

# PETITION REQUESTING AN EXTENSION TO THE RUISLIP GARDENS PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME

<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 an extension to the Ruislip Gardens Parking Management Scheme to cover all of Ruislip Gardens Estate.
<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 recommendations 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:

- Discusses with petitioners and listens to their request for an extension to the Ruislip Gardens Parking Management Scheme across the entire Ruislip Gardens estate.**
- Explains to petitioners that recent consultations with residents have indicated that the majority of residents in all roads have a preference for no change to the current parking arrangements.**

### Reasons for recommendation

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

## 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 37 signatures has been submitted to the Council requesting that the Ruislip Gardens Parking Management Scheme be extended across the entire Ruislip Gardens estate. The initial petition comprised 28 signatures although an additional nine were subsequently added. In the covering letter, the lead petitioner explains the difficulties that residents are experiencing with non-residential parking, which they associate with commuters, due to the close proximity of the Ruislip Gardens Underground Station.
2. An area plan of the Ruislip Gardens area including the extent of the existing Ruislip Gardens Parking Management Scheme is indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A.
3. This petition has been signed by residents of 13 different properties within the Ruislip Gardens Estate. However, it should also be noted that the remaining signatures came from residents who live elsewhere within the Borough.
4. Closer examination of the petition shows that the signatures from local roads were as follows:

Bedford Road -	2
Clyfford Road -	8 + 2 added later
Trevor Crescent -	<u>1</u>
Total in Estate -	13
5. The Cabinet Member will be aware that last year the Council carried out an informal consultation with all roads within the Ruislip Gardens estate on the periphery of the existing scheme, to see if any roads would support an extension to the parking scheme and options to manage parking in their road. This is in line with the Council's approach to respond to residents' views and to only introduce any fresh parking controls which are clearly supported by a majority of local people.
6. A significant number of the properties in Bedford Road and Clyfford Road benefit from off-street parking and this may explain the lack of enthusiasm for any form of parking controls.
7. The results of this consultation were reported and considered by the Cabinet Member in August 2013. An overwhelming majority of responses from all roads consulted indicated a preference of no change and so it was decided that no further action should be taken to introduce further parking restrictions in the Ruislip Gardens area, due to the apparent lack of support. For the benefit of this meeting, the results of the consultation which were reported to

the Cabinet Member are attached to this report as Appendix B. Key aspects of this are extracted below:

<b>Road</b>	<b>'No Change' / No Returned</b>	<b>In support of waiting restrictions / No Returned</b>	<b>In support of a parking management scheme / No Returned</b>
Acorn Grove	8/8	0/8	0/8
Bedford Road	25/42	1/42	15/42
Bromley Crescent	8/13	0/13	5/13
Clyfford Road	48/53	1/53	4/53
Hathaway Close	2/4	0/4	2/4
Lea Crescent	32/33	0/33	1/33
Stafford Road	31/38	1/38	6/38
<b>Total</b>	<b>154/191</b>	<b>3/191</b>	<b>33/191</b>

8. Comparison of the consultation results with the petition shows that at least three of the residents in one road who signed the petition asking for an extension of the parking management scheme also rejected it in the consultation.
9. It is recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with residents their concerns and explains that, as previous consultations have indicated a clear lack of support for parking restrictions across the entire estate, the Council has decided to not proceed with any further proposals to extend the parking scheme.

### **Financial Implications**

There are none 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 consider the petitioners request and explain that given the outcome of the previous consultation, the Council has taken no further action to introduce parking scheme.

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

The Council informally consulted all residents across the Ruislip Gardens estate in 2013 and 2010.

## **5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

Corporate finance concurs that there are no financial implications associated with the recommendations to this report.

## **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.

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. 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 add the request to either the Council's overall parking programme or the Council's Road Safety Programme for subsequent investigation there will need to be consideration of Highways Act 1980, 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.

## **Corporate Property and Construction**

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

## **Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Cabinet Member report - Ruislip Gardens Parking Management Scheme - Results of informal consultation on a possible extension to the scheme - 15<sup>th</sup> August 2013

Cabinet Member decision notice – 20<sup>th</sup> September 2013