

## PEPYS CLOSE – PETITION REQUESTING MEASURES TO PREVENT ALL DAY NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKING

**Cabinet Member**

Councillor Keith Burrows

**Cabinet Portfolio**

Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling

**Officer Contact**Kevin Urquhart  
Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services**Papers with report**

Appendix A

### HEADLINE INFORMATION

**Purpose of report**

To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents of Pepys Close asking the Council to consider parking restrictions in the road to prevent all day non-residential parking and improve access.

**Contribution to our plans and strategies**

The residents' request will be considered as part of the Council's strategy for on-street parking.

**Financial Cost**

There are none associated with the recommendation to this report.

**Relevant Policy Overview Committee**

Residents and Environmental Services

**Ward(s) affected**

Ickenham

### RECOMMENDATION

**That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking in Pepys Close.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of 1 above, asks officers to add the request to the Council's programme for parking schemes for future consultation on options to address all day non-residential parking and then to report back to local Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member on the outcome.**

## INFORMATION

### Reasons for recommendation

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and if appropriate add their request to the parking scheme programme.

### Alternative options considered / Risk Management

None at this stage.

### Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

### Supporting Information

1. A petition with 55 signatures signed by some of the residents of Pepys Close has been submitted to the Council under the following heading:

*“As you probably noticed recently, cars are parking quite selfishly as you come into Pepys Close.*

*This practice creates a dangerous situation for traffic entering and exiting the close, particularly at the junction with Milton Road.*

*Also, they often park on both sides of the road causing great difficulties for Emergency Vehicles, Refuse Lorries (as was the case recently) and Delivery Lorries.*

*Since the motorists themselves are incapable of using their own intelligence, we thought that it would be sensible for the Council to implement appropriate parking restrictions in order to ensure that no residents are denied a service – especially that of an Ambulance or a Fire Engine. This could also prevent the road being used as a free all-day car park for commuters and others.*

*Would you support a suggestion to the Council to restrict parking in this way?”*

2. Pepys Close is a residential road just off Milton Road consisting of a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties with flats with a private forecourt located at the end of the close. Due to the relatively close proximity to Ickenham Underground Station and local amenities Pepys Close is an attractive area for non-residents to park. The location of Pepys Close is indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A.
3. This petition has been signed by 32 households of Pepys Close which represents 53% of the total number of households in the Close.
4. Residents have not indicated what type of parking restrictions they would like to see implemented in Pepys Close, although a couple of individual petitioners who signed the

petition expressed their preference for a limited waiting restriction operational for an hour a day. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns and, if considered appropriate, asks officers to add this request to the future parking scheme programme and carry out an informal consultation with the residents of Pepys Close to establish the overall level of support for parking restrictions. This will also give residents the opportunity to consider the options available to address non-residential parking. The outcome of this consultation will be reported back to Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member to assist the Council in making a decision on how best to proceed.

### **Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendation to this report.

### **EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES**

#### **What will be the effect of the recommendation?**

To allow the Cabinet Member to consider the petitioners' request and available options the Council has to address these concerns.

#### **Consultation Carried Out or Required**

It is recommended that informal consultation be carried out with residents to establish the overall level of support for parking restrictions in Pepys Close and the options available to address these concerns.

### **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Legal**

There are no special legal implications for the proposal, which amounts to an informal consultation. A meeting with the petitioners is perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise, especially where consideration of the policy, factual and engineering issues are still at a formative stage. Fairness and natural justice requires that there must be no predetermination of a decision in advance of any wider non-statutory consultation.

Should there be a decision that further measures are to be considered then the relevant statutory provisions will have to be identified and considered. In particular the Council's power to make orders creating residents permit parking arrangements are set out in Part IV, Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The consultation and order making statutory procedures to be followed in this case are set out in The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (SI 1996/2489).

In considering any informal 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.

## **Corporate Property and Construction**

Corporate Property and Construction is in support of the recommendations in this report.

### **Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Petition received 15<sup>th</sup> December 2011