

**TITLE: THIRLMERE GARDENS, NORTHWOOD –
PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF “AT
ANY TIME” WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

ITEM #

Cabinet Portfolio

Planning and Transportation

Report Author

Steve Austin

Papers with report

Appendix A

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report

To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents of Thirlmere Gardens asking the Council to consider the introduction of “At any time” waiting restrictions on the access to the residential sections of the road from Rickmansworth Road.

**Contribution to our
plans and strategies**

The request can be considered as part of the Council’s Programme for road safety improvements.

Financial Cost

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.

**Relevant Policy
Overview Committee**

Residents’ and Environmental Services

Ward(s) affected

Northwood

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member

- 1. Considers the petitioner’s request for the installation of “At any time” waiting restrictions on the main access carriageway to the residential sections of Thirlmere Gardens.**
- 2. Asks officers to prepare options for an appropriate waiting restriction scheme in Thirlmere Gardens for consultation with residents and report back with the results.**

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

To fully investigate the request from the petitioners who live in Thirlmere Gardens.

PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners 14 April 2010

Alternative options considered

These can be derived as part of the feasibility study for the introduction of waiting restrictions in Thirlmere Gardens.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

Supporting Information

1. A letter with a list of residents and addresses has been submitted to the Council requesting the introduction of double yellow lines in the road leading to the residential sections of Thirlmere Gardens from Rickmansworth Road. The list has come from 45 of the households but only contained 22 signatures. Nevertheless, it is in excess of the Council's criteria and is therefore presented to the Cabinet Member for consideration.
2. There would appear to be in the order of 190 households in Thirlmere Gardens and the number of addresses in the list represents just under a quarter of these.
3. Thirlmere Gardens is very close to Mount Vernon Hospital and has a junction with Rickmansworth Road. This is indicated on Appendix A. The junction with Rickmansworth Road is the only access to the large residential development of Thirlmere Gardens. The access road from Rickmansworth Road to the T-junction which leads to the residential sections has no direct residential frontage other than a flat development on the south east side. From the T-junction, Thirlmere Gardens runs east and west with the western side more densely developed than the eastern.
4. The petition organiser points out in a letter, which is stated to have been submitted on behalf of the residents of Thirlmere Gardens, that parking takes place on both sides of the access road from Rickmansworth Road. It is considered by the organiser, the majority of parking emanates from Mount Vernon Hospital and is a combination of Hospital Staff and visitors. With parking on both sides, there is concern that a Fire Appliance would not be able to access the main residential areas and that it also takes place on the T-junction at the northern end which makes it hazardous for motorists to make a turning movement because of restricted visibility.
5. In view of the proximity of the road to Mount Vernon Hospital, it is very likely that parking is associated with it and would appear to be a very convenient road for hospital staff and visitors to park as an alternative to parking in the hospital grounds.
6. The width of the access road from Rickmansworth Road into the main residential sections of Thirlmere Gardens is wider than the residential sections. It is approximately 7.5 metres wide and clearly is considered by motorists that parking can take place on both sides. Within the main residential sections of Thirlmere Gardens, the road reduces to approximately 6 metres in width and with parking this possibly may cause problems for residents to access their off-street parking.

7. The request from the residents is acknowledged but the Cabinet Member will be aware that if waiting restrictions are introduced on one part of a road network, it is very likely to transfer the parking further along or into other roads. It is noted however, that the resident's addresses supporting the request are reasonably distributed throughout Thirlmere Gardens and there would appear to be problems for residents when leaving or entering the estate. The width of the main access road however, could allow some parking but not on both sides if emergency vehicle access is to be protected.
8. It is suggested to the Cabinet Member that a feasibility study is carried out with the preparation of options for consultation with local residents. Following consultation, a report can be submitted to the Cabinet Member for consideration of a suitable scheme.

Financial Implications

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report as a feasibility study can be undertaken within in-house resources. However, if subsequently the Cabinet Member approves the introduction of waiting restrictions, funding would be required to implement, and this is usually provided through an allocation from the Parking Revenue Account Surplus.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member to consider the petitioners request following discussions and if appropriate asks Officers to prepare options for a scheme of waiting restrictions for consultation with all residents of Thirlmere Gardens.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

One of the recommendations is that further consultation be carried out with residents following the preparation of options for waiting restrictions.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Legal

A meeting with the petitioners is perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise 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. If a local authority decides to embark upon a non-statutory process of consultation the applicable principles are no different from those which apply to statutory consultation: see *R (Partingdale Lane Residents Association) v Barnet London Borough Council* [2003] EWHC 947 (Admin), [2003] All ER (D) 29. Officers must ensure there is a full note of the main points discussed at the meeting with the petitioners.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition received 30th November 2009