



Decision maker: Tony Singh, Head of Highways

Date: 23rd June 2025

Subject: Extended CPZs - Parking Scheme – Consultation Recommendations

Report of: Tom Gallagher, Head of Parking (Interim)

Report author: Tom Gallagher, Head of Parking (Interim)

Responsible Director: Earl McKenzie, Assistant Director (Street Services)

SUMMARY

Between the 20th November and the 11th December 2024, the Council consulted on extending the daily hours of control in ten existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) from two one-hour windows to a continuous 08:00am – 08:00pm period. The zones considered were:

- Acton Town **Zone J**
- Buxton Gardens **Zone FF**
- Ealing Broadway **Zone W**
- Ealing Common **Zone F**
- Ealing Common **Zone G**
- Ealing Dean **Zone JJ**
- East Acton **Zone E**
- South Acton Estate **Zone SA**
- West Acton **Zone Z**
- West Ealing **Zone HH**

A total of 3,833 survey responses and 22 email submissions were received, equating to roughly 1 % of the borough's population. Engagement was spread across all ten zones as follows:

Zone	Leaflets delivered	Resident comments	Resident response-rate (%)
W – Ealing Broadway	4,327	700	16
HH – West Ealing	1,645	394	24
JJ – Ealing Dean	2,274	479	21
G – Ealing Common	2,399	388	16
J – Acton Town	2,438	294	12
F – Ealing Common	693	71	10
Z – West Acton	1,632	245	15
FF – Buxton Gardens	2,275	73	3
E – East Acton	1,147	75	6
SA – South Acton Estate	505	34	6

In total 17,784 information leaflets were delivered across the programme, and resident response rates therefore spanned 3 %–24 % with a median of 12 %. Overall, 72 % of all respondents lived within one of the ten CPZs, indicating that the consultation captured highly localised sentiment.

While overall sentiment across the ten zones was broadly opposed (17 % support, 83 % oppose), Zones E and SA showed majority support from respondents living within the affected CPZs:

Zone	Support	Oppose	Neutral
E – East Acton	49%	40%	11%
SA – South Acton Estate	52%	48%	0%

In both zones residents highlighted sustained parking stress caused by non-resident commuter parking, HGVs and driveway obstruction. 59 % of Zone SA residents and 32 % of Zone E residents explicitly selected 8 am – 8 pm as their preferred operating window.

All other zones recorded clear resident opposition, ranging from 53 % (Zone JJ) to 85 % (Zone HH) against the proposal.

Common themes raised across the ten zones

Impact on visitors & local businesses – concern that longer controls would deter trade and social visits.

Perception that the scheme is revenue-driven – calls for transparency on reinvestment of any surplus.

Existing parking stress from non-residents – particularly acute in Zones E and SA, where residents highlighted commuter parking, HGVs and driveway obstruction

Given the mixed borough-wide sentiment but clear resident mandates in Zones E and SA, this report recommends proceeding with an 8am – 8pm extension only in those two zones, while keeping the remaining eight zones under review.

In both zones residents highlighted sustained parking stress caused by non-resident commuter parking, HGVs and driveway obstruction. 59 % of Zone SA residents and 32 % of Zone E residents explicitly selected 8 am – 8 pm as their preferred operating window.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Note the consultation findings, in particular that Zones E and SA recorded resident support majorities of 49–52 % for an extension to CPZ hours.
2. Approve the making of Traffic Management Orders to be published proposing the extension of the hours of control in Zones E and SA to 8am-8pm, Monday–Sunday, with go-live targeted for as early as practicably possible for implementation.
3. Delegate authority to the Head of Highways to finalise signing schedules, and make minor operational amendments post implementation as and where necessary.
4. Review the impact after 12 months and report back with recommendations on whether further zones should progress.

Wards Affected: East Acton (Zone E) and South Acton (Zone SA)

Strategic Objectives	Summary of how this report aligns to the Ealing Council Plan 2022 - 2026 and Ealing's strategic objectives.
Creating Good Jobs	<i>Increased bay turnover supports local high-street custom in Old Oak Common Lane, South Acton High Street and Churchfield Road.</i>
Tackling the Climate Crisis	<i>Continuous controls deter commuter car trips, reduce cruising for spaces and</i>

	<i>help deliver the Council's Net Zero 2030 target.</i>
Fighting Inequality	<i>Introduction of cash-free and telephone-based visitor sessions, plus PayPoint options, ensures digitally excluded and vulnerable users can still access parking. Revenue can support improved public realm and active travel infrastructure benefiting all residents.</i>

Proposals and analysis of options

Option	Description	Pros	Cons	Recommendation
A	Implement 8am–8pm in Zones E & SA only	Responds to resident support; manageable scale; evidence base	Pressures remain in other zones; limited revenue uplift	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommended
B	Do nothing	Avoids short-term controversy	Fails to address parking stress; undermines Climate Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> ❌
C	Implement in all 10 zones	Uniform approach	Strong opposition elsewhere; legal risk; high cost	<input type="checkbox"/> ❌
D	Retain split windows, intensify enforcement	Minimal statutory process	Resource-intensive; poor compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> ❌

Reasons for decision

1. Continuous 12-hour control maximises enforceability; scattered 1-hour windows cannot be patrolled effectively and currently yield 35–45 % non-compliance.
2. Parking beat surveys (Oct 2024) recorded average peak occupancies of 96 % (Zone E) and 101 % (Zone SA), well above the 85 % comfort threshold
3. Extending only the two supportive zones honours the engagement outcome while providing a live demonstration of benefits ahead of any wider roll-out.

Financial impact

3. The projected cost of publishing a Traffic Management Order (TMO) and implementing the proposed changes is £5,000 £10,000.
4. Revenue projections should be considered conservative given uncertainty around behavioural change and displacement effects. Based on comparable schemes, realistic projections suggest Year 1: £75,000, Year 2: £65,000, Year 3: £55,000.

Legal Implications

No Traffic Management Order (TMO) has yet been advertised. The engagement exercise conducted between 20 November and 11 December 2024 was a non-statutory consultation, undertaken under the Council's general power of competence (s.1 Localism Act 2011) to gauge resident sentiment and inform next steps.

If the recommendations in this report are approved, the Council will rely on its powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make a Traffic Management Order extending the hours of control in Zones E and SA.

Before any Order can be made the Council must comply with the procedural requirements in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996, including:

- Publishing a Notice of Proposal in the local press and the *London Gazette*;
- Making the draft Order, statement of reasons and plans available for public inspection; and
- Allowing a minimum 21-day period for representations or objections.

The decision constitutes a Key Decision (Article 13 of the Constitution) because it affects more than one ward and commits expenditure/revenue above the £500 k threshold over four years. It is therefore being taken under officer delegated powers following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Climate Action.

In exercising its functions, the Council must also have due regard to:

- its network-management duty under s.16 Traffic Management Act 2004; and
- the Public Sector Equality Duty under s.149 Equality Act 2010.

There are no State-Aid, procurement or property implications arising at this stage.

Equality implications

5. An equality impact assessment identifies potential indirect discrimination through digital requirements affecting age (smartphone ownership drops from 95% under-55 to 65% over-70) and disability (23% lack internet access vs 11% general population).
6. Mitigation measures including non-digital alternatives, such as option to use a telephone number and make a phone call to register a parking session, or using a physical PayPoint (197 across the Borough).
7. The rights of blue badge holders are completely unaffected by these changes.

Risk Management Implications

8. Key risks include reputational damage from perceived discrimination, legal challenge on equality grounds and operational failure of payment systems. These are mitigated through comprehensive alternatives, phased implementation and robust testing protocols.
9. Displacement of parking into adjacent streets. This will be mitigated by reviewing and monitoring occupancy rates in adjacent locations.

Climate and Sustainability Implications

10. Longer controls reduce commuter car mode share and discourage cruising for spaces, cutting tail-pipe CO₂ and NO_x emissions by an estimated 40 t CO₂e per annum across the two zones. Net revenue will help fund School Streets and EV charging points locally.

Consultation

11. The engagement campaign delivered 3,833 unique responses (1 % of borough population). Leaflets were delivered to every property within the ten zones; 1,147 in Zone E and 505 in Zone SA. Response rates were 32 % (E) and 59 % (SA) of leaflet drop totals, exceeding the borough's 20 % benchmarking threshold for CPZ changes. The Public Notice stage of the Traffic Orders will provide a further 21-day statutory window for objections.
12. While 23% cited inadequate consultation, the process met all statutory requirements and achieved higher than typical response rates for parking consultations. Late submission patterns (78% in final week) suggest awareness building throughout period.

Conclusion

13. On the strength of resident support, legal readiness and a self-financing business case, the Council should proceed immediately to draft and publish the Traffic Management Order (TMO) required to put the 8am–8pm operating hours in place for Zones E and SA. Moving straight to the TMO stage will deliver prompt benefits for residents, establish a live evidence base for future policy, and demonstrate the Council's responsiveness to local feedback.