis-parked bikes, reports of abandoned scooters	See Themed Response 3 The borough does not currently have an e-scooter hire scheme.	Retain
<u>Kings Terrace opp 22-23</u>	Mis-parked bikes, parking loss, anti-social behaviour, fear of reduced property values; requested removal	See Themed Response 2, 3, 4	Retain

Osterley & Spring Grove

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation
<u>Bassett Gardens</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Borough Road opp 51</u>	Mis-parked bikes (obstructions), traffic flow/safety	See Themed Response 3 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions. 	Retain
<u>College Road jct with London Road</u>	Traffic flow/congestion, mis-parked bikes (obstruction), design critique (bollards), parking loss, property damage	See Themed Response 1, 2, 3, 4 Bay to be relocated	Relocate to move bay away from junction to reduce risk of adverse interactions between bay users and vehicles. Noted a higher volume of traffic accessing/egressing the junction, and e-bike bay has high usage (>300 trip starts/month).
<u>Gower Road, adjacent to 177 Syon Lane</u>	Anti-social behaviour, safety concerns, mis-parked bikes (obstruction), traffic flow/safety; requested removal	See Themed Response 3, 4 Bay to be relocated	Relocate to move bay away from junction to reduce visibility to pupils (and thus lower risk of antisocial behaviour). Officers have requested to Lime that they ensure bay is regularly reviewed and rebalanced.
<u>Wood Lane opp 99/101</u>	Mis-parked bikes	See Themed Response 3	Retain

Harlequin Avenue (8) Orchard House	Mis-parked bikes (obstruction), anti-social behaviour, safety risks	See Themed Response 3, 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The presence of bollards within the parking bay extent is accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions.	Retain
Harvard Road jnct with London Road	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
Lulworth Avenue	Mis-parked bikes (obstructions)	See Themed Response 3	Retain (need to remove from TMO and re-consult on retention due to spelling error in current TMO)
Musgrave Road junction with Wood Lane	No comments/objections received	N/A	Relocate to move bay away from junction due to the narrowness of the carriageway and the higher volume of vehicular movements accessing and egressing the road (appears to be used as a cut-through from the A4/Syon Lane).
Pevensey Close, adjacent 111 Jersey Road	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove bay due to low utilisation and proximity to other bays
Roxborough Avenue adjacent to 36 Northumberland Avenue	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
Spencer Road, adjacent to 174 Spring Grove	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

<u>Syon Park Gardens, adjacent to 834 Great West Road (A4)</u>	Mis-parked bikes	See Themed Response 3 Bay to be relocated	Relocate to move bay away from junction due to the potentially higher speeds that vehicles are accessing the road from the A4 and the possible safety concerns this may bring.
<u>Thornbury Road o/s 1 St Christopher's close</u>	Traffic flow/safety/congestion, parking loss, anti-social behaviour, littering; requested relocation	See Themed Response 2, 4	Retain
<u>St Mary's Crescent, adjacent to 151 Thornbury Road</u>	Traffic flow/safety (junction concerns)	Bay to be relocated	Relocate bay to existing double yellow lines at the opposite end of the parking bays
<u>St Mary's Crescent, opposite 66</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove to improve turning movements for buses. The Council will monitor the impact on the overall parking network following removal of the bay.
<u>Thornbury Avenue, adjacent to 120 Thornbury Road</u>	Mis-parked bikes (obstruction); requested removal	See Themed Response 3 Bay to be relocated	Relocate to move bay away from junction to improve accessibility for larger vehicles (e.g., delivery vehicles) to the local sports club. This also allows the bay to be co-located next to a car club bay, creating a shared mobility hub.
<u>Villiers Road Opp 6 and 7</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain