

Appendix C – Summary of Comments (Area 3)

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:** Utilisation describes how many e-bike trips started from a parking bay in a given month. Consistently high utilisation may suggest the need for an additional bay in the vicinity. In other parts of the borough, bays have been flagged for review due to identified issues with bays being overcapacity and/or demonstrated high utilisation plus community comments. No bays in Area 3 currently meet these criteria as it is still relatively newly established. Parking bays showing consistently low utilisation* have also been reviewed to see if relocation/removal of the bay might be warranted. Any decision to remove a parking bay 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. In parts of the borough that currently have lower historic uptake of active/sustainable transport, it is important to give the scheme time to grow. Shared e-bikes can provide a convenient transport option in areas that are poorly served by public transport, but behaviour change takes time.

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

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 3

Bedfont

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Bedfont Road, adj to New Square Business Park</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove (low utilisation)
<u>Bell Lane j/w Staines Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove (low utilisation)
<u>Benedict Drive (adj no 15)</u>	Traffic safety/flow (visibility of bay on bend); requested relocation	Bay to be removed	Remove (low utilisation)
<u>Cains Lane j/w Hatton Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hatchett Road j/w Bedfont Green Close</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hatton Green, adj to No. 140 Faggs Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Longleat Way j/w Hatton Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>New Road, adj. to No. 422 Staines Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

<u>North Road j/w Hatton Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove (ASB concerns)
<u>Oak Way j/w Southville Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove (low utilisation)
<u>Sherborne Road j/w Grovestile Way</u>	Low bay utilization, loss of vehicle parking; requested removal	See Themed Response 2, 5	Retain
<u>Staines Road (481), adj to j/w Gould Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Cranford

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Arundel Road (27), outside Beavers Primary School</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Bath Road (554)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Berkeley Ave (Junc w Bath Road 728)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Chaucer Avenue (4), junction with Woolfield Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Clevedon Gardens, adjacent to 622 Bath Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Firs Drive, adjacent to 1 to 75 Pine Tree Close flats</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Great South West Road (97)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Green Lane, outside Heathrow International Trading Estate</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hawthorn Close, adjacent to 65 High Street</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity of bay to junction)	Bay to be relocated	Relocate to inset parking area further into Hawthorn Close
<u>Legrace Avenue, adjacent to 448 to 450 Bath Road, Swallowfield House</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

<u>Mornington Crescent adjacent to 693 Bath Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Salisbury Road, close to the entrance of Beavers Farm Car Park</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Feltham North

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Baber Drive, adj to No. 160 Hounslow Road</u>	Traffic safety/flow (bay visibility/restricting carriageway), service impacts (emergency services)	See Themed Response 1, 6 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. Bollards within the parking bay are accounted for and do not extend into the carriageway, avoiding any further narrowing of the road or creation of new obstructions. Double yellow lines opposite the e-bike bay ensure a clearway, maintaining driver visibility and access for larger statutory vehicles. 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	Retain
<u>Brainton Ave (adj no 32)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Burns Avenue j/w Shakespeare Avenue</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Carlton Avenue, adj to No. 88</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Central Way, adj unit 1 Marlin Park</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Harlington Road West (Opp Nos. 87 & 89)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hounslow Road, adj to Feltham Assembly Hall</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

<u>Space Way (Adj to Unit 3)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Sparrow Farm Drive (outside 5 Central Parade)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Staines Road (No. 371, site layout changed since streetview image)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Staines Road (Nos. 129 & 131)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Feltham West

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Ashford Road, adj to Oak Hill Academy</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Bedfont Lane, public realm area between shops and railway bridge</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Bedfont Road (Opp No. 66)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Chertsey Road service road j/w Cranleigh Road</u>	Noted potential for noise concerns/disturbance to residents	See Themed Response 4	Retain
<u>High Street, Feltham j/w Bedfont Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Highfield Road, adj to 'The Centre' car park</u>	Mis-parked bikes, anti-social behaviour	Bay to be relocated	Relocate south to pavement adjacent to Aldi car park
<u>Raleigh Road (Outside No. 95)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>St Dunstan's Road, adj to No. 250 High Street</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Westmacott Drive, at southernmost j/w Bedfont Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Westmacott Drive, west of the j/w Padstow Walk</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

Hanworth Park

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Alfred Road j/w Hanworth Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Boundaries Road adj to No. 220 Uxbridge Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Cardinal Road j/w Hanworth Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Elizabeth Way j/w Queens Way</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity to junction), mis-parked bikes, poor lighting, conservation area, location inhibits for bay visibility/access	See Themed Response 1, 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. Bollards within the parking bay are accounted for and do not extend into the carriageway, avoiding any further narrowing of the road or creation of new obstructions. Double yellow lines at the junction up to the e-bike bay ensure a clearway for vehicles negotiating at the junction and will aid driver visibility and access for larger statutory vehicles. 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. We have not received any previous user complaints regarding accessibility to the e-bike bay due to poor street lighting, nor have we identified any accident statistics indicating lighting visibility as a concern or a contributing factor to collisions. However, we understand the importance of safety 	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

		and visibility. We will continue to monitor this matter and, if necessary, raise it with the Street Lighting Department to review the lighting conditions on Elizabeth Way.	
<u>Elmwood Avenue (Opp No. 21)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Forest Road j/w Browell's Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>High Street j/w Elmwood Avenue</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>High Street j/w Parkfield Crescent</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>High Street, Feltham - adj to pond</u>	Mis-parked bikes, anti-social behaviour (bikes thrown in pond), bay too close to war memorial	Bay to be removed	Remove (low utilisation/ASB concerns)
<u>Kings Road, adj to No. 106 Queens Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Ludlow Road, adj to No. 55 Sunbury Road</u>	Noise complaint, bay will add to congestion on pavement (existing local park access and dog walkers)	See Themed Response 4 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay assessed for safety concerns. No safety issues have been identified regarding carriageway/vehicular safety concerns, nor are there any concerns relating to hinderance of park entrance. Congestion of the footway should not be impacted by the e-bike bay, as bikes are to be ridden on the carriageway and not the footway. 	Retain
<u>Poplar Way j/w Sycamore Close</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Roebuck Close j/w Beagle Close</u>	Traffic safety/flow (posts in the bay obstructing exit from estate), mis-parked bikes, bay is underutilized, aesthetic concerns	Bay to be removed	Remove (low utilisation, resident concerns)

Hanworth Village

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Bear Road (Opp No. 98)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Bideford Close j/w Exeter Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Hounslow Road (Outside No. 88)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Lebanon Avenue (Adj to No. 1)</u>	Traffic safety/flow (restricting carriageway); requests DYL opposite the e-bike bay to ensure sufficient width (i.e. not requesting bay removal)	See Themed Response 1 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	Retain
<u>Mount Road (Opp No. 1)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Nene Gardens j/w Saxon Avenue</u>	Parking loss resulting in personal safety concerns (needing to park further from residence/walk longer distances during late evenings), lack of consultation/communication	See Themed Response 2, 9 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The e-bike bay supports the council's goals of promoting sustainable transport, reducing congestion, and improving air quality. While it replaces a parking space, it offers an alternative travel option that may ease parking pressures over time. 	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about personal safety are noted, and the e-bike bay can enhance community safety by increasing activity and footfall. This initiative aligns with the vision of creating safer, healthier, and more sustainable streets, and its impact will be monitored to ensure it benefits the community. 	
<u>Pevensy Road, adj to 353 Hounslow Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Riverdale Road, adj to No. 1 Stourton Avenue</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>South Road (Opp 59)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>St George's Road, adj to No. 13 Bear Road</u>	Traffic safety/flow, parking loss, service impacts (blocking emergency vehicles), anti-social behaviour, low bay utilization, mis-parked bikes; requested removal	<p>See Themed Response 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</p> <p>Bay assessed for safety concerns:</p> <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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	Retain
<u>Sunningdale Avenue j/w Hampton Road West</u>	Traffic safety/flow (bikes coming into fast flow traffic), loss of parking	<p>See Themed Response 1, 2</p> <p>Bay assessed for safety concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 6-metre e-bike bay has been strategically positioned to replace an existing car parking space within the one-hour maximum stay bay. This ensures there is no additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow. The 	Retain

		<p>presence of bollards within the parking bay area has been accounted for and does not extend into the carriageway, thereby avoiding further narrowing of the road or creating any new obstructions for road users or pedestrians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This location has been carefully reviewed to maintain functionality within a busy residential street while ensuring accessibility and safety for both e-bike users and other road users. The placement complies with operational safety standards and has been designed to minimize potential congestion or hazards. • While the e-bike bay replaces an existing parking space, it provides an opportunity to encourage sustainable transport options, potentially reducing demand for car parking in the area over time. The impact on local shop parking is acknowledged, and the Council will monitor usage patterns and resident feedback to assess its effectiveness. • The issue of flooding near the chip shop, which reduces parking availability, has been noted and will be passed on to the drainage team for further investigation and consideration during future reviews of the area. 	
<u>Swift Road, adj to Nos. 1-7 Hardie House</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Wigley Road (Adj to 173)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Wigley Road j/w Uxbridge Road service road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Woodlawn Drive j/w Uxbridge Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

Heston Central

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Bath Road, outside Noel Court</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Broad Walk, opp 81</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity to junction), mentioned that the post used to demarcate bay is the first sight upon entering road	See Themed Response 1 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	Retain
<u>Church Road, outside 1 to 5 Stanworth Court</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Kingswood Avenue adjacent to telegraph pole, junction with Great West Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>New Heston Road, outside Heston Royal British Legion</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Queenswood Avenue, west of the junction with Sutton Lane</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity to junction)	See Themed Response 1 Bay assessed for safety concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bay has been positioned to replace existing car parking spaces, ensuring no 	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

		<p>additional impact on carriageway width or traffic flow, with bollards within the parking bay extent accounted for to avoid extending into the carriageway or creating new obstructions. Additionally, double yellow lines were introduced on the south-western side of Queenswood Avenue to prevent obstruction, aid visibility, and reduce congestion at the junction by allowing passing gaps for vehicles to negotiate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	
<u>Summerhouse Avenue, adjacent to 120 Vicarage Farm Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Sutton Square, adjacent to No. 129 West Way</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Vicarage Farm Road, junction with the Great West Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>West Way, adjacent to 9 The Crossways</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity to junction); requested relocation	Bay to be relocated	Relocate: Extend DYs by approx. 5 metres and relocate bay accordingly

Heston East

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Alderney Avenue, adjacent to 65 Heston Road</u>	Traffic safety/flow (restricting carriageway), low bay utilization; requested relocation	See Themed Response 1, 5 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	Retain
<u>Channel Close, adjacent to 42 Sutton Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Crosslands Avenue, outside 3 Crosslands Parade</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Lampton Road outside 1 to 22 Kestrel Court</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Sutton Hall Road, adjacent to 61 Upper Sutton Lane</u>	Traffic safety/flow (proximity to junction, restricting carriageway)	See Themed Response 1 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 	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.

		<p>the carriageway, thereby not further narrowing the road or creating new obstructions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 operational safety standards and does not contribute to additional congestion or hazards. 	
<u>Walnut Tree Road, adjacent to 9 New Heston Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Winchester Avenue, adjacent 290 The Gables, flats 1 to 16</u>	Mis-parked bikes obstructing pavement	See Themed Response 3	Retain

Heston West

Bay Location	Community Comments	Officer Comments	Recommendation ¹
<u>Beechcroft Close,</u> <u>adjacent to No.</u> <u>132 Cranford</u> <u>Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Brabazon Road,</u> <u>Outside 174</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Court Road</u> <u>adjacent to 91</u> <u>Court Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Cranford Lane,</u> <u>east of Parkway</u> <u>Trading Estate</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Lynmouth</u> <u>Gardens,</u> <u>adjacent to 71</u> <u>Springwell Road</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Remove (low utilisation/ASB concerns)
<u>Northfield Road</u> <u>(1)</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain**
<u>Raleigh Road,</u> <u>adjacent to 271</u> <u>North Hyde Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Ringway, adjacent</u> <u>to 180 North Hyde</u> <u>Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>The Vale, adjacent</u> <u>to 38 North Hyde</u> <u>Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain
<u>Wentworth Road,</u> <u>adjacent to 376</u> <u>North Hyde Lane</u>	No comments/objections received	N/A	Retain

¹ Bays that did not achieve at least 30 trip starts in a single month (from July-Sept 2024) have been flagged for review, as indicated in the tables with a 'Retain**'. Officers recommend retaining these bays to ensure network continuity and monitoring bay utilisation.