

**TITLE: COLUMBIA AVENUE AND BEECH AVENUE,
EASTCOTE – PETITION REQUESTING PARKING
RESTRICTIONS**

ITEM #

Cabinet Portfolio

Planning and Transportation

Report Author

Steve Austin

Papers with report

Appendices A, B and C

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report

To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents of Columbia Avenue requesting parking restrictions to address a problem they experience with commuter parking.

**Contribution to our
plans and strategies**

The request can be considered in association with the Council's strategy for the control of on-street parking and a safer borough.

Financial Cost

There is none associated with the recommendation to this report.

**Relevant Policy
Overview Committee**

Residents' and Environmental Services

Ward(s) affected

Cavendish

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member

1. **Discusses with petitioners the problems they experience with parking in their road and asks officers to:**
 - (i) **Take into consideration the petition request when reporting on the objections received to the Council's proposals for waiting restrictions in Columbia Avenue.**
 - (ii) **Investigate the feasibility to introduce a Parking Management Scheme in Columbia Avenue and Beech Avenue as requested and report back.**

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

To address the residents concern with commuter parking in their road and to arrive at a suitable scheme which will be supported by the residents affected.

Alternative options considered

These can be discussed with the petitioners but they have put forward a comprehensive suggestion to control parking in Columbia Avenue and Beech Avenue.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 39 signatures has been received from residents of Columbia Avenue requesting the Council to introduce parking restrictions to address problems they experience with commuter parking. In a covering letter to the petition, the organiser points out that parking takes place on bends and opposite residents driveways which causes obstruction, to the extent that emergency vehicles would be denied access.
2. Columbia Avenue is accessed from Oak Road in Eastcote and forms a cul-de-sac. A layout plan is attached as Appendix A. However, there is a pedestrian footpath from the northern extremity to Field End Road and emerges very close to Eastcote Underground Station. Consequently, it can be seen as a very attractive parking area by commuters.
3. The housing development is relatively new and the road, although complying with the Council's standards is narrow and on-street parking in inappropriate places would cause obstruction.
4. The petition organiser canvassed all residents in Columbia Avenue and also included the short section of Beech Avenue, east of Oak Grove. The results indicated there was enormous support for parking restrictions, although the residents appear to be split on whether the introduction of a Parking Management Scheme or Waiting Restrictions would provide the most benefit. As a result of this consultation, the petition organiser has put forward a suggested scheme and this is indicated on Appendix B. The suggestions are a combination of Residents Permit Parking Bays, Short two, one hour waiting restrictions between 10am – 11am and 2pm – 3pm with double yellow lines at junctions and bends.
5. The petition organiser points out that most obstructive parking takes place outside numbers 40 to 49 and this problem had been brought to the Council's attention previously. As a result, before the petition was presented to the Council, proposals were developed for waiting restrictions in this area and are indicated on Appendix C. For the Cabinet Member's information, Public Notice was given of these proposals between 13th January and 2nd February and a number of objections have been received, including a further petition from residents of Columbia Avenue against the measures. This petition will be included in a report to the Cabinet Member detailing all objections to the proposed restrictions with a recommendation on the way forward. The petition objecting to the

proposed restrictions was organised by the same person as the one the subject of this report and points out that although residents are objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions, the original suggestions as shown in Appendix C are still supported by residents.

6. The residents clearly have problems with commuter parking because it is such an attractive road for commuters who use Eastcote Underground Station. It is suggested the Cabinet Member discusses in detail with petitioners their problems with parking and asks the petition objecting to the Council's current proposals be taken into consideration when reporting on all objections that have been made. As the residents would appear to be requesting a Residents Permit Parking Scheme with waiting restrictions in Columbia Avenue and Beech Avenue, it is further suggested to the Cabinet Member that officers are asked to investigate the feasibility.

Financial Implications

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report. However, if subsequently the Council were to consider the introduction of a Parking Management Scheme in Columbia Avenue and Beech Avenue as requested, an allocation would be required from a surplus of the Parking Revenue Account to fund the consultation and subsequent implementation.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To consider in detail the problems experienced by residents of Columbia Avenue with parking and to determine the feasibility to introduce a scheme as suggested by them.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

If the Council subsequently decided to consider the introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme in Columbia Avenue, all residents will initially be consulted on whether they are in agreement with a scheme.

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 or 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.

Petition meetings after the close of a statutory consultation where that extra-statutory consultation raises new points but where all other members of the public (other than the petitioners) are unable to comment because the consultation has closed may raise problems.

A new consultation might be required if the new points are material and might influence the decision, and if there is no re-consultation in those circumstances, then in the worst case scenario persons opposed to the petitioners may take the view that they have been unfairly treated in procedural fairness terms. This is because:

(a) It may be seen as a gloss on the statutory consultation process and result in accusations of the decision maker taking into account considerations that those with opposing views cannot deal with - because the time for making further consultation responses has closed; and

(b) That the form (a petition), rather than the substance of consultation responses has enabled a specific group of persons to have enhanced access to the Cabinet Member after the statutory consultation period. This would be presented as an unfair "further bite" for one group of residents, which is not available to those persons that have not submitted petitions and for whom the statutory consultation period is closed.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition received 2nd December 2009

Petition received 5th February 2010