

## TITLE: ST DAVID CLOSE, COWLEY – PETITION OBJECTING TO A PARKING SCHEME

<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Planning and Transportation
<b>Report Author</b>	Steve Austin
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendix A

### HEADLINE INFORMATION

<b>Purpose of report</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents of St David Close objecting to the road becoming part of the Cowley Residents Parking Scheme. This report is presented to the Cabinet Member to consider the residents concerns.
<b>Contribution to our plans and strategies</b>	The request can be considered as part of the Council's strategy for on-street parking schemes.
<b>Financial Cost</b>	The estimated costs to remove or retain the Close in the scheme are similar and can be funded from an existing allocation from the Parking Revenue Account surplus provided for the installation of an extension to the Cowley Parking Scheme.
<b>Relevant Policy Overview Committee</b>	Residents and Environmental Services
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	Brunel

### RECOMMENDATION

**That the Cabinet Member discusses with residents their concerns with inclusion of St David Close within the Cowley Parking Management Scheme and decides whether the road should be removed or retained in the scheme.**

### INFORMATION

#### Reasons for recommendation

The residents of St David Close have previously indicated support for a parking scheme but the petition clearly indicates there is significant opposition. As the Cabinet Member has previously approved the inclusion of St David Close within the Cowley Parking Scheme, a review may be appropriate after listening to the concerns of residents.

## **Alternative options considered**

The Cabinet Member can decide to remove St David Close from the latest extension of the Cowley Parking Scheme or retain its inclusion.

## **Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)**

None at this stage

## **Supporting Information**

1. A petition with 21 signatures has been received from residents of St David Close, Cowley against the installation of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme within their road.
2. St David Close is a small cul-de-sac with a junction with St Peters Road in Cowley. It is shown on Appendix A which also indicates the boundary of the existing Cowley Parking Management Scheme and a proposed extension. St David Close is included in the proposed extension.
3. Following a review of the existing Cowley Scheme, several roads outside the boundary indicated support to become part of it. An extension was considered by the Cabinet Member in December 2008. The Cabinet Member was mindful that as schemes expand so parking transfers to other roads outside the boundary of a larger scheme. This would have occurred to the area around St David Close and the Cabinet Member requested further consultation be undertaken with these roads to determine if residents wanted to join the scheme on the basis that adjacent roads were to become part of it. This consultation was undertaken in January/February 2009 and the results from St David Close indicated the majority of those who responded wanted the road to be included within the scheme. This was subsequently considered by the Cabinet Member and approval given to include the Close within the scheme. Consequently, detailed design and statutory consultation was carried out in March/April. Although no formal objections were received from St David Close, correspondence with a resident during the consultation period indicated there was overwhelming resistance to the Close becoming part of the scheme and this has led to the presentation of the petition at this evening's meeting.
4. It would appear residents of St David Close have changed their views on whether the road should become part of the Cowley Parking Management Scheme. It is the Council's general policy to only introduce these schemes where they are supported by the majority of residents however it should be pointed out to residents that if St David Close is not included in the Cowley Scheme and St Peters Road is, residents of the Close will not be allowed to apply for permits in order to park in the scheme. A situation could arise whereby there is no available on-street parking in St David Close but residents would not, during the hours of operation of the parking scheme, be able to park in St Peters Road.
5. Following approval of the scheme after statutory consultation and as there were no objections from St David Close, plans have been made to install the scheme. It was at the initial stages of this installation that residents became concerned with becoming part

of the scheme and the presentation of this petition. After receipt of the petition, a decision was made not to progress any further with installation of the scheme in St David Close until the Cabinet Member has had an opportunity to consider the resident's request.

6. It is suggested the Cabinet Member discusses with the petitioners their concerns and subsequently decides whether installation should proceed with a scheme in St David Close or it is removed from the scheme.

### **Financial Implications**

The estimated cost to introduce the scheme in St David Close has been previously approved from an allocation of the Parking Revenue Account surplus, as part of the proposed extension of the Cowley Parking Management Scheme. If St David Close is subsequently removed from the scheme, there will be additional cost to change the Traffic Order and signing which approximately equal to the cost of installing a scheme in the Close.

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

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

To allow the Cabinet Member to give further consideration to the needs of St David Close residents with parking on-street.

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

Both informal and statutory consultation has been undertaken with the residents of St David Close.

### **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Corporate Finance**

#### **Legal**

In all cases, there must be 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.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Report to Cabinet Member 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009  
Cabinet Member decision 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009  
Petition received 11<sup>th</sup> August 2009