

# PETITION REQUESTING RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING IN WALNUT WAY, 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
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendices A and B

## 1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition requesting residents' parking to be introduced in Walnut Way, Ruislip.
<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 to this report.
<b>Relevant Policy Overview Committee</b>	Residents' and Environmental Services.
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	South Ruislip

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Discusses with petitioners and listens to their request for parking restrictions in Walnut Way, Ruislip.**
- 2. Explains to petitioners that the existing proposals for a Parking Management Scheme in Walnut Way appear to maximise the overall amount of kerbside space for parking without causing obstruction but were previously rejected during the formal consultation process.**
- 3. Notes that the scheme shown in this report was previously the subject of a statutory consultation and unfortunately drew a small response with a majority opposed to the proposals. On this basis, the scheme was never further progressed at that stage.**

**4. Decides whether a scheme for Walnut Way should be included under the Council's future parking scheme programme for further consultation when resources permit.**

#### **Reasons for recommendation**

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

#### **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 34 signatures has been submitted to the Council with the following heading:

*"Petition from residents of Walnut Way to be part of the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme."*

2. Walnut Way is a residential road off Mahlon Avenue, South Ruislip. Due to the close proximity to South Ruislip Underground Station and extent of the nearby South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme, Walnut Way would appear to be an attractive area for non-residents to park. The location of Walnut Way and the extent of the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme is indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A.

3. This petition has been signed by 34 households of Walnut Way which represents approximately 71% of the total number of households in the road.

4. The Cabinet Member will be aware that an extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme was proposed in Walnut Way and nearby Masson Avenue in May 2013. Attached as Appendix B to this report is a plan of the detailed design that was developed for the road and on the basis of which residents were formally consulted. During the consultation the responses from Walnut Way indicated that three residents supported the scheme and one was against the scheme. However, three other residents felt the proposed scheme would not provide enough parking for residents. These residents were effectively asking for parking to be considered on both sides of the road. Unfortunately it was not possible to recommend parking on both sides of Walnut Way as the total road width is between 5.9 and 6.1 metres, which is not enough space to allow for parking on both sides whilst still leaving enough remaining road width for a fire tender. As it was not possible to accommodate the suggestions made by residents' as part of these proposals it was recommended that the proposed scheme for Walnut Way be deferred.

5. As the Council has only recently consulted on proposals which were mainly rejected by the majority who responded to the consultation, it is 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 for future consultation. It is also recommended that the previous proposals indicated on Appendix B are discussed with petitioners and the reasons understood why more parking could not be considered in this street.

### **Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report, however if the Council were to consider the introduction of parking restrictions in Walnut Way, funding would need to be identified from a suitable source.

## **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**

The Council has previously carried out statutory consultation to introduce an extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme in Walnut Way, however these proposals were subsequently deferred due to the lack of support. Should the Council now propose parking restrictions in Walnut Way, formal consultation will be carried out with residents to establish if there is overall support for a scheme.

## **5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

None at this stage.

### **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 consultation.

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 Cabinet Member must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

Should there be a decision that further measures are to be considered then the relevant statutory provisions will have to be identified and considered at that point

## **Corporate Property and Construction**

None at this stage.

## **Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Nil