CITY OF WESTMINSTER – ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITIES

DELEGATED AUTHORITY CONSULTATION REPORT 8061

TRAFFIC ORDERS – NEEDHAM ROAD

AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING PROVISIONS TO FACILITATE THE PLANTING OF TREES

(Drawing Nos. 70010374-WSP-P01-X-DR-HI-1202 to -1203 Revs S2-P03 and 70100374-WSP-P01-SK-DR-HI-0001-05 Rev SK-01)

(Bayswater Ward)

Background

In August 2019, Cabinet Member agreement was given for a scheme to increase the number of trees in the City. It was recognised that there are a number of constraints to planting trees within existing footways and a finite number of remaining locations for street tree planting. In order to create more space for trees, the Highways Buildouts project was initiated to accommodate trees within buildouts constructed on highway land, in addition to those planted within existing footways. Following Cabinet Member agreement, capital funding of £2.5 million has been allocated to the highway buildouts programme.

This scheme aligns closely with the Council's City for All – Vision and Strategy, in particular the Greener and Cleaner objective.

The Trees and the Public Realm – a tree strategy for Westminster document, identifies and acknowledges the value and importance of trees. Trees can provide a wealth of benefits that can positively impact the lives of those who live, visit and work in the city. Alongside their aesthetic benefits, trees provide a myriad of sustainability benefits that in turn ensure a climate resilient Westminster. As an authority in the heart of central London, the carbon sequestration and storage benefits of trees are of significance as they can help to mitigate against the impact of climate change across the capital.

The new trees would be installed on kerb buildouts in or adjacent to existing waiting restrictions and parking places, necessitating a reduction in the available lengths of both.

On 28th August 2024, the Head of Parking considered and approved a report under his delegated powers allowing consultation on proposals to make Traffic Orders, as follows:

a) on the east side of **Needham Road**:

(i) remove 4 metres of single yellow line waiting restrictions adjacent to the boundary wall of 152 Westbourne Grove and introduce 9.3 metres of double yellow "at any time" waiting restrictions (to install a tree buildout);

(ii) remove 4.6 metres of the Pay-by-Phone parking place adjacent to the boundary wall of 152 Westbourne Grove and outside No.2 Needham Road;

(iii) introduce 3 metres of double yellow "at any time" waiting restrictions outside No. 2 (to install a tree buildout); and

(iv) remove 1 metre of the residents' parking place outside Nos. 2 to 6; and

(b) on the west side of **Needham Road**:

(i) remove 0.6 metres of the Pay-by-Phone parking place adjacent to the boundary wall of 154 Westbourne Grove;

(ii) remove 3 metres of the residents' parking place outside Nos. 1-5 to 9;

(iii) introduce 5.3 metres of double yellow "at any time" waiting restrictions (to install a tree buildout outside No. 9);

(iv) remove 3 metres of the residents' parking place outside Nos. 11-3 to 17,the Cock and Bottle Public House; and

(v) introduce 5.3 metres of double yellow "at any time" waiting restrictions outside No. 17, the Cock and Bottle Public House (to install a tree buildout).

The proposals would result in no net loss of residents' parking spaces and the net loss of one Pay-by-Phone parking space.

The consultation consisted of three parts:

- A formal Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation on the proposed changes to parking arrangements and waiting restrictions, undertaken by WSP;
- An informal section 6 consultation on the proposed streetscape changes (via "Commonplace") undertaken by the City Council; and
- A consultation on the proposed removal of a street tree (via "Commonplace") meeting the City Councils' 'Duty to Consult' obligations, also undertaken by the City Council.

A separate notice was posted on the mature Alder tree outside No.17, the Cock and Bottle Public House that was impacting accessibility along the street to invite comment. The proposals detailed planting an Ornamental cherry tree Prunus 'Umineko' in the proposed buildout near that location. While the statutory consultation period for formal TMO consultations is usually 21-days, this was extended to 28-days to co-ordinate with the 'duty to consult' obligation and the informal consultation undertaken by the City Council.

Consultation Results

Following the publication / posting of press and street notices between 4th September 2024 and 2nd October 2024 and consultation with frontagers and other key parties on the proposed measures, 21 responses in total were received, as detailed in the Appendix to this report. The extent of the email / letter consultation included three Ward Councillors, three local residents' associations, 40 statutory bodies and 48 frontages.

There were 202 visitors to the consultation via Commonplace, and a breakdown to which part of the three aspects of the consultation the respondents commented on (either the Duty to Consult aspect, Informal Questionnaire (section 6) aspect or an email to the formal TMO consultation aspect) are also shown in the Appendix to this report, along with the 'feedback feelings' data.

Recommendation

It is recommended that a Traffic Order is made to facilitate the implementation of the measures outlined above and shown on Drawing Nos. 70010374-WSP-P01-X-DR-HI-1202 to -1203 Revs S2-P03 and 70100374-WSP-P01-SK-DR-HI-0001-05 Rev SK-01

I agree / ~~disagree~~ with the recommendation.

Signed: [redacted] Date: 05/02/2025

[redacted]
Business Improvement & Development Manager
City Highways, Environment and Communities

Signed: [redacted] Date: 05/02/2025

[redacted]
Head of Parking
City Highways, Environment and Communities

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
1.	[redacted] Traffic Management Officer for the Government Security Zone, and the City of Westminster Roads & Transport Policing Command Metropolitan Police Service [redacted] Email dated 4th September 2024	The Met Police have no objection or observation to add with regard to the proposal.	Noted.
2.	[redacted] No address given [redacted] Email dated 8th September 2024	(a) I strongly object to these plans, it's not needed, it's already hard to park round here, you may say, it's only one bay you're taking away but remember, for literally half the year you allow restaurants to take up bays with their out door seating, which needs to go, pandemic is over, then to have double yellow lines too, that's taking away parking for people visiting, which leads to them parking in residence bays, which then leads to residence having to wait till late at night or having to get up extra early to move their car into a residence bay.	Thank you for your response. (a) While it is regrettable that the proposals do result in the loss of one pay-by-phone parking space, to accommodate the buildouts, it was not possible to maintain the present parking capacity, largely due to where trees could be sited on the street. Yellow lines were necessary to restrict parking around the buildouts to prevent obstruction. A permit holder can use their 'B' Zone permit to park in any of the nearby roads' 'B' Zone residents' parking places as, with regret, holding a permit does not guarantee the holder a space close to their property.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			WCC did carry out a number of pilot hole investigations prior to finalising the design of the scheme to ensure any trees being planted did not conflict with the underground infrastructure. Parking occupancy of the pay-by-phone bays in the area is generally at 75%, so the loss of a pay-by-phone bay rather than one of the limited residents' permit holders only parking places was the best option to carry out the objective of the works programme, which is to improve streetscapes with the planting of trees and make Westminster a greener and more pleasant place to live. In addition, the buildouts, rather than planting directly on the available footway, will ensure that the trees do not obstruct the footway and result in the same situation that necessitates the removal of the obstructing tree outside the Cock and Bottle Public House. Any outdoor seating should be confined to a businesses private land and only those who hold a valid street trading licence to place chairs / tables on the footway or parking bays may do so legally. The Cock and Bottle Public House's seating in within the confines of their private land and there is no action the City Council can take. However, if there is any overspill onto the public highway, without any licence being held, any instances can be reported via the Report it webpage: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/report-it

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		(b) Plus it's not like there's no trees around, you have trees on Westbourne Grove, Artisan Road, there's a tree on Needham Road, but you want to cut that down, which I understand because it can be hard to walk past it, especially if you are disabled or have a buggy. So conclusion... leave Needham Road as it is.	(b) Comments in support of the removal of the alder tree outside the Cock and Bottle are noted. The rationale for tree planting in streets like Needham Road lies with the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover across the City. Whilst the existing trees on surrounding streets are noted, new planting locations on existing streets are becoming increasingly hard to find, so the creation of space in carriageways on build outs such as these is regarded as a means to increase tree numbers, combat climate change and bring other environmental and aesthetic benefits to the neighbourhood.
3.	Anonymous respondent, local resident Response received 5th September 2024 via 'informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Mostly negative (25/100) Only the loss of the alder tree is a seemingly un-necessary tragedy, please please move the companion new small tree further along the street and then we at least have five trees to look forward to. I have lived [redacted] and was at consultation in Cock and Bottle PH a couple of months ago.	Thank you for your response. The removal of a large existing tree is not something that would ordinarily be considered as part of a new tree planting scheme and is a matter that was discussed in some detail by officers. In this case, officers considered the benefits and disbenefits of retaining the existing alder tree, but ultimately decided that the tree has rather outgrown its location, and the trunk and roots of the tree obstruct the pavement. This is particularly important for mobility or sight impaired individuals, or those using mobility aids or child buggies. Currently, in order to navigate around the tree an individual has to use the Cock and Bottle Public House's private land, which is not part of the public highway. The forecourt is also slightly raised from the pavement and creates a trip hazard, and a potential difficulty for some pedestrians as outlined

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			above. The alder tree has not reached its full size and therefore retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction in future years, if it were it to remain. This issue was considered alongside the opportunity that the proposed scheme provides to enhance the appearance of the street with a coherent design using a single species of tree, and to contribute to the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover across the City as part of our response to climate change. On balance, officers considered that the retention of the alder was outweighed by the positive benefits of the proposed scheme. With regard to your suggestion that the alder tree is retained, and four new trees are planted, this was also considered, but ultimately the constraints (such as below ground utilities, basements, street lighting), and the limitations on the amount of parking that could reasonably be lost to provide space for tree planting resulted in the current proposal.
4.	Anonymous respondent, local resident, [redacted] Response received 15th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: No sentiment (not selected) I am a [redacted]. I think it would be a shame to fell this tree on Needham Road. There is space on the pavement to walk and it isn't uneven, so I do not think it is reason enough to remove the tree.	Thank you for your response. The removal of a large existing tree is not something that would ordinarily be considered as part of a new tree planting scheme and was a matter that was discussed in some detail by officers. Whilst your comments about the space/ evenness of the

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		Please plant more and thanks for consulting the public.	pavement are noted, in this case, officers consider that the tree has rather outgrown its location, and the trunk and roots of the tree do obstruct the pavement. This is particularly important for mobility or sight impaired individuals, or those using mobility aids or pushing buggies. Currently, in order to navigate around the tree an individual has to use the Cock and Bottle Public House's private land, which is not part of the public highway. The forecourt is also slightly raised from the pavement and creates a trip hazard, and potential difficulty for some pedestrians as outlined above. The alder tree has not reached its full size and therefore retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction in future years if it were it to remain. This issue was considered alongside the opportunity that the proposed scheme provides to enhance the appearance of the street with a coherent design using a single species of tree, and to contribute to the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover across the City as part of our response to climate change. With regard to new tree planting, the current proposal is to plant four new trees on build outs in the carriageway in Needham Road. The City Council has a commitment to increase canopy cover across the City as part of our response to climate change.
5.	Anonymous respondent	Feelings feedback form: No sentiment (not selected)	Thank you for your response.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Response received 17th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	More secure cycle parking is required. Please install some cycle hangers.	In response to both comments, the City Council are always appreciative of suggested locations to improve the City Councils' cycle parking infrastructure and are committed to greener and healthier travel initiatives and are currently rolling out our Cycle Movement Strategy programme to promote cycling in Westminster. Interested applicants for cycle parking can register their interest for a cycle hangar on the City Councils' website here: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/walking-and-cycling/cycle-parking WCC have recently concluded an informal consultation to roll out 13 cycle hangars across the Borough and are presently formally consulting on these. Further future consultations will follow where feasibility and demand exists.
	Response received 17th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Please provide some secure cycle parking / cycle hangers on Needham Road. There are currently long waiting lists for all secure cycle parking nearby! Please consider converting a car parking space or two into secure bicycle parking.	
6.	Anonymous respondent Response received 17th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Mostly positive (75/100) More trees are welcome. The existing tree by the Cock & Bottle has grown too large so I support its removal. I regret the loss of a parking space. Is there some way to keep the same number of parking bays?	Thank you for your response. The comments in support for the removal of the existing alder tree and provision of four new trees are noted. With regret, it was not possible to maintain the present parking capacity, largely due to where trees could be sited on the street. and yellow lines were necessary to restrict parking around the buildouts to prevent obstruction.
	Response received 17th September 2024 via 'Duty to	I support the removal of the existing tree because it has grown too big	The comments in support for the removal of the existing alder tree are noted.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Consult' comments on Commonplace		
7.	Anonymous respondent Response received 18th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Positive (100/100) Road should be made no entry for vehicle traffic and have a cycle hanger installed	Thank you for your response. There are no proposals within the scope of this scheme to prohibit vehicular movement and any changes to the prohibition of vehicles would have to be consulted on separately. The City Council are always appreciative of suggested locations to improve the City Councils' cycle parking infrastructure and are committed to greener and healthier travel initiatives and are currently rolling out our Cycle Movement Strategy programme to promote cycling in Westminster. Interested applicants for cycle parking can register their interest for a cycle hangar on the City Councils' website here: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/walking-and-cycling/cycle-parking WCC have recently concluded an informal consultation to roll out 13 cycle hangars across the Borough and are presently formally consulting on these. Further future consultations will follow where feasibility and demand exists.
8.	Anonymous respondent Response received 25th September 2024 via informal	Feelings feedback form: Positive (100/100) Yes I agree with this consultation. All very good ideas.	Thank you for your response and for the support for the proposals.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	consultation questionnaire on Commonplace		
9.	Anonymous respondent Response received 25th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Mostly negative (25/100) (a) Whilst I completely support the aim of these proposals and understand the need to balance highways needs with Westminster's agreed policy on greening, Environment and Climate Change, I find the proposals disappointing. The net gain of three new and smaller trees, involving the removal of a large and heathy tree shows a real lack of ambition. This road is wide and spacious and deserves a more imaginative approach similar, for example, to that shown by the Council in Marylebone High Street. I am not suggesting a similar scheme but a similar approach - i.e. have ambition, and the courage to think differently even if it means facing down the parking lobby. Further, the destruction of established, healthy trees should never be part of any plan.	Thank you for your response. (a) The removal of a large existing tree is not something that would ordinarily be considered as part of a new tree planting scheme and was a matter that was discussed in some detail by officers. In this case, officers considered the benefits and disbenefits of retaining the existing alder tree, but ultimately concluded that the tree has rather outgrown its location, and the trunk and roots of the tree obstruct the pavement. This is particularly important for mobility or sight impaired individuals, or those using mobility aids or pushing buggies. Currently, in order to navigate around the tree an individual has to use the Cock and Bottle Public House's private land, which is not part of the public highway. The forecourt is also slightly raised from the pavement and creates a trip hazard, and potential difficulty for some pedestrians as outlined above. The alder tree has not reached its full size and therefore retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction in future years if it were it to remain. This issue was considered alongside the opportunity that the proposed scheme provides to enhance the appearance of the street with a coherent design using a single species of tree, and to contribute to the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			across the City as part of our response to climate change. On balance, officers considered that the retention of the alder was outweighed by the positive benefits of the proposed scheme. With regard to consideration of a more ambitious approach to Needham Road, the current proposals do not preclude future plans for this street. The proposals for Needham Road are part of the borough-wide programme that seeks to plant trees in buildouts on the carriageway. This programme has a sole focus on planting trees – there is no scope within this programme for wider public realm improvements. This programme also has an approved budget. There is currently no approved budget for the more ambitious approach to Needham Road. The current proposals provide a valuable opportunity to deliver some positive interventions to Needham Road relatively soon.
10.	Anonymous respondent Response received 25th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Neutral (50/100) (a) I like the idea of adding more trees and perhaps wider pavement sections (though not sure if this is absolutely necessary), but I don't like the idea of removing a tree in order to do this.	Thank you for your response. (a) The removal of a large existing tree is not something that would ordinarily be considered as part of a new tree planting scheme and was a matter that was discussed in some detail by officers. In this case,

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		Is it not possible to keep that tree, and either just add 3 trees or otherwise add the 4th tree just a few feet further away? If the consultation is successful and this tree does get removed, can it at least find a new home somewhere else?	officers considered the benefits and disbenefits of retaining the existing alder tree, but ultimately concluded that the tree has rather outgrown its location, and the trunk and roots of the tree obstruct the pavement. This is particularly important for mobility or sight impaired individuals, or those using mobility aids or pushing buggies. Currently, in order to navigate around the tree an individual has to use the Cock and Bottle Public House's private land, which is not part of the public highway. The forecourt is also slightly raised from the pavement and creates a trip hazard, and potential difficulty for some pedestrians as outlined above. The alder tree has not reached its full size and therefore retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction in future years if it were it to remain. This issue was considered alongside the opportunity that the proposed scheme provides to enhance the appearance of the street with a coherent design using a single species of tree, and to contribute to the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover across the City as part of our response to climate change. On balance, officers considered that the retention of the alder was outweighed by the positive benefits of the proposed scheme.
	Response received 25th September 2024 via informal	(b) I hope there is a way to keep this tree, and still keep the bulk of the new proposals. It's not good to remove a tree as the whole point of this	(b) With regard to your suggestion that the alder tree is retained, and three new trees are planted, this was also considered, but ultimately officers

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	'greening' is to have more trees! Perhaps there is a way to keep this tree and just add 3 other trees instead of 4, or otherwise have the 4th tree slightly further along. If this tree will be destroyed, then I don't think that's right, but if it can be moved somewhere else then I could support the proposal.	concluded that the drawbacks of retaining the alder were sufficient to justify removal in light of the proposed tree planting. Planting four new trees and retaining the alder is precluded by the below and above ground constraints and the limitations on the amount of parking that could reasonably be lost to provide space for tree planting. Unfortunately, due to the size and age of the tree, it is not feasible to move and relocate it. Finally, on the query over whether build outs to accommodate new trees are necessary, the width of the existing pavements and the presence of below ground utilities preclude planting trees in the pavements.
11.	Anonymous respondent Response received 26th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Mostly positive (75/100) Happy with proposals	Thank you for your response and for the support for the proposals.
12.	Anonymous respondent Response received 27th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: No sentiment (not selected) I write with weary realisation that, like all consultations, the decision to remove this tree will already have been taken and its fate sealed. In many respects, Westminster has been visionary in environmental and climate change	Thank you for your response. The comments preferring retention of the mature tree over planting new trees are noted. The removal of a large existing tree is not something that would ordinarily be considered as part of a new

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		issues. However, in my experience, not when it comes to trees. Recently, planning allowed the removal of three trees in a neighbouring street for no good reason - action supported by the Senior Arboricultural Officer. Now there is a proposal to remove a mature and perfectly healthy tree because it is "obstructing the footway". The tree is in the same position that it has been for probably 75 years so how it comes now to be an "obstruction" mystifies me. Of course, requirements for access have changed but I do not see any issues here as the pavement and frontage of the Cock and Bottle provides plenty of opportunity for access. The accompanying proposal, for four small and ineffective replacements is unambitious. As recent research from Birmingham University has shown older trees are able to accelerate their rates of absorbing planet-warming emissions as Co2 levels rise, younger trees cannot do this as they lack the density. So, from the point of view of the local environment and the bigger climate change policies adopted by Westminster, this would be a huge mistake. However, I fear that, once again, policy will be seen as only there to allow officers to create reasons to ignore it,	tree planting scheme and was a matter that was discussed in some detail by officers. In this case, officers considered the benefits and disbenefits of retaining the existing alder tree, but ultimately concluded that the tree has rather outgrown its location, and the trunk and roots of the tree obstruct the pavement. This is particularly important for mobility or sight impaired individuals, or those using mobility aids or pushing buggies. Currently, in order to navigate around the tree an individual has to use the Cock and Bottle Public House's private land, which is not part of the public highway. The forecourt is also slightly raised from the pavement and creates a trip hazard, and potential difficulty for some pedestrians as outlined above. The alder tree has not reached its full size (and it is estimated to be around 30 years old rather than over 75 years old), and therefore retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction in future years if it were it to remain. This issue was considered alongside the opportunity that the proposed scheme provides to enhance the appearance of the street with a coherent design using a single species of tree, and to contribute to the City Council's commitment to increasing canopy cover across the City as part of our response to climate change. On balance, officers considered that the retention of the alder is likely to be a short-term proposition only given its continued growth and is outweighed by the positive benefits of the proposed scheme.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			With regard to the removal of three trees in a neighbouring street, if you would like a further response please contact Barbara Milne, Head of Arboricultural Services at: bmilne@westminster.gov.uk
13.	Anonymous respondent Response received 27th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Negative (0/100) (a) I was unable to attend the meeting at the Cock & Bottle in July but understand that the broader plans for the junction of the two roads were discussed which included traffic calming and widening pavements. Whilst appreciating that the current budget only allows for tree planting in Needham Road, it would seem sensible to view the tree-planting as Stage 1 of the wider plan and design. This would naturally affect the positioning of the trees and the overall aesthetic improvement to the neighbourhood. (b) Architectural Heritage Needham Road is one of the most attractive roads in the area. The two pairs of Grade 2 listed bow-fronted houses, (4 and 6, 7 and 9) as 'mirrors', are especially noteworthy. By planting one tree in the street directly in front of No 9, will have an adverse visual affect on the 'mirror'. It should also be noted that [redacted], so if a new tree were to be	Thank you for your response. (a) This scheme focusses on the planting of trees and would not form part of a Local Safety Scheme (LSS). Any future LSS that might be proposed in the area would be formed on accident and collision data and would be subject to a separate consultation proposing specific road safety aspects at the junctions. A Road Safety Audit was undertaken as part of these plans where intervisibility at the junctions were considered, and moving the trees closer to the junction would affect visibility of drivers conflicting between Needham Road / Artisan Road etc. (b) and (c) Comments about architectural integrity and townscape are an important consideration. The proposed tree species are intended to be subservient to the architecture. *Prunus* 'Umineko' is a small sized tree between five and eight metres in height at maturity. The form of the canopy is columnar or vase-shaped, being narrower in spread than height. Abundant single white flowers produced around April provide visual interest as well as early season nectar for pollinating insects. Further visual interest later in

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		planted on the road, light would be blocked by trees on both of the front and back [redacted]. (c) Removal of alder tree outside no 17/proposed replacement with a Prunus Umineko There is no doubt that the alder has seen better days. However, the proposed 'replacement' by this particular species should be reconsidered. We planted two such trees in another garden some 15 years ago and, although they blossom magnificently for a few weeks of the year, the structure of the tree with branches that stick upwards is, frankly, unattractive. As the overall shape of the tree is not aesthetically pleasing, it would be great shame to plant this tree in such a prominent position at the junction of the two roads. (d) Proposed new trees We understand that at the July meeting there were members attending from Westminster Council with expert knowledge of trees. Please could they share with us a selection of trees suitable for planting in Needham Road and could we be involved in the final decision making? We residents are so proud of our street we feel it's important we take part in both the selection and the nurturing of any new greening.	the season is created by the orange to red/ purple autumn colour. The size and form of the tree is considered to be an appropriate choice for location in the carriageway, small enough in stature to compliment rather than overwhelm the architectural merits of the buildings and casting a modest sized footprint of shade, whilst still announcing its presence in the street, providing a unifying element, and contributing to canopy cover goals in response to climate change. (d) As above, the current proposal is for *Prunus* 'Umineko'. Officers have considered other tree species, with a view to maximising aesthetic and environmental benefits whilst respecting the townscape. For example, consideration has been given to Magnolia spp, Ornamental apples (*Malus* spp), Pears (*Pyrus* spp) and Thorns (*Crataegus* spp). In brief, for reasons of crown dimensions/ density, public amenity, biodiversity and townscape, officers consider that *Prunus* 'Umineko' is an appropriate choice. However, resident involvement in species choice is welcomed, so if any alternative suggestions are made, these will be actively considered.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		(e) At one stage it had been suggested that the trees were to be in 'planters', then later proposals suggest they be planted on the street, in soil. But are these spaces to have a kerb stone, or higher protective surrounds? This would impact on access to parking spaces and street cleaning. (In [redacted], we have three planters which are constantly filled by passers-by with cigarette buts, fast food containers etc. These are not emptied by the street cleaners and are a constant eyesore). (f) Reduction in parking spaces With tape measure in hand, we do not agree the only loss of parking space is one pay space. Publicity from Westminster Council has boldly said 'no loss of resident parking bays'. We contest this. The length of the cars parked by the residents of Needham Road and surrounding streets is such that you cannot park a car which measures 4.8m or 5m in a horizontal space of 5m. On the current plans we estimate we would lose a total of 5 parking spaces. With the problem of finding a parking space on or close to our road already a constant challenge, we would suggest that the original messaging to residents and local business was misleading and needs to be addressed, and that this proposal should be reviewed. We would be happy to meet with representatives of the Council at any time.	(e) Your concerns regarding the maintenance of the proposed build outs are noted. The four trees are intended to be located on 3 metre wide and 1.8 metre long build outs into the carriageway, with a 300mm gap between the back of the buildout and the existing pavements to allow for drainage. These islands will be surrounded by 300mm kerbstones to protect the trees, but around the trees, it is likely that perforated grilles topped with permeable resin bound gravel will be used to maintain cleanliness and reduce the likelihood of rubbish accumulation. (f) Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above. Residents' parking is oversubscribed in Needham Road. A 'B zone' residents' parking permit is valid for the zone denoted and an alternative parking place should be sought if one is not available at the time of parking.
	Response received 27th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Comments via informal consultation questionnaire were a repeat of above comments.	Please see above addressing the repeat comments received.
14.	Anonymous respondent	Feelings feedback form: Mostly negative (25/100)	Thank you for your response.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Response received 27th September 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	(a) This was an unsuitable choice of tree when it was first planted, but the pub was already there. The alder on the other, Artesian Road side, was removed and a lime tree replaced it in the exact same position, so I see the proposed plan as designed mostly to facilitate the pub clientele spreading across the pavement. The pub needs to control their customers outside on the Needham Road side. The choice of trees for the road generally is relevant to the value of the scheme.	(a) Trading should be confined to a businesses private land and any breaches can be reported to the City Council via the Report it webpage: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/report-it Comments regarding the choice of the alder on Needham Road as unsuitable are noted. The alder tree has not reached its full size and whilst the removal of this tree has been carefully considered, officers concluded that retaining the tree would result in a worsening obstruction to the pavement in future years, if it were it to remain. At the time the alder was planted, it was not anticipated it would grow at such a rapid rate.
	Response received 27th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	(b) I am appalled that this plan is ignoring the issue of the junction with Artesian Road which is far too wide and consequently a danger to pedestrians. Adding the trees should come as an addition to a better overall plan dealing with the junctions at each end of the road. The plan should exist even if the trees are all the Council can afford at the moment.	(b) This scheme focusses on the planting of trees and would not form part of a Local Safety Scheme (LSS). Any future LSS that might be proposed in the area would be formed on accident and collision data and would be subject to a separate consultation proposing specific road safety aspects at the junctions. A Road Safety Audit was undertaken as part of these plans where intervisibility at the junctions were considered, and moving the trees closer to the junction would affect visibility of drivers conflicting between Needham Road / Artisan Road etc.
		(c) I'd like to add that I remember the two Italian alders being planted either side of The Cock and Bottle. This was not as somebody	(c) Comments regarding the age of the alder tree age and rapid growth rate are noted. The canopy of

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		thought, 75 years ago! They grow too fast to be retained in that position and this one has recently been mutilated to reduce its size, so would never again have a natural shape. There comes a point when trees need replacing.	the tree has been reduced more than once to limit inconveniences.
15.	Anonymous respondent Response received 30th September 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: No sentiment (not selected) (a) I note that there is a reduction in the length of the residential parking spaces though there is no allowance for this in the calculation ie no 'reduction in spaces' though there is a noticeable reduction in actual length of total parking roadway.	Thank you for your response. (a) Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above.
		(b) A tree is to be placed [redacted] This will eventually lead to loss of sunlight on to [redacted] solar panels which Westminster Council [redacted] (c) I would like details as to the species of the trees, the sizes of the trees at initial planting and the form and size of the surround for the trees with material used ie granite, brick etc.	(b) and (c) The current species proposal is for *Prunus* 'Umineko'. It is a small sized tree between five and eight metres in height at maturity. The form of the canopy is columnar or vase-shaped, being narrower in spread than height. Abundant single white flowers produced around April provide visual interest as well as early season nectar and pollen for bees and other pollinating insects. Further visual interest later in the season is created by the orange to red/ purple autumn colour. It is unlikely to impact on solar panels. Initial tree planting size is yet to be determined. There is a balance to be struck between initial impact and survival rates (the larger the tree planting size, the greater the risk of failure in the first few years after planting). On the basis of recent schemes, an initial planting size of between 3 to 4m in height is anticipated.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			The four new trees are intended to be located on 3m wide and 1.8m long build outs into the carriageway, with a 300mm gap between the back of the buildout and the existing pavements to allow for drainage. These build outs will be surrounded by 300mm kerbstones to protect the trees, and to raise them to the level of the adjacent pavement. It is intended that that there will be a paved finish on the build outs, but around the trees, it is likely perforated grilles topped with permeable resin bound gravel will be used.
16.	Anonymous respondent Response received 1st October 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Negative (0/100) We are going to lose resident parking spaces in spite of the fact we were adamant we did not want them reduced. It looks like the same spaces will be kept but they are much shorter. Not practical for large family cars.	Thank you for your response. Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above.
17.	[redacted] [redacted] Response received 1st October 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Negative (0/100) I have the following points and would like the Council's detailed response to them as I believe the "general effect" of the Orders listed by the Council to be somewhat misleading and does not take account of the area in which Needham Road is situated and the practical effect which will be caused by the proposals. The numbers below refer to the paragraph numbers in the Notice.	Thank you for your response.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		2 (a) (i) This refers to the introduction of 9.3m of double yellow line. The plan of the proposal shows only 7m.	The proposed plan shows 9.3 metres of double yellow "at any time" waiting restrictions adjacent to 152 Westbourne Grove and this measure is correct. There are 5.3 metres around the proposed buildout, with an additional 4 metres extending towards the junction of Westbourne Grove totalling 9.3 metres.
		2 (a) (ii) and (iii). This leaves 11m for 2 pay by phone spaces, but these are book-ended by the trees. These spaces are very often used by contractors' vans. In attempting to park in this space, although it is not stated how the new trees will be protected, damage will almost certainly be caused either to the trees themselves or, if they are protected in planters, to the planters. In addition, 11m is not long enough for two vans to be parked in that space.	The City Council cannot pre-empt the type of vehicle that will park in a space but do use the calculations provided below to determine bay sizes, where possible. In this case, a space of 5.5 metres per pay by phone space would be deemed above the acceptable threshold for the average vehicle.
		2 (a) (iv) The remaining residents' parking space has been reduced from 21.30m to 20m. which it is claimed will be adequate for 4 cars. However, cars have got bigger and not smaller since the present space was allocated. On the morning of 26 September seven cars measuring 4.90m – 5.10m were parked in the twelve available residents' spaces in the street which is about the average day on day. Thus this reduction will almost certainly result in the loss on one space especially as one end is against a tree or planter. 2 (b) (i) This will shorten the space for pay by phone from 15m. to 14.40m which is not big	Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		enough for three cars let alone vans. One further space will therefore be lost. 2 (b) (ii)-(iii) Currently the available space for residents is 23m20 which accommodates 4 cars. This will be reduced to 20m. Given that one end is blocked by a tree and the average length of cars in this area is as described in 2 above, there will be a further loss of a resident space. 2(b) (iv)-(v) There are often three cars parked with the Cock & Bottle space; the proposal will reduce this to two. The Council's letter accompanying the Notice together with the details on the website refer only to the loss of one pay-by-phone and no loss of residents' spaces. Our measurements show the loss one pay-by phone space on the East side of the road and one on the West side; and the loss of one res space on the East side and two more on the West, a total of 5 spaces. The street currently has spaces for 19 vehicles, of which 6 are pay-by-phone. The Council have assumed 5m per space but this leaves no room between parked cars which is clearly unmanageable for the average size of cars in the area. The proposals will reduce resparks from 13 to 10, a reduction of 23%. [NB we have not counted the space outside nos 12-14 which has been out of commission for 4-5 years and no	4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		information is available as to when the necessary repairs will be made. I therefore contend that the information in the Council's notice is misleading and should be revised before being further considered by the relevant department in the Council and further time must be given for the relevant parties (including the residents) to comment. The proposals should take account of the area in which Needham Road is situated and the practicalities of parking longer than average cars in this area. Whilst [redacted] very keen to see more tree planting in the area, we are very concerned to know the type of trees proposed as we believe this to be a key consideration in our appraisal of the proposals. The Council has given us no information on this. We would like to be assured that any trees planted in the street add to the overall aesthetic of the neighbourhood. From a personal perspective we believe that planting immediately [redacted] will detract from the very attractive street view of [redacted].	
18.	Anonymous respondent Response received 1st October 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Negative (0/100) (a) The addition of four highway buildouts, including the planting of 4 trees; - We do not have enough information. The tree that the council is	Thank you for your response. (a) The proposed tree species is *Prunus* 'Umineko'. It is a small sized tree between five and eight metres in height at maturity. The form of the

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		proposing to plant are not particularly nice, there are much better options in the city that can give the sense of nature in the middle of the city. We need to have more details about the trees, how they will be planted etc. need to improve the aesthetic but without losing the mirror image that the 4 houses have. Also, this planting can be placed in the street without taking away any parking spaces as it has been done in many places in London. (b) The removal of one pay-by-phone bay to facilitate for tree buildouts; - Not possible, as we only have 6 spaces available now, it is not enough. This street needs all the space possible. There will be no impact to the resident parking bays. - This is clearly not true, please look closely to the planning. The change suggested will take away 3 to 4 resident spaces in a street with only 10 usable spaces for the last year or two years.	canopy is columnar or vase-shaped, being narrower in spread than height. Abundant single white flowers produced around April provide visual interest as well as early season nectar for pollinating insects. Further visual interest later in the season is created by the orange to red/ purple autumn colour. The size and form of the tree is considered to be an appropriate choice for location in the carriageway, small enough in stature to compliment rather than overwhelm the architectural merits of the buildings and casting a modest sized footprint of shade, whilst still announcing its presence in the street, providing a unifying element, and contributing to canopy cover goals in response to climate change. Having said that, resident involvement in species choice is welcomed, so if any alternative suggestions are made, these will be actively considered. With regard to the comment that the tree planting can take place in the street, the width of the existing pavements and the presence of below ground utilities preclude planting trees in the pavements, (b) Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		(1 space is taken by gas works and who knows when this will be resolved). Please we clearly need a new meeting to discuss this further.	Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above.
19.	Anonymous respondent Response received 2nd October 2024 via informal consultation questionnaire on Commonplace	Feelings feedback form: Negative (0/100) As a resident of [redacted], I am very disappointed that the proposal claims not to have any impact on residents parking, when the	Thank you for your response. Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		scheme will actually see the removal of 7 metres of residents parking space. This equates to the loss of at least one, and in reality probably two parking spaces for residents. This misrepresentation of the plans is at best misleading, and is certainly inaccurate. On this basis, I do not support the scheme.	length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Response received 2nd October 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Should at least some aspects of the scheme be approved, please can residents be consulted on the species of tree(s) to be planted? I would also question the wisdom of planting a tree directly in front of one of the nearly unique bow-fronted, Listed Buildings in the street, as it will grow to obscure the facade of the property.	Resident involvement in tree species choice is welcomed. The current proposal is for *Prunus* 'Umineko', and if any alternative suggestions are made, these will be actively considered. *Prunus* 'Umineko' is a small sized tree between five and eight metres in height at maturity. The form of the canopy is columnar or vase-shaped, being narrower in spread than height. Abundant single white flowers produced around April provide visual interest as well as early season nectar for pollinating insects. Further visual interest later in the season is created by the orange to red/ purple autumn colour. The size and form of the tree is considered to be an appropriate choice for location in the carriageway, small enough in stature to compliment rather than overwhelm the architectural merits of the buildings and casting a modest sized footprint of shade, whilst still announcing its presence in the street, providing a unifying element, and contributing to canopy cover goals in response to climate change. With regards to the comments about listed buildings and architectural integrity and townscape, these are an important consideration. The size and form of the tree is considered to be an appropriate choice for location in the carriageway, small enough in stature to compliment rather than overwhelm the architectural merits of the buildings and casting a modest sized footprint of shade, whilst still

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			announcing its presence in the street, providing a unifying element, and contributing to canopy cover goals in response to climate change.
20.	Notting Hill East Neighbourhood Forum Response received 2nd October 2024 via 'Duty to Consult' comments on Commonplace	Needham Road was identified early on in the preparation of our Neighbourhood Plan as a Public Realm project with great potential. With its charming historic shops, mirrored elegant architecture and wide road surface, it offers multiple opportunities for enhancement. Wider footways and complementary trees and plantings could provide a respite from all the hard surfaces, and the church is a significant focal point that could be strengthened. Extending the pavements at each end could help pedestrians cross and slow traffic. Whilst we welcome additional trees in the neighbourhood, we question whether the current proposal would be an appropriate first step or whether the 4 tree peninsulas would interfere with a more comprehensive scheme. We would like the council to provide feedback to us on a number of residents' concerns - parking space retention, tree types and whether these peninsulas would allow the more ambitious scheme originally envisioned.	Thank you for your response. With regard to consideration of a more ambitious approach to Needham Road, the current proposals do not preclude future plans for this street. The proposals for Needham Road are part of the borough-wide programme that seeks to plant trees in buildouts on the carriageway. This programme has a sole focus on planting trees – there is no scope within this programme for wider public realm improvements. This programme also has an approved budget. There is currently no approved budget for the more ambitious approach to Needham Road. The current proposals provide a valuable opportunity to deliver some positive interventions to Needham Road relatively soon.
21.	[redacted]	I would like to express my concerns over the proposed changes to parking on Needham Road.	Thank you for your response.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Email dated 2nd October 2024	Although the document suggests that no resident parking places will be lost, I feel in practice that this will not be the case and depending on the way cars park, two (occasionally three) resident spaces will be lost. To explain my thinking further I will look at the existing then the proposed bays. The existing bays measure: 23m, 21m and 13m. When parked as densely as possible the existing bays hold 4, 4 and 2 (occasionally 3) cars respectively, totalling 10 (occasionally 11). It is squeeze for three cars in 13m but, because it is open at both ends, this sometimes happens. Images showing use of the 21m and 13m bays are below. 21m bay – please notice how 4 cars only just fit into this bay and were it to be reduced in length by 1m and tree to exist at one end, 4 cars would generally no longer fit 	Resident parking places are a length of kerb space in which to park and is dependent on the space between vehicles parking in that parking place and length of an individual vehicle itself, so the number of available 'spaces' is not determinable or quantifiable by measure alone, unlike pay-by-phone spaces which are individually marked. Parking bays already existed across most of Westminster long before parking decriminalisation (in 1994) and the Traffic Signs Regulations and Directions (TSRGD) from 1994 specified a minimum length of 4.6 metres. Previous practical experience demonstrated that this was too small so the City Council generally set a minimum length of 4.8 metres for internal bays and 4.6 metres for end bays, but where practicable used a length of 5 or 5.5 metres. Minimum and maximum bay sizes (apart from disabled bays) were relaxed in the TSRGD when it was updated in 2016, and, although cars have increased in size over time, the City Council continue to consider an average car length as being 5 metres as a minimum. A vehicle is deemed legally parked if the wheels are within the bay, and any overhang of the front or rear of vehicle is not deemed to be enforceable. The proposals detail the loss of 3 metres from two different parking places outside Nos. 1-9 and Nos. 13-17, and 1 metre from outside Nos. 2-6, but whether the remaining lengths could accommodate a residents' specific large vehicle (other than motorcycles or a small car as long as anything in total does not exceed up to 3 metres) does not necessarily determine whether a parking place is actually lost, as opposed to reduced

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		13m bay – on occasion 3 cars do park here, because of the possibility to protrude at the ends of the bay  In the suggested new layout: The bays will measure 20m, 20m and 10m. And each will now have a tree at one end. I mention the tree because it makes access more difficult to access the end space and therefore will slightly reduce the maximum realistic parking density. Bearing in mind that the existing 21m bay only just holds 4 cars (see photo above), a 20m bay with a tree at one end will make the likely number of cars that could use it 3, rather than the 4 stated. This is my main point. So, in the proposed layout the realistic number of spaces available will be 3, 3 and 2, totalling 8. I believe the council has been monitoring usage of parking spaces on Needham Rd and may not consider the existing spaces to be maximally utilised. I can only say that it is already hard to find a space [redacted] on Needham Road	in length. Thus, there is no quantifiable overall loss of residents' parking as each parking place is dependent on the factors detailed above. Taking the above into consideration, while on occasions 3 cars can sometimes park in a 13m space, the City Council would consider this length of space to fit 2 cars, based on 5 metres per car. Therefore, if the space is reduced from 13m to 10m, this doesn't reduce the number of cars that can park here.

APPENDIX – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION (continued)

ITEM NO.	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		(except some weekends and during August) and I often need to park quite a walk away. That is why I am so sensitive to any further loss of spaces. Although an algorithm may say no resident spaces would be lost, I am pretty convinced that for much of the time 2 (and occasionally 3) spaces would be lost from a starting level of 10 (occasionally 11) in the zone under review. Thank you for considering my views on this matter.	