

## VICTORIA ROAD, SOUTH RUISLIP – PETITION REQUESTING RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME

<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Councillor Keith Burrows
<b>Cabinet Portfolio</b>	Planning and Transportation
<b>Report Author</b>	Steve Austin, Planning, Environment and Community Services
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendix A

### HEADLINE INFORMATION

<b>Purpose of report</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been organised by residents living in the service road fronting Nos. 442 –512A Victoria Road, South Ruislip requesting the introduction of controlled parking, which in effect is requesting an extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme and measures to address speeding traffic.
<b>Contribution to our plans and strategies</b>	The request can be considered as part of the Council's strategy for on-street parking controls and of the Council's annual programme of road safety initiatives.
<b>Financial Cost</b>	There is none associated with the recommendations to this report
<b>Relevant Policy Overview Committee</b>	Residents' and Environmental Services
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	South Ruislip

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

1. **Considers the petitioners' request and discusses with them their concerns with parking outside their homes.**
2. **Subject to the outcome of 1 above, asks officers to include this part of Victoria Road in the subsequent review of the recent extension to the South Ruislip Parking Scheme.**
3. **Asks officers to include the request and possible options for traffic calming measures in the Road Safety Programme**

## **INFORMATION**

### **Reasons for recommendation**

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns with parking and, if appropriate, to include this section of Victoria Road within the subsequent review of the most recent extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme. The success of traffic measures which address speeding and rat-running are largely successful if they are acceptable to local residents. These can be discussed with petitioners for further detailed investigation by officers within the Road Safety Programme.

### **Alternative options considered**

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 49 signatures has been received from residents living on the service road fronting Nos. 442 – 512A west side of Victoria Road requesting the introduction of a Parking Management Scheme and measures to reduce speeding traffic. This part of Victoria Road is shown on Appendix A.
2. The petition request for a parking management scheme is assumed to be for an extension to the existing South Ruislip Parking Managing Scheme. This was recently enlarged to nearby roads including, Rydal Way, Angus Drive and Long Drive. It is very likely that this request has arisen from this extension, which may have transferred parking to just outside the new zone boundary.
3. The Cabinet Member will know that the Council's policy is to review all schemes within 6 to 12 months of it coming into operation and this includes consultation with residents outside the scheme to determine if there would support for an extension. At this time, the Council circulates to residents outside the scheme an information leaflet so that they will have a better understanding on how a scheme would affect them.
4. The most recent extension of the South Ruislip Parking Scheme came into operation in September 2009. Consequently, the review will be carried out within 12 months but as resources permit and subject to progress with other schemes on the parking programme, it may be possible to carry this out at an earlier date.
5. It is recommended therefore that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking and, if it is considered appropriate, to include this section of Victoria Road within the forthcoming review and that it can be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.
6. The petitioners also suggest that the service road is used by traffic travelling at excessive speed to "leap-frog" queuing traffic. It would seem that this is due to queuing traffic at the traffic signals at the Victoria Road/Long Drive junction.

7. It is suggested that the Cabinet Member discusses in detail with petitioners their concerns about speeding traffic and asks officers to investigate options as part of the Road Safety Programme.

### **Financial Implications**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report. The review, when carried out, would require the identification of funding. If subsequently it could be recommended to extend the scheme to include this section of Victoria Road and possibly other roads in the area, further funding for installation would need to be identified. If suitable options can be found to address traffic concerns, any scheme could be funded through an allocation for Road Safety Schemes subject to capital release approval being given.

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

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

To allow the Cabinet Member to understand the petitioners' concern with on-street parking and to consider adding this section of Victoria Road to the subsequent review of the most recent extension to the South Ruislip Parking Scheme. To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss petitioners' road safety concerns and asks officers to investigate options to mitigate them as part of the Road Safety Programme.

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

All residents within the area of the subsequent review will be consulted for their views and comments.

### **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Corporate Finance**

N/A.

#### **Corporate Procurement**

N/A.

#### **Legal**

There are no special legal implications for the proposal, 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 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 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010