# PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF PARKING PERMITS IN OLD HATCH MANOR, RUISLIP

| Cabinet Member(s) | Councillor Keith Burrows |
|---|---|

| Cabinet Portfolio(s) | Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling |
|---|---|

| Officer Contact(s) | Steven Austin, Residents Services |
|---|---|

| Papers with report | Appendix A - Area plan of Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip |
|---|---|

## 1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

| Summary | To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition requesting the introduction of Parking Permits on Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip. |
|---|---|
| Contribution to our plans and strategies | The request can be considered in relation to the Council's strategy for on-street parking controls. |
| Financial Cost | There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations to this report. |
| Relevant Policy Overview Committee | Residents' and Environmental Services. |
| Ward(s) affected | Eastcote and East Ruislip & Manor (near to ward boundary). |

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Meeting with the Petitioners, the Cabinet Member:**

1. **Listens to their request for the introduction of Parking Permits for Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip;**

2. **Notes that, although within Eastcote and East Ruislip ward, Old Hatch Manor is near the boundary of Manor ward; and,**

3. **Subject to the outcome of the above, decides if the request for a parking scheme should be added to the Council's future parking scheme programme for further investigation and more detailed consultation when resources permit.**

**Reasons for recommendations**

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

---

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

**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 28 signatures, which represents half of the households in Old Hatch Manor, has been submitted to the Council under the following heading:

   *"We the undersigned are residents of Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip. We are formally requesting that Hillingdon Council consider the installation of restricted parking for non-residents. It is becoming difficult to park our own vehicles because of increased parking by others".*

2. Old Hatch Manor is a residential road within easy walking distance of Ruislip Manor Town Centre and London Underground Station, served by the Metropolitan and Piccadilly lines. The entrance to Warrender School is located approximately halfway along the road.

3. In a covering letter attached with the petition, the lead petitioner states *"I am writing on behalf of residents of Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip. You will see the attachments are in the form of a petition; we are asking that Hillingdon Council kindly considers the introduction of Parking Permits in our road. Our concerns are that the street is being used by commuters as there are plans to double the size of Warrender School (situated in the middle of old Hatch Manor) and this will surely have an impact on traffic and parking in our short road.*

4. The petitioners have helpfully indicated that their preferred option is a residents' permit holders-only parking scheme. However, the Cabinet Member will be aware of the sensitivities with the introduction of a new Parking Management Scheme in isolation, as there is the risk that solving the parking issue in a single road may lead to the displacement of the problem into the adjacent area.

5. The Cabinet Member may also wish to note that while the petitioners live in Eastcote and East Ruislip Ward, the potential wider implications of any parking scheme, as well as the possible displacement of parking into other residential roads, could have an impact on Manor Ward and, for that reason, the views of the Councillors for both wards may need to be considered.

6. It is therefore 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. As is common practice, this could be combined along with any other nearby roads that the local Ward Councillors feel may also benefit from parking controls.

---

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

**Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report. However, if the Council was to consider the introduction of parking restrictions in Old Hatch Manor or any other of the surrounding roads, 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 has to address these concerns.

**Consultation Carried Out or Required**

If the Council subsequently investigates the feasibility to introduce parking restrictions in Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip and the surrounding area, consultation will be carried out with residents to establish if there is overall support.

## 5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

**Corporate Finance**

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and concur with the financial implications noted above.

**Legal**

There are no special legal implications for the proposal to discuss with petitioners their request for the introduction of Parking Permits for Old Hatch Manor, Ruislip, which amounts to an informal consultation, and to note that although within Eastcote and East Ruislip ward, Old Hatch Manor is near the boundary of Manor ward. A meeting with the petitioners is perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise, especially where consideration of the policy, factual and engineering issues and 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. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

**Corporate Property and Construction**

None at this stage.

**Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

## 6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

NIL.

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS