

# PETITION REQUESTING RESTRICTED PARKING IN ICKENHAM CLOSE, RUISLIP

<b>Cabinet Member(s)</b>	Councillor Keith Burrows
<b>Cabinet Portfolio(s)</b>	Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling
<b>Officer Contact(s)</b>	Kevin Urquhart Residents Services Directorate
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendix A

## **1. HEADLINE INFORMATION**

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition requesting parking restrictions in Ickenham Close
<b>Contribution to our plans and strategies</b>	The request can be considered in relation to the Council's strategy for on-street parking controls.
<b>Financial Cost</b>	There are no financial implications associated with the recommendation in this report
<b>Relevant Policy Overview Committee</b>	Residents' and Environmental Services.
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	West Ruislip

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking in Ickenham Close, Ruislip.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the discussions with petitioners, asks officers to include the request in a subsequent review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform them that the Council intends to include Ickenham Close in the next review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.

### **Alternative options considered / risk management**

These will be discussed with petitioners.

### **Policy Overview Committee comments**

None at this stage

## **3. INFORMATION**

### **Supporting Information**

1. A petition with 32 signatures from residents of Ickenham Close has been submitted to the Council under the following heading:

*“The residents of Ickenham Close propose that parking restrictions be applied to all areas of Ickenham Close due to the continued use by commuter and off-peak travellers who use the close as a free car park for West Ruislip Station. This inhibits residents and their visitors / deliveries etcetera. from parking in close proximity to their dwellings / places of deliveries. As no restrictions are in place a constant stream of traffic drives around the close looking for free parking with no consideration for the residents and in some cases, discarding litter etcetera. from their cars once they have parked.*

*We would consider all restriction options and the times they would be imposed, but prefer the introduction of permits. We have the support of Councillor Philip Corthorne in the implementation of these parking restrictions.*

*We the undersigned support this proposals and confirm that we are residents and vehicle drivers who hold a full driving licence of Ickenham Close.”*

2. Ickenham Close is a cul-de-sac off Ickenham Road just to the north of West Ruislip Underground Station. Attached as Appendix A is a location plan which also indicates the extent of the nearby West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme. As other roads in the vicinity of Ickenham Close have parking restrictions the road forms an attractive parking area for commuters.

3. Parking in Ickenham Close is already partly restricted, consisting of a mixture of ‘at any time’ and Monday to Friday 11am to Midday waiting restrictions. By way of this petition, residents are effectively asking for the entire road to now become a controlled parking area and have indicated they would prefer a residents’ permit parking scheme similar to the scheme in operation in other roads nearby.

4. In September 2011 the Council informally consulted the residents of Ickenham Close to see if residents would like to consider being included in a possible extension to the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme. At that time the majority of residents that responded to the

consultation indicated they would prefer no change to the existing parking arrangements and therefore no further action was taken to introduce parking restrictions in Ickenham Close.

5. In October 2012 an extension to the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme was implemented nearby in the layby next to the junction of Ickenham Close and Ickenham Road. Since this extension to the scheme has been installed it is probably likely that some non-residential parking may have been displaced into Ickenham Close.

6. The residents of Ickenham Close now appear to wish to reconsider parking restrictions with 17 out of the 31 households in the road signing this petition broadly in support of parking restrictions.

7. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns and, if considered appropriate, includes Ickenham Close within the next review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme, which is scheduled to take place within 6-12 months of the most recent extension coming into operation or sooner if resources allow.

### **Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendation to this report.

## **4. 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 have to address these concerns.

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

Informal consultation has been carried out in Ickenham Close when residents were asked if they wanted to be part of an extension to the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme. Due to a negative response Ickenham Close was not included in a subsequent statutory consultation on a detailed design for a possible extension to the scheme. The next review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme is scheduled to take place between 6 and 12 months from October 2012.

## **5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications associated with the recommendations set out above.

### **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 and factual 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.

Accordingly, the Council must balance the concerns of the objectors with its statutory duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

Should the outcome of the informal discussions with petitioners require that officers include the Petitioners request in a subsequent review of possible options under the Council's Parking Management Scheme and a consultation be carried out when resources permit there will need to be consideration of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, which govern road traffic orders, traffic signs and road markings. If specific advice is required in relation to the exercise of individual powers Legal Services should be instructed.

### **Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

NIL