



To: Audit, Scrutiny & Petitions Board

On: 21 March 2016

Report by: Director of Finance & Corporate Services

Heading: PETITION: PARKING BAYS, RENFREW ROAD, PAISLEY

1. Summary

1.1 At its meeting on 25 January 2016, the Board agreed to continue consideration of this petition to await submission of further information.

1.2 A petition, comprising 15 signatures, had been received from Leslie Hunter in the following terms:

"I would like Renfrew District Council to remove the safety hazard caused by the position of parking bays outside by house at 86a Renfrew Road. I would like a Health and Safety assessment of the risk and I would like the pavement to be re-instated and metal bollards on the pavement to prevent on pavement parking."

1.3 At the meeting of this Board held on 25 January 2016, the Head of Amenity Services intimated that the lay-bys should remain. They performed the function for which they were created in 2006, which was to provide a location in the local area that made up for the shortfall in residential and visitor parking while maintaining two free running lanes and a right turn filter lane to West College Scotland (formerly Reid Kerr College). A clear passage was particularly relevant to ensure buses into Paisley along the inside lane of this route were not delayed. Prior to the construction of the lay-bys residents and visitors would park either on the footway creating a danger and obstruction to pedestrians or on the carriageway which created congestion on this main approach into Paisley.

- 1.4 He had also advised that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) had been considered. However, as this would have required agreement, through the Statutory TRO process, of those residents along this route who would be displaced and had no feasible alternative parking location, it was not considered viable at that time. The design of the lay-bys and associated private access visibility splays (2m by 20m for a 30 mph restricted road), accord with the former Strathclyde Region Roads Development Guide Section 5.2.4, a document used at that time because it was the most appropriate, there being no relevant Renfrewshire Council guidance available at that time.
- 1.5 The Head of Amenity Services further advises that:
- (a) Although the frontagers are as stated in title deeds owners of the solum of the road, the road and footways adjacent to 86 Renfrew Road, Paisley, are adopted by Renfrewshire Council who are responsible for their maintenance. Therefore, any proposed alteration to adopted roads and footways requires approval by Renfrewshire Council;
 - (b) Accident statistics show there has been no injury accidents for the three year period from January 2012 to December 2014 at this location;
 - (c) Should further evidence be produced showing vehicles parking on the footway at the entrance to the petitioner's driveway then consideration will be given to installing bollards to prevent this;
 - (d) The parking bays in question were provided some years ago in order to remove vehicles which were parking on the road at this location causing congestion on Renfrew Road which is the main arterial route from the M8 Motorway into Paisley Town Centre and there is no justification to support reducing the on-road parking provision at this location; and
 - (e) A site visit took place at 10am on 22nd January 2016.
- 1.6 The petitioner has been asked to return in order that the Board may resume consideration of his petition.
- 1.7 The role of the Board is to consider the petition, hear and ask questions of the petitioner and take the appropriate action in respect of the petition which will be one of the following:
- (a) that no action is taken, in which case the reasons will be specified and intimated to the petitioner;
 - (b) that the petition be referred to the relevant director and/or policy board for further investigation, with or without any specific recommendation; or

- (c) refer the petition to another organisation if the petition relates to that organisation.

2. **Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Board resumes consideration of this petition.

Implications of this report

1. **Financial Implications** – none
2. **HR and Organisational Development Implications** – none
3. **Community Plan/Council Plan Implications** – none
4. **Legal Implications** – none
5. **Property/Assets Implications** – none
6. **Information Technology Implications** – none
7. **Equality and Human Rights Implications**
 - (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 because for example it is for noting only. 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 and Safety Implications** – none
9. **Procurement Implications** – none
10. **Risk Implications** – none
11. **Privacy Impact** – none

List of Background Papers – none

Author: Anne McNaughton, Senior Committee Services Officer 0141 618 7104