

WHEELERS DRIVE, RUISLIP – PETITION IN SUPPORT OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Cabinet Member

Councillor Keith Burrows

Cabinet Portfolio

Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling

Officer Contact

Steven Austin
Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services

Papers with report

Appendices A & B

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

This report contains confidential or exempt information

N / A

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report

To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents living in and close to Wheelers Drive, Ruislip indicating they do not object to possible waiting restrictions in a small section of Wheelers Drive, Ruislip.

Contribution to our plans and strategies

The request can be considered as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.

Financial Cost

Relevant Policy Overview Committee

Residents' and Environmental Services

Ward(s) affected

West Ruislip

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

1. **Meets and discusses with petitioners in detail their concerns they are experiencing with parking in their road.**
2. **Subject to 1 above, asks officers to identify suitable options to address these which will be acceptable to residents.**

PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with petitioners – 14 September 2011

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

It is understood from the petition that some residents have indicated that they would not object to possible “at any time” waiting restrictions on one side of the Wheelers Drive and Leaholme Way junction. However, the Cabinet Member will be mindful that previous proposals have met with strong local opposition.

Alternative options considered

These can be identified from the discussions with the petitioners.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage.

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 32 signatures has been received from residents living in and close to Wheelers Drive, Ruislip under the following heading:

‘Petition – No objection to waiting restriction in Wheelers Drive (Local residents).’

The petition was signed by 11 households of Wheelers Drive, 14 households of Leaholme Way, 3 households of Wyteleaf Close and 2 from Ladygate Lane. In an accompanying email attached to the petition the lead petitioner suggests that the residents were not aware of an amended “At any time” waiting restriction proposal included as Appendix B to this report and would have no objections to them.

2. In October 2008, a request was received from a resident of Wheelers Drive requesting the installation of “At any time” waiting restrictions at the junction of Wheelers Drive and Leaholme Way. The resident stated that vehicles parking close to the junction resulted in larger vehicles experiencing access problems, and that vehicles parking opposite this resident’s drive restricted access and egress to their off-street parking.
3. Following site visits to the location and subsequent photographic evidence provided by the resident, a scheme was developed for “At any time” waiting restrictions at the junction of Wheelers Drive, Wallington Close and Leaholme Way, a plan of which is attached as Appendix A to this report. These proposals were approved for formal consultation which took place from 12th May 2010 for 21 days.
4. On 26th May 2010, the Council received a petition with 68 signatures objecting to the proposals signed under the following heading *“We the undersigned agree to the enclosed letter, fully objecting to the proposed restrictions, prohibiting parking in Leaholme Way, Wallington Close and Wheelers Drive.*
5. The petition was heard by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling in October 2010 who met with petitioners and discussed in detail their concerns. The

Cabinet Member asked that officers include the petition, the outcome of discussions and other representations to the formal consultation in a report for his consideration before he makes a decision on how to proceed.

6. It was clear from the meeting that a significant number of residents were opposed to the original scheme and that there appeared to be a degree of community tension on the subject, so another meeting was requested by a local Ward Councillor to try to reach a compromise to the issues which it was hoped would satisfy all affected residents' concerns.
7. In November 2010, residents, a local ward councillor and council officers met and as a result an amended proposal for "at any time" waiting restrictions was developed.
8. It appears that some residents were shown a copy of the amended scheme and anecdotally the message from them was that most would object to any parking restrictions. As a consequence of the views expressed to the consultations and at meetings with residents, it was recommended in the subsequent report submitted to the Cabinet Member that no further action to implement "At any time" waiting restrictions should be taken at this stage, as there appeared to be no consensus on a possible compromise. The recommendation was subsequently approved by the Cabinet Member in March 2011.
9. However, at the end of March 2011 a new petition was submitted which would seem to indicate that residents would not object to an amended scheme that would see the original "At any time" waiting restrictions significantly reduced.
10. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns and, subject to the outcome, asks officers to identify possible solutions that will be acceptable to all residents.

Financial Implications

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report. However, if a suitable option can be agreed to address residents' concerns subject to the usual protocols, funding from an allocation for road safety schemes could be used for formal consultation and possible implementation.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns and explore possible options that could be introduced to address their issues.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None at this stage.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Legal

This report does not propose any formal measures to be taken at this stage: only an informal consultation is proposed. In considering the 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 were conscientiously taken into account. However, section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 means that the Council must balance the concerns of the objectors/supporters with the statutory duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic.

The Council's power to make orders imposing waiting restrictions are set out in Part 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Should waiting restrictions be required, the consultation and order making statutory procedures to be followed in this case are set out in The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (SI 1996/2489). If measures are recommended in a Cabinet report subsequent to this report, advice on the legal implications of such measures should be requested from legal services.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition received – 16th May 2011

Petition received – 30th March 2011