

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 1 March 2011

Present:

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)

Councillors Kathy Bance, Jane Beckley, Roxy Fawthrop, Ellie Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Nick Milner, Ian F. Payne, Richard Scoates and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop, Councillor John Getgood and Councillor Colin Smith

87 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Lydia Buttinger and Councillor Tom Papworth. Councillor Roxhannah Fawthrop attended as alternate to Councillor Lydia Buttinger.

Although not a Member of the Committee, apologies were also given for Councillor Peter Fortune as Executive Assistant to the Portfolio Holder.

88 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Richard Scoates declared a Personal Interest in item 9b of the agenda.

89 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

90 PETITIONS

A petition had been received on 31st January 2011 from Elena Tincu and Sian Thomas against a parking permit scheme in the Penge East area with roads including Station Road, Mosslea Road, Kingswood Road, Lucas Road, St John's Road, Queen Adelaide Road, Montrave Road, Crampton Road, High Street, Bredhurst Close. In line with the Council's Petition Scheme, the Environment Portfolio Holder responded to the petitioners on 13th February 2011 and details of the Portfolio Holder's response had been provided to Members. Following receipt of the Portfolio Holder's response and in view of

the petition having more than 250 signatures it was the wish of the Petitioners to present their petition to the Environment PDS Committee as permitted under the Petition Scheme. Accordingly Elena Tincu attended the meeting to present the petition.

Members agreed to consider the petition, questions from Elena Tincu to the Portfolio Holder and the report for item 9c of the agenda (Report ES11020) together on the agenda.

Elena Tincu addressed the Committee presenting the background to the petition and reasons for not advocating a parking permit scheme in the roads highlighted above. Further details of Elena Tincu's address along with Members' consideration of the matter can be seen at Minute 95c.

91 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 11th JANUARY 2011 AND 31ST JANUARY 2011

The minutes were agreed and in so doing the Chairman referred to some matters arising from the previous meeting.

Referring to Minute 81A (Carbon Management Programme – Progress Report) the Chairman highlighted the final paragraph concerning new street lights in the Chelsfield area and the lights being powered by 60w bulbs compared with 45w bulbs in Farnborough village. On behalf of Councillor Julian Grainger, the Chairman asked that this matter be included as a matter arising for the future.

Concerning Minute 79A and a parking income shortfall in the context of budget monitoring, the Chairman reported that a note had been circulated by officers indicating no evidence of a modal transport shift contributing to the parking shortfall.

92 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

Three questions to the Portfolio Holder had been received from Elena Tincu concerning parking scheme proposals for certain roads in the location of Penge East railway station (see also minutes 90 and 95c). The questions and Portfolio Holder replies were tabled for Members and are reproduced at **Appendix A**.

93 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Members were provided with Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's meeting on 11th January 2011.

94 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11

Report ES11024

Based on expenditure and activity levels up to December 2010 the controllable budget for the Portfolio was expected to be overspent by £743k at year end after allowing for transfers to and from central contingency for the waste underspend of Cr £756k and recession monies to cover the £400k net shortfall on parking income. A large overspend on winter maintenance was due to the UK experiencing the coldest December in 31 years and the South East in particular suffering two main snow events with as much as 60cm falling in some parts of the Borough.

A £46k income under achievement was also projected for non-controllable budgets.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.

B) CAPITAL PROGRAMME - 3RD QUARTER MONITORING 2010/11 AND 2010 CAPITAL REVIEW

Report DR11007

Following Executive agreement on 2nd February 2011 to a revised Capital Programme from 2010/11 to 2013/14, changes were highlighted to the Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio and a revised programme for the Portfolio was provided.

At its 2nd February meeting the Executive also approved new capital bids and details of new Portfolio related schemes, approved for inclusion in the Capital Programme, were also provided.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the report.

C) REVIEW OF MOBILE PHONE PARKING: SEASON TICKETS

Report ES11015

Mobile Phone Parking was so far proving successful with an average of 200 users per day, Monday to Friday which was steadily increasing. Income received to date was 1.3% of the total amount of income normally collected through pay and display machines. With an increase in mobile phone parking

there was also potential for future savings e.g. a reduced budget for old machine replacements and a decrease in the number of cash collections.

It was proposed that a generic season ticket be developed for use borough-wide with the exception of Bromley town centre. The cost of a proposed season ticket would be based on the lowest common on-street charge rate per hour, currently 40p, for a period of ten hours per day. When used in a higher priced facility the motorist would effectively receive a discount. It was proposed that season tickets be available as either a Monday to Friday or a Monday to Saturday permit and the proposed charge would be subject to any annual parking charge increases. There would be minimal set up and on-going costs as the contractor had indicated that this could be absorbed.

The season ticket would allow motorists to park at on and off-street pay and display and/or mobile phone only locations except within the Bromley Controlled Zone where the tariffs were significantly higher than the remainder of the Borough. There was also a high number of Pay and Display machines and parking spaces in close proximity within the town centre.

Although motorists would be permitted to use time limited bays with a season ticket it would be necessary to adhere to the time restriction. A traffic warden would need to log the time of the vehicle's first observation and return later to ensure the vehicle has not exceeded the maximum stay. Should demand for season tickets be significantly higher than the low numbers anticipated the scheme would have to be reviewed. The proposed cost of season tickets were as follows:

Type	Weekly	Monthly	Quarter	6 month	Annual
Mon - Fri	£20	£87	£260	£520	£1040
Mon - Sat	£24	£104	£312	£624	£1248

In discussion the Chairman suggested that details of a refund policy for season tickets were also necessary with clarity provided on the details of any handling charge. The Assistant Director (Customer and Support Services) explained that officers were being cautious with a pricing policy; if the season tickets were not proving successful Members were advised that it might be necessary to come back with a review of the pricing structure.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) agree that a generic season ticket be introduced allowing motorists to park outside of Bromley town centre in Council operated car parks and at on-street pay and display bays; and**
- (2) consider the provision of a refund policy for season tickets including details of any handling charge.**

**D) TFL FUNDED WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2011/12 - 2013/14:
REVISION FOLLOWING THE COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING
REVIEW**

Report ES11014

Programmes of TfL-funded expenditure for the period 2011/12 to 2013/14 were approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 13th October 2010 and used in preparation of the Council's Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was submitted to Transport for London (TfL) in December 2010.

Following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review, TfL reduced borough funding over the three year period and a revised programme of formula-funded schemes 2011/12 to 2013/14 was recommended as a basis for preparing the Council's Final LIP due for submission in Spring 2011.

Although it was necessary to take a view on a reduced spending profile and to submit the information to TfL in the Final LIP, Members were advised that the suggested profiles for 2012/13 and 2013/14 remained indicative within the limits set by TfL. Officers would continue to bring forward proposals for the following year's spending in early autumn each year and it would be possible to reconsider programmes and priorities at that time.

Members were provided with the proposed revised programme along with changes from the previously agreed programme. An explanation was also provided on how the recommended revisions to the programme met the reduced levels of TfL funding.

In discussion the Head of Transport Strategy explained that a further update on funding had been received although the benefits had yet to be allocated to boroughs. The Chairman noted that the Council's final Local Implementation Plan (LIP) would come back in May and officers would be able to take account of the funding update as the LIP is finalised.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher, referring to the latest known funding position suggested the inclusion of "*Locally Determined Minor Schemes*" which had formerly been included in the expenditure programme.

The Chairman advocated a focus on principal road replacement and outlined his preference to see this, if necessary at the expense of other projects. He indicated that the condition of roads was a concern for residents. He also suggested that School Travel Planning should ensure that the focus remained fully on the original purpose for School Travel Plans i.e. congestion relief and encouraging pupils to walk to school; for "*Light against crime*" he felt that this programme could also be used to support the replacement of the old neon street lamps. The Chairman also asked if there was sufficient engagement with cycling groups - with the groups themselves helping new cyclists to venture on to the roads.

On “*Road Safety Education*” and Smarter Driving and as an incentive to encourage young people with a full driving licence to undertake further driver training, Councillor Roxhannah Fawthrop suggested that insurance premiums be reduced for more than just one year for younger drivers who had undergone such training.

Referring to casualty reduction, Councillor Bance enquired how schemes were selected and a brief explanation was provided by the Head of Traffic and Road Safety. The Portfolio Holder also referred to support that could be provided by Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the Chairman asked that the Police be invited to address the Committee (in May or June 2011) on the issue of their role in traffic enforcement.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) endorse the general structure and balance of the three year programme of formula funded schemes for 2011/12 to 2013/14 (contained at Appendix 1 of Report ES11014) while noting the Committee’s comments; and

(2) take account of further expected changes to the levels of TfL funding support when approving a three year expenditure programme for inclusion in the Council’s Final LIP.

**E) PRIVATE STREET WORKS - RAVENSBOURNE AVENUE,
BECKENHAM (UNADOPTED SECTION) - SECOND
RESOLUTION**

Report ES11023

A Resolution of Approval under the Private Street Works Code was sought in respect of the unadopted section of Ravensbourne Avenue.

It had previously been agreed to progress a scheme for a shared pedestrian and cycle way for the unadopted section provided the new shared path in Lewisham’s park was built. Following Lewisham Council approval this was completed in July 2010 and another shared path was also built in Murray Avenue Playing Fields connecting to nearby Ravensmead Road.

So that various complaints could be addressed about the surface in Ravensbourne Avenue (north section) it was necessary for the Council to adopt the street following improvement to appropriate standards. It was indicated that the improvement works could be carried out under the provisions of the Private Street Works Code but for this to occur it was necessary to make two distinct resolutions. The first was made by the Portfolio Holder in September 2009 under s. 205(1) of the Highways Act 1980 and to enable a further resolution, the appropriate documents had been prepared i.e. the Resolution of Approval.

In discussion it was confirmed to Members that should there be concerns about parking then it would be possible to consult on a possible parking permit scheme.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve without modification the specification, plan, sections and typical details, estimate and provisional apportionment submitted by the Director of Environmental Services, in respect of the scheme approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder following the Environment PDS Committee meeting on 21 September 2009;

(2) resolve that the Council bears the whole of the cost of the street works, under the provisions of s. 236(1) of the Highways Act 1980 (the proposal is to fund this cost from external TfL funding); and

(3) approve the allocation of funding from the 2011/12 Neighbourhoods and Corridors allocation, subject to officers identifying the funding from within the TfL LIP allocation for 2011/12 and subject to the approval of Transport for London.

95 MINOR TRAFFIC/PARKING SCHEME REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) LENNARD ROAD ZEBRA CROSSING AND SPEED MANAGEMENT

Report ES11028

Following concerns from residents about the lack of a crossing point on Lennard Road, in particular for parents and children travelling to and from Alexandra Junior School, a zebra crossing was proposed as per plan ESD-10719-1 providing a safer crossing point and route to and from Alexandra School. There was no School Crossing Patrol located at the site.

Hatching to a width of 2.0 metre was also proposed, extending from the existing traffic island near the junction of Lennard Road and Cator Road, to the junction of Kent House Road, as per plan ESD-10719-2. This followed concerns raised by residents and a Ward Member about vehicles speeding on Lennard Road, particularly between the junctions of Cator Road and Kent House Road.

Councillor Kathy Bance as a ward Councillor for the area expressed her support for the recommendations, noting however that a number of residents at Sycamore House had not supported the proposal.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) agree the installation of a proposed Zebra Crossing and hatching as per plan ESD-10719-1;

- (2) agree the installation of proposed hatching as per plan ESD-10719-2;**
- (3) approve funding for the scheme cost from the TfL budget for Locally Determined Schemes for 2010/2011; and**
- (4) delegate to the Director, in consultation with Ward Members and the Portfolio Holder, any minor changes needed at the detailed design stage.**

B) PETTS WOOD PARKING SCHEME

Report ES11018

Members considered proposals to amend and introduce additional parking restrictions within the Petts Wood area.

A major review of parking in Petts Wood was undertaken in 2008 with works implemented in 2009. Since then requests had been received to amend existing parking restrictions and implement additional parking restrictions. Following consultation, proposals had been designed to address as many local concerns as possible and details of the proposed alterations were provided in Report ES11018.

Consultation letters on the proposed alterations were delivered to local residents and businesses in February 2011 and Members were given an oral update on outcomes. Councillor Simon Fawthrop also spoke on this item and provided a number of comments.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) consider implementing the proposed restrictions in Petts Wood, as shown on plans ESD-10289-6D (1 – 16), taking into account the outcomes of the current consultation along with any further refinements considered appropriate to certain proposals;**
- (2) agree that the scheme implementation cost of £12k be funded from the Transport for London budget for Parking Schemes; and**
- (3) delegate to the Director of Environmental Services the authority to make any further minor modifications which might arise as a result of any further consultations or considerations.**

C) PENGE TOWN CENTRE PARKING REVIEW

Report ES11020

Residents and Ward Members had raised concerns about a number of roads in Penge having parking problems. This included commuter parking in roads surrounding Penge East station.

A consultation exercise had been carried out with residents in the centre of Penge with residents being advised that the consultation was to gauge initial views only. Only where the majority of residents felt there was a parking problem in their road, or where a nearby scheme proposal might affect their road if implemented, were roads being considered for a parking scheme.

Results of the consultation identified the following roads as having parking problems:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| ○ Bailey Place | ○ Linden Grove | ○ Raleigh Road |
| ○ Barsons Close | ○ Lucas Road | ○ Southey Street |
| ○ Bredhurst Close | ○ Maitland Road | ○ Station Road |
| ○ Cottingham Road | ○ Montrave Road | ○ Studland Road |
| ○ Crampton Road | ○ Mosslea Road | ○ Tennyson Road |
| ○ Kingsdale Road | ○ Parish lane | ○ Torr Road |
| ○ Kingswood Road | ○ Phoenix Road | ○ Venner Road |
| ○ Lennard Road (part of) | | ○ Wordsworth Road |

A summary of the consultation returns was appended to Report ES11020.

Where residents had indicated a parking problem it was proposed to consult further on the possibility of implementing permit parking in roads that might form a suitable permit zone. This would not just be in roads indicating a problem but also in roads adjacent to where displaced vehicles might park.

A petition of over 250 signatures from Elena Tincu and Sian Thomas objecting to a parking permit scheme for certain roads had been received - highlighted at item 4 of the meeting agenda (see minute 90). It was agreed to consider the petition, questions from Elena Tincu to the Portfolio Holder and Report ES11020 together on the agenda.

Elena Tincu addressed the Committee presenting the background to the petition and reasons for not advocating a parking permit scheme in the following roads: *Station Road, Mosslea Road, Kingswood Road, Lucas Road, St John's Road, Queen Adelaide Road, Montrave Road, Crampton Road, High Street and Bredhurst Close*. The petition referred to many roads (Phoenix Road and Mosslea Road included) where there was no problem for the availability of parking. The petitioners felt that commuter parking was not a problem although families having more than one car could often take up

several spaces. Residents would often be using their cars between 7am and 7pm when parking restrictions were being considered. The petitioners felt that parking bays and any new yellow lines at junctions would lessen parking space available. The petitioners also felt that consultation information on parking vouchers was limited and that the cost of vouchers for visitor parking would be a burden for those on low incomes, the unemployed and Old Age Pensioners.

A number of points were made in Ms Tincu's statement to the Committee including:

- why consideration of parking restrictions in other roads in the area if concern was about parking around Penge East station?
- life being made more difficult for residents of Kingswood and other roads, some of whom were elderly and depending on carers or others who were dependent on using their car for work;
- parking bays and yellow lines reducing available parking;
- no parking problem between 7am and 7pm provided neighbours parked more considerately;
- a suggestion of door to door consultation to gain an accurate reflection of residents' views;
- a low response from the total number of residents in a road not necessarily indicating a majority view;
- consultation needing to be improved – delivery of a sheet of paper could be considered “junk mail”;
- residents of certain roads being against a parking permit scheme; and
- further information needed for the second consultation on the voucher system and associated charges.

The Portfolio Holder explained that there had been a question about parking in Penge for some time. A previous consultation had indicated that a majority of residents were against a scheme. Parking schemes were not proactively forced on areas where they were not wanted and if a scheme was not required it would not be taken forward. It was important for residents to respond to the consultation so that their opinion could be recorded.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that a second consultation should go into detail. It could also highlight the potential for parking displacement with residents being additionally asked whether this would change their views. The outcome would be based on what residents wanted.

Councillor John Getgood as a local ward Councillor spoke on the item referring to two sets of roads in the ward where there was pressure for a parking scheme. The first consultation was broad and he had no wish for a scheme to be imposed where it was not wanted. Councillor Getgood agreed that consultation leaflets should have more information on matters such as the costs residents could expect to pay and the effects that a scheme would have for residents. The petition was important but decisions were based upon consultation results and he advocated proceeding with a second consultation.

On a map of the area, the Head of Traffic and Road Safety identified the three possible parking permit zones. He explained that further consultation was necessary particularly in view of possible parking displacement.

Councillor Kathy Bance was concerned about affordability for residents; she also encouraged the capturing of “no” responses. Councillor Ian Payne indicated that it was difficult to draw conclusions for a number of roads in view of a small response rate. The Portfolio Holder considered the first consultation inconclusive and supported a second consultation to understand more of what residents wanted. He also indicated that the consultation document should be more refined and Councillor Richard Scoates felt there should be a greater consultation emphasis on consequences.

Referring to the first consultation being inconclusive, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher felt that an adequate response level was necessary before action should be taken on schemes; she also suggested the Committee look at consultation material going to residents. Such material should indicate why it was important to respond with the consultation material being more formal and enclosed in an envelope.

In considering the report recommendations, the Chairman felt that the first was not contentious as the roads identified were not included on the petition.

For the second recommendation the Chairman suggested that further consultation be undertaken with the residents of roads where responses had indicated a parking problem – the further consultation outlining details of what was being proposed and the resident(s) being asked to indicate whether or not they supported the proposed measures. For other roads in the recommendation where responses had indicated there was no parking problem, the Chairman suggested that the consultation highlight a continuation of the current position. For these roads residents could then be asked to indicate whether or not they supported such an approach. The Chairman added that the consultation could also indicate that there might be displacement of parked vehicles into the roads.

For the third recommendation the Chairman suggested that consultation for the roads be undertaken on the basis of timed parking restrictions/single yellow lines.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) note the details of the petition submitted by Ms Elena Tincu and Ms Sian Thomas;**
- (2) agree that Wordsworth Road, Southey Street, Raleigh Road, Cottingham Road, Kingsdale Road and Torr Road are further consulted on the possibility of a permit parking scheme being implemented;**

(3) consult with residents of Kingswood Road, Crampton Road, Station Road Lucas Road, Bredhurst Close, Mosslea Road, St Johns Road, Montrave Road, Phoenix Road, Queen Adelaide Road and Barsons Close on whether any parking restrictions should be implemented with the consultation options being clearer and with the response rate being considered a factor in the decision process;

(4) agree that residents of Maitland Road, Westbourne Road, Linden Grove, Parish Lane, part of Lennard Road, Studland Road, Bailey Place and Tennyson Road be consulted on the possible introduction of timed parking restrictions; and

(5) agree that all other roads, except those identified at (2), (3) and (4) above be omitted from any further consultation.

96 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE

A) SERVICE PROPOSALS AND PROCUREMENT STRATEGY - STREET CLEANSING CONTRACT 2012 / 2019

Report ES10190

The Council's current Street Cleansing contract with Kier Services, was due to expire on 28th March 2012 following the maximum permitted extension and Members considered a report outlining the procurement requirements and strategies for letting a new contract(s).

As the proposed contract value had a budgeted cost of £4.9m per annum it was necessary to follow European Union regulation and place an advertisement in the OJEU seeking expressions of interest from organisations wishing to tender.

Councillor Michael Turner enquired whether tendering the contract with separate "lots" might remove the need to place an advertisement Notice in the OJEU. Councillor Roxhanah Fawthrop enquiring further about the lots was advised that Lot 1 (Street Cleansing & Weed Control) was the largest (over 75% of projected value).

With reference to the evaluation of bids against specified criteria based around a 60/40 price/quality split, Members were advised that this represented a desire to see value for money and quality.

RESOLVED that the Executive be recommended to:

(1) agree to the re-letting of a contract for the provision of a Street Cleansing Service and to the placement of an advertisement in the OJEU seeking expressions of interest from organisations wishing to tender; and

- (2) endorse the 60/40 price/quality split for the evaluation of bids or consider whether a higher quality weighting is justified.**

97 FRIENDS ANNUAL REPORT

Report ES11021

Members considered a report on work carried out by the Streetscene and Greenspace Division working in partnership with the Friends (volunteers) of the Borough. The report provided a summary of the progress made over the past twelve months.

With reference to recommendation 2.3 of Report ES11021, the amount secured by the Friends of Parks and Greenspaces through external funding opportunities during 2010/11 was corrected to £265,860.

The Chairman referred to the Committee's esteem for the success of the Friends of the borough and conveyed congratulations for their achievements.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the report and success of the Borough's Friends be noted;**
- (2) the thanks of the Environment Portfolio Holder and the Environment PDS Committee be conveyed to staff and volunteers for their significant and invaluable contribution;**
- (3) the securing of £265,860 for green space improvements by the Friends of Parks and Greenspaces through external funding opportunities during 2010/11 be noted; and**
- (4) the success of new initiatives under the Healthy Lifestyles heading be noted along with projects that reinforce the health programme delivered by Parks and Greenspace section.**

98 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report ES11011

Members noted the Committee's work programme for the remainder of the year along with progress on decisions from previous meetings and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio.

For the Work Programme, the Assistant Director (Customer and Support Services) indicated that a report would be provided to the Committee's next meeting on a design and consultation policy for minor traffic schemes. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher asked that this include consultation document samples. The Assistant Director also explained that it was unlikely

that a report on Chislehurst Bridge replacement would be ready for the Committee's next meeting.

Concerning Matters Arising, reference was made to the recommendation at Minute 80C (Kings Hall Road Safety Improvements) and a revised plan of the scheme was circulated.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Forward Work Programme be adjusted in the light of comments above;**
- (2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**
- (3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Questions from Elena Tincu

Question 1

Can you confirm that after the second consultation of the committee, the roads that are overwhelmingly against parking charges of any sort (Mosslea Road, Phoenix Road, Montrave Road) will not be included further in discussion? It is clear from both your survey and my petition that these roads are not in favour of parking controls.

Reply

I am extremely sorry to have to disappoint you with my answer, but I simply have to say no at this stage.

As the consultation progresses, and other neighbouring roads determine their own destinies, there is an obvious possibility that roads such as Mosslea Road, Phoenix Road and Montrave Road could suffer from displaced parking.

With that possibility in mind, people living in the three named roads could decide, upon reflection and albeit unhappily, that parking restrictions might after all be more favourable than an increase in nuisance parking.

Question 2

If, for example, in Station Road, where your survey shows that 7 people are in favour (and 4 are against), you should consider that only 7 people out of approx 50 residents there are in favour and this is in itself significant.

Reply

As with all such surveys, the Council can only make decisions based on the information received. Rather like elections, if people do not respond, it is possible that others will make decisions affecting them which they would prefer not to have been taken. I would therefore urge all residents to speak at this time, whilst there is still time to influence the outcome. Specific to Station Road, I would very much like to understand more concerning the views of local residents living there and hope this might be achieved if the consultation referred to in Recommendation 2.2 of this evening's report on the subject is approved.

Question 3

Was that piece of paper that was put through our doors the correct way of doing a survey?

Reply

I believe so. It is a model that has served us effectively across the Borough for a good number of years.

The Meeting ended at 9.48 pm

Chairman