

**TITLE: BURY STREET, RUISLIP – PETITION  
REQUESTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS****ITEM #****Cabinet Portfolio**

Planning and Transportation

**Report Author**

Steve Austin

**Papers with report**

Appendix A/B

**HEADLINE INFORMATION****Purpose of report**

To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from the households in Bury Street between Pinn Way and High Street requesting the introduction of double yellow lines and resident permit parking to address the concerns they have with the level of traffic in Bury Street.

**Contribution to our  
plans and strategies**

The petitioner's concerns can be considered as part of the Council strategy for on-street parking and a safer borough.

**Financial Cost**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report

**Relevant Policy  
Overview Committee**

Residents' and Environmental Services

**Ward(s) affected**

Eastcote and East Ruislip/ West Ruislip

**RECOMMENDATION****That the Cabinet Member**

- 1. Considers the petitioner's request for the introduction of parking controls in Bury Street between Pinn Way and High Street, Ruislip.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of 1 above, asks officers to carryout a feasibility study based on the petitioners suggestions for parking controls and report back.**

**INFORMATION****Reasons for recommendation**

It would appear the petitioners have given some thought to the introduction of parking controls that would help traffic flow and the egress/access to off-street parking. The suggestions put forward can be investigated in detail and reported back to the Cabinet Member on the feasibility.

## Alternative options considered

None at this stage, as the petitioners have put forward their suggestions for parking controls. However, further options may emerge during the petition hearing with the Cabinet Member.

## Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

## Supporting Information

1. A petition with 34 signatures has been received from households in Bury Street between Pinn Way and High Street, Ruislip. The petitioners signed to the following:  
  

*“We, the undersigned, request that a double yellow line be painted on one side of Bury Street from Sharps Lane to Pinn Way to help ease traffic congestion and manage street parking. Residents parking bays should be made available for numbers 1,3, 5, 7 and 9 Bury Street. (The 3 cottages nearest to Sharps Lane)”.*
2. This section of Bury Street is indicated on Appendix A. There is residential frontage on the western side together with industrial premises. On the eastern side, there are residential properties between Pinn Way and The Great Barn. The remainder of this frontage is the Ruislip Library, bowling green and duck pond. The majority of households between the Library and Pinn Way have signed the petition whereas only a minority south of the Library have signed it.
3. In a covering letter to the petition, the organiser indicates the reason for the parking restrictions is to address the high volume of traffic in Bury Street. With parking on both sides it creates difficulties for large vehicles and they are particularly concerned with emergency vehicle access. Residents with off-street parking apparently have difficulty with using these facilities due to parked vehicles and to address these concerns, the petitioners have put forward suggestions for residents parking and double yellow lines. The suggestions were attached as a plan to the petition and for the Cabinet Member’s information it is included as Appendix B. The petitioners are suggesting that parking be allowed on the eastern side between High Street and the Library/ The Great Barn with double yellow lines northwards to Pinn Way. On the opposite side, the petitioners are requesting Residents Permit Parking only for numbers 1 to 9 then double yellow lines northwards to the end of the residential frontage. The petition organiser also points out the local Police are in agreement with these proposals.
4. The petitioners are effectively requesting the installation of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme but only in a small section of Bury Street. The Cabinet Member will be aware that residents around High Street, Ruislip have been asked for their views on Residents Permit Parking and to-date there has not been a majority preference to justify a scheme.
5. Further investigations will be required to be in a position to advise the Cabinet Member if a recommendation could be put forward to introduce a small Residents Permit Parking Scheme as requested by the petitioners. It is suggested therefore that the Cabinet Member listens to the petitioner’s concerns with parking and asks officers to investigate the feasibility of suggestions and report back.

## **Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report as a feasibility study can be undertaken with in-house resources. However, if subsequently the Cabinet Member approves the introduction of double yellow lines, these can be funded from an allocation of the Parking Revenue Account surplus for the introduction of waiting restrictions. If subsequently, the Cabinet Member approves the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme between Nos. 1 – 9 Bury Street, a bid would have to be made for the estimated cost from the Parking Revenue Account surplus.

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

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

To investigate in detail, the petitioner's concerns and suggestions for parking controls and report back to the Cabinet Member with the details.

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

If subsequently, the Cabinet Member approves the introduction of parking controls, all residents will be consulted who will be directly effected.

## **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Legal**

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.

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

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.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Petition received 7<sup>th</sup> October 2009