

TAVISTOCK ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING THE ABANDONMENT OF PARTS OF YIEWSLEY (Y1) PMS EXTENSION

Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Gordon Hill Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix A - Plan

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To advise the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received requesting the abandonment of any plans to extend the Yiewsley Parking Management Scheme into Tavistock Road, Winnock Road, Wimpole Road and Padcroft Road.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The Council's Overall Parking Programme.
Financial Cost	There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services.
Ward(s) affected	Yiewsley

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their request not to implement the proposed parking restrictions in Yiewsley and;**
- 2. Subject to the above, asks officers to include the petition request and the outcome of discussions with petitioners in the forthcoming report incorporating all representations received from statutory consultation on the proposed extension to the Yiewsley (Y1) Parking Management Scheme.**

Reasons for recommendation

Following statutory consultation on parking proposals, all comments received must be considered by the Council before a final decision is made. A report will subsequently be drafted

detailing these comments which can include this petition together with the outcome of discussions with the Cabinet Member at the petition evening.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None at this stage.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 102 signatures has been received from COMAG, who are a marketing and distribution company based in Tavistock Road, submitted as follows:

“Petition Topic and Desired Outcomes

Topic – Parking Restrictions

Outcome – No parking restrictions to be introduced in any of the following roads in West Drayton Tavistock, Winnock, Wimpole, and Padcroft”

In an accompanying letter submitted with the petition it is stated that a minimum of 23 of the petitioners are local residents although none appear to be from the affected roads and the remainder appear to be employees of COMAG.

2. Tavistock Road, in which COMAG are based, is a mix of light industrial units at the eastern end and residential properties to the west. The other roads mentioned in the petition, Winnock Road, Wimpole Road and Padcroft Road are mostly residential roads.
3. The Cabinet Member will be aware that in September 2010 the Yiewsley Parking Management Scheme came into operation. It is the Council's usual practice to review schemes 6-12 months after starting.
4. This review took place in September 2011 when residents within the scheme were asked if they had any views in light of operational experience. Roads on the periphery of the scheme were delivered an information leaflet and questionnaire to ask if residents living there would like their road included in the scheme.
5. From the review, six roads indicated they would like to consider measures to prevent all-day non-residential parking. These were Albert Road, Horton Road, Padcroft Road, Tavistock Road, Trout Road and Wimpole Road. The results were reported to the Cabinet Member who subsequently approved detailed design and formal consultation for the area indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A to this report.
6. Statutory consultation was conducted over a three week period from 22 August to 12 September 2012. An information letter was delivered to all properties in the area and during this time plans were available for inspection in Yiewsley Library.

7. The petition is clearly asking that no parking restrictions are introduced in Tavistock Road, Winnock Road, Wimpole Road and Padcroft Road. However, what is not clear is the reason why the petitioners are objecting to the proposals.
8. As it is intended to submit a report to the Cabinet Member detailing all the representations received to the formal consultation, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member listens to the petitioners' concerns and asks officers to take them into account when completing the report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations to this report.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns.

To allow the petitioners' concerns to be included in the statutory consultation report.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

Statutory consultation carried out on a detailed design.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications.

Legal

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.

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 to ensure fairness between the statutory consultees and the petitioners.

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

There are no property implications resulting from the recommendations set out in this report.

Relevant Service Groups

None at this stage.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

NIL