RUISLIP MANOR TOWN CENTRE – PETITION OBJECTING TO A PROPOSED "STOP & SHOP" PARKING SCHEME

Cabinet Member	Councillor Keith Burrows

Cabinet Portfolio	Planning and Transportation

Report Author	Steve Austin, Environment and Consumer Protection

Papers with report	Appendix A

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	To advise the Cabinet Member that a petition has been submitted to the Council objecting to the proposals for a "Stop & Shop" parking scheme in Ruislip Manor town centre. The petition was submitted in response to the statutory consultation on design and operational characteristics for a proposed scheme.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The objection will be considered along with all other representations received from the consultation in accordance with the Council's strategy for on-street parking controls.
Financial Cost	There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services
Ward(s) affected	Manor

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

1.   **Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with the proposed "Stop & Shop" parking scheme.**

2.   **Asks officers to take the petition into account, including relevant points raised by the petitioners at the petition evening, with all other representations from the public in the forthcoming report on the consultation results for the parking scheme.**

PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

The Council has given Public Notice of the proposals for a "Stop & Shop" parking scheme in Ruislip Manor town centre. It is a requirement that all objections must be considered by the Council before making a final decision on proposals. The petitioner's objections should be considered along with all other representations submitted to the Council before it makes a final decision.

Alternative options considered

None at this stage, as the Cabinet Member when considering the report containing all other objections can decide to either approve the scheme or modify it or take no further action.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage.

Supporting Information

1.   A petition with 97 signatures has been submitted to the Council under the following terms:

"*We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to:*

Consider the detrimental impact of the scheme on small local businesses which form the majority of the business community along Victoria Road.
Appreciate the confusion for potential visitors to Ruislip Manor with the differing restrictions.
The possibility of reducing the number of visitors spending time in the area due to the pressure of 30 minutes free.

In light of the above, we urge the abandonment of the proposed scheme entirely".

Of the 97 signatures, 65 came from non-residents.

2.   In an accompanying letter to the petition, the grounds for objection to the scheme are generally that parking controls in the main shopping area would transfer parking to surrounding roads. The petitioners considered businesses were not properly consulted by the Chamber of Commerce on proposals and that customers will not be able to park.

3.   The Cabinet Member will recall considering a report in July concerning a request from the Ruislip Manor Chamber of Commerce for a "Stop & Shop" parking scheme in the town centre outside the shops. These are mostly situated on Victoria Road and the extent of the scheme is indicated on Appendix A. Detailed design was discussed with the Chamber of Commerce and the business occupiers who gave support for the proposals. Following this, the Cabinet Member subsequently approved the carrying out of statutory consultation as the first stage in the process to introduce the parking scheme.

---

4.   Statutory consultation took place between 18 November and 9 December 2009 by the insertion of a Public Notice in the local newspaper which was also displayed on street and circulated to all frontages in the proposed parking area. During this period, several representations have been received including the petition which the subject of this report.

5.   It is intended to submit a report to the Cabinet Member detailing all the representations received and it is recommended therefore that the Cabinet Member listens to the petitioners' concerns and asks officers to take these into account when completing the report.

Financial Implications

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the concerns of petitioners to be taken into account with all other representations that have been made to the Council regarding proposals for the parking scheme.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

The statutory consultation was carried out between 18 November and 9 December 2009 to allow all members of the public to put their views forward to the Council regarding the scheme.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

N/A.

Legal

In considering the consultation responses, decision makers must ensure there is a full consideration of all representations arising including those which do not accord with the officer recommendation. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account. If a local authority decides to embark upon a non-statutory process of consultation, the applicable principles are no different from those which apply to statutory consultation: see R (Partingdale Lane Residents Association) v Barnet London Borough Council [2003] EWHC 947 (Admin), [2003] All ER (D) 29.

Officers must ensure there is a full note of the main points discussed at the meeting with the petitioners. If there are new points raised in the period after the statutory consultation period which are likely to make a material difference to the competing considerations, then officers ought to consider the need for further statutory consultation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Report to Cabinet Member - 17July 2009

PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners 17 March 2010