

# PETITION REQUESTING AN EXTENSION TO THE ICKENHAM PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN THE EASTERN SECTION OF HOYLAKE CRESCENT, ICKENHAM

<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 - Location plan

## 1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition requesting the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme be extended to include the eastern section of Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham
<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>	Ickenham.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

1. Listens to their request for an extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme to be introduced in the eastern section of Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham.
2. Informs petitioners that the Council intends to review the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme Zone IC again in July 2017.
3. Instructs officers to include Hoylake Crescent within the upcoming review of the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme so that residents can reconsider parking restrictions within this section of the road.

### Reason for recommendations:

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform them that the Council plans to review the parking in the vicinity.

---

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 50 signatures has been submitted to the Council signed by the residents of part of Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham. Within the petition proforma the lead petitioner has made the following statement:

*"The eastern section of Hoylake Crescent between Copthall Road East and Woodland Close is used as a car park for commuters and, on numerous occasions, for people going on holiday and leaving their vehicles parked for many days. The stretch of Hoylake Crescent stated above has cars parked both sides of the road where it is only passable by a single car. There are limited passing places which causes hold ups and anger, particularly when school traffic is heavy. At these times, residents cannot get up the road.*

*The dense parking causes two further problems for residents;*

*1. Even if cars are parked legally (ie not encroaching on residents drives) residents cannot get out of their drive due to the limited turning space available and those in Farm Close cannot get out of the close.*

*2. Vehicles arriving or leaving Hoylake Crescent see no cars coming from the opposite direction, accelerate through the section where cars are parked in an attempt to get through before a car approaches from the opposite direction. This is a danger when residents are leaving their drives as other vehicles approach at significant speeds. There have been a number of near misses in such situations.*

*Furthermore, it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to get up the road and certainly could not enter Farm Close if a situation where these would be required ever arose."*

*"The residents would like to see a parking management system introduced in the defined section of Hoylake Crescent, excepting Farm Close, which returns the road to a safe neighbourhood road where traffic can flow safely and residents can get out of and back into their properties without risk to themselves and others, and without unacceptable delays."*

2. The boundary of the nearby Ickenham Parking Management Scheme Zone IC is indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A. Hoylake Crescent is situated on the periphery of the existing scheme and as such is likely to be an attractive area for non-residents to park. This petition refers specifically to the eastern section of Hoylake Crescent which theoretically would suffer the worst from non-residential parking being one of the closest unrestricted roads to the Ickenham Village Town Centre.

3. The Cabinet Member will be aware that the residents of Hoylake Crescent have been consulted previously to see if they would consider being included in a possible extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme. This was last carried out in October 2014 where the majority of residents that responded indicated they would prefer no change to the current parking arrangements. As a result no proposals for parking restrictions were developed for Hoylake Crescent and parking has since remained unrestricted. However, the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme was recently extended in the adjacent road Copthall Road East in July 2016, therefore parking may have been displaced into Hoylake Crescent and other nearby unrestricted roads as a result.

4. The Council already intends to conduct a review of the parking scheme 12 months since the last extension of the scheme was introduced in part of Copthall Road East. As part of this review the Council intends to consult residents of roads on the periphery of the existing scheme to see if they would like to consider an extension to the scheme in their road to prevent non-residential parking. The extent of the consultation area for this review will be agreed in liaison with the local Ward Councillors.

5. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns and, if considered appropriate, asks officers to include Hoylake Crescent within this upcoming review of Ickenham Parking Management Scheme so that the residents can reconsider parking controls for their section of street.

### **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 part of Hoylake Crescent 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**

Informal consultation was carried out with the residents of Hoylake Crescent in October 2014 to see if residents would like to consider parking restrictions in their street. The recommendation of this report is to include Hoylake Crescent in a future informal consultation to see if residents would like to reconsider parking restrictions again.

## **5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

Corporate Finance has reviewed the report and concur with the financial implications set out above

## **Legal**

There are no special legal implications for the proposal to discuss with petitioners their request for an extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme, 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 or statutory consultation.

In considering the residents' 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.

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 time.

## **Corporate Property and Construction**

None at this stage.

## **Relevant Service Groups**

None at this stage.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Cabinet Member report - Ickenham Parking Management Scheme - Results of informal consultation on a possible extension to the scheme - Published February 2015

Cabinet Member report - Results of statutory consultation for the proposed extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme - Published December 2015

Cabinet Member report - Results of statutory consultation for amendments to an extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme - Published May 2016