
To: Infrastructure, Land and Environment Policy Board

On: 22 January 2020

Report by: Director of Environment & Infrastructure

Heading: The Renfrewshire Council (Paisley, Corsebar Road & Environs) (Various Restrictions and Pay & Display) Order 2019, Sustained Objections

1. Summary

- 1.1. In terms of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is delegated to the Director of Environment & Infrastructure after consultation with the Convener of the Infrastructure, Land and Environment Policy Board and the local ward Members.
 - 1.2. The proposed TRO allows Renfrewshire Council to complete its proposals to protect the public roads around the Royal Alexandra Hospital and in particular Corsebar Road, some of which suffer from inconsiderate, congestive and in some cases dangerous parking.
 - 1.3. On the 24 April 2019 the above TRO, was advertised for public consultation. Eight objections were received. Officers communicated with the objectors and after further discussion four objections were withdrawn. Four objections were maintained.
 - 1.4. In accordance with the 'Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 1999' and the Council's procedures, the Board may now decide how to proceed; to either make the order, make the order in part or not make order. The type of proposed restriction does not automatically require the appointment of an independent Reporter to decide on the objections. The Board is therefore free to choose either to decide on the objections itself or to appoint a Reporter to do so.
 - 1.5. A plan of the proposed TRO location is included in Appendix 1.
-

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Infrastructure, Land and Environment Policy Board:

- 2.1. Considers and decides on the 4 the objections made and not withdrawn in relation to The Renfrewshire Council (Paisley, Corsebar Road & Environs) (Various Restrictions and Pay & Display) Order 2019 at the meeting of this Policy Board rather than appointing an independent reporter.
 - 2.2. Subject to recommendation 2.1 and the objections not being upheld, approves the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised on Corsebar Road, Paisley and authorises the Director of Environment & Infrastructure in conjunction with the Convener of Infrastructure, Land & Environment Policy Board to make the Traffic Regulation Order.
-

3. Background

- 3.1. This Order is considered necessary for Renfrewshire Council to complete its proposals to protect the roads around the Royal Alexandra Hospital from inconsiderate, congestive and in some cases dangerous parking.
- 3.2. On 27 January 2016 the Environment Policy Board agreed to the recommendation of the then Director of Community Resources to commence the statutory process to promote a TRO to, among other things, enable a residents' parking scheme combined with pay and display parking to be introduced between numbers 52 and 74 on the west side of Corsebar Road, Paisley.

4. Consultation Results

- 4.1. The proposal went through a two-stage consultation process. The first stage was issued on 22 August 2018 where the proposals were issued to emergency services, public utilities, local road user groups, local community groups and local ward Members with a response date of 2 October 2018. Comments were received and amendments made. The TRO then underwent its second (public) consultation and was advertised in the Paisley and Renfrewshire Gazette on 24 April 2019 for responses by 21 May 2019. Notices were also placed on-street in the vicinity of the proposal during that time.
- 4.2. A number of responses expressing support for the proposal were received. Examples of which are given below:
 - Supporter 1: Victoria Road.
'...provided the regulations are monitored and enforcement action taken as appropriate. Victoria Rd and especially Corsebar Rd are becoming increasingly dangerous streets because of inconsiderate parking and excessive speed,...'

- Supporter 2, Victoria Road.
‘we are deeply concerned about our children’s safety as RAH Staff race to find parking often on the pavement, blocking drive access and driving erratically.’
- Supporter 3, Corsebar Road.
‘...[I] believe that these [proposed changes] will have a positive impact on reducing issues of poor visibility due to parking on pavements...’
- Supporter 4, Victoria Road.
‘... no waiting Mon. – Fri. 8 am to 5 pm is a good proposal on [the] very busy Corsebar Road and Victoria Road ...’
- Supporter 5, Corsebar Road.
‘fully support this proposal as parked cars on the pavement blocking the view of oncoming traffic makes exiting my property very difficult.’
- Supporter 6, Victoria Road.
‘When the homeowners of Ashwood Court ... drive out of the Car Park we ... cannot see traffic coming up the hill at the beginning of Victoria Road.’

4.3. Eight objections were received from seven members of the public and one local Elected Member. The seven members of the public were invited to discuss accommodations which would allow the removal of those objections. The local Elected Member was also consulted on their objection. Officers met with six of the seven invited objectors (one did not respond to the invitation) and after further discussion four objections were withdrawn. Four objections were maintained, as outlined below:

Objector	Address	Objection
Objector 1	Victoria Gardens	The proposed restrictions would push on-street parking further away from RAH and into other residential roads.
Objector 2	Member of staff who gave address as c/o Royal Alexandra Hospital	RAH has introduced a barrier system that prohibits access to its car park for ‘9 to 5’ staff. Staff who work ‘9 to 5’ shifts are penalised as there is nowhere to park close to the hospital. There are various reasons why staff have to commute by car including poor public transport links. Also, many staff are contracted to work across sites (within Greater Glasgow & Clyde Health Board area) and need to travel from hospital to hospital and to provide emergency on-call services.
Objector 3	Renfrewshire Council	The proposed restrictions would push on-street parking further away from the RAH

	Member for Ward 7	and into other residential roads in Ward 7. Until we tackle the volume of traffic at the RAH and its lack of parking spaces, the parking problems in the Corsebar area are not going to be resolved.
Objector 4	Corsebar Drive	The proposal is not solving the problem it is only pushing it further up Corsebar Road into Corsebar Drive causing conflict between residents and car owners and affecting other road users in the area.

- 4.4. In response to these objections, officers have stated that should the proposal displace parked cars into surrounding roads, consideration will be given to promoting further TROs to extend restrictions into these roads (with the proviso that such TROs are subject to public consultation and cannot be guaranteed to be made). Officers also explained that they have no influence over the Royal Alexandra Hospital's car parking policy. In fact, the Council's only recourse in many circumstances where decisions taken by others impact on the number of cars parking on the public road, is to promote parking restrictions.
- 4.5. Officers consider the maintained objections to be answered by the Council's commitment to promote further TROs as necessary or that the solution to the objection is outside the control of the Council. Officers recommend that the TRO be made as advertised.

5. Consideration of the objections

- 5.1. The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 state that before making the order, the Council (in the form of its Infrastructure, Land and Environment Policy Board) must consider all objections made and not withdrawn. In this respect, the terms of the Regulations state that the Board may consider the objections itself in fulfilment of its statutory obligation to give due consideration to all objections made and not withdrawn. Alternatively, the Board may choose to appoint an independent Reporter to hold a hearing to consider the objections.
- 5.2. If the Board decides to exercise its discretion and not appoint an independent Reporter, then it must consider the objections and either uphold them, in which case the proposal shall be dropped, or consider the objections and then approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised, as a whole or in part, and authorise the Director of Environment & Infrastructure to make the Order.
- 5.3. If the Board decides to choose the public hearing, it should be recognised that the Reporter's deliberations could take approximately 15 weeks. Thereafter, the Board has an obligation to consider the report and recommendation made by the Reporter and to decide on whether to proceed with the order.
- 5.4. The cost of arranging an independent Reporter to hold a public hearing is estimated at £5000 (estimated cost of Reporter's time @ £290 per day plus expenses for 15 days). Therefore, it is recommended that the Board considers the objections itself.

6. Implementation

- 6.1 Should the Policy Board approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised, officers will arrange for the required works to take place.
 6. In addition to lining and signage requirements, there will be a requirement for six pay and display parking meters as part of the restrictions.
-

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** - the nominal capital and revenue costs of implementing and maintaining the proposed lines and signs can be accommodated within existing budgets.
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – The nominal increase in the number of restrictions to be enforced by the Council's Parking Attendants can be accommodated within current staffing levels.
3. **Community Planning**

Children and Young People – N/A

Community Care, Health & Well-being – N/A

Empowering our Communities – N/A

Greener – N/A

Jobs and the Economy – N/A

Safer and Stronger – N/A
4. **Legal** – The relevant legislation is the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999.
5. **Property/Assets** – N/A
6. **Information Technology** – N/A
7. **Equality & Human Rights** -
 - (a) The Recommendations contained within this report have been assessed in relation to their impact on equalities and human rights. No negative impacts on equality groups or potential for infringement of individuals' human rights have been identified arising from the recommendations contained in the report. If required following implementation, the actual impact of the recommendations and the mitigating actions will be reviewed and monitored, and the results of the assessment will be published on the Council's website.

8. **Health & Safety** – The primary reason for the proposal is for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising
9. **Procurement** – N/A
10. **Risk** - no risks have been identified in relation to the proposal.
11. **Privacy Impact** – N/A
12. **CoSLA Policy Position** – N/A.
13. **Climate Risk** – The implementation of the TRO will assist in reducing traffic levels and encourage use of public transport which would contribute to positive climate change.

List of Background Papers - none

Author: Mark Higginbotham
mark.higginbotham@renfrewshire.gov.uk
07432 105694

Appendix 1

