

Notice of Meeting and Agenda Petitions Board

Date	Time	Venue
Monday, 08 November 2021	14:00	Council Chambers (Renfrewshire), Council Headquarters, Renfrewshire House, Cotton Street, Paisley, PA1 1AN

KENNETH GRAHAM
Head of Corporate Governance

Membership

Councillor Bill Brown: Councillor Stephen Burns: Councillor Neill Graham: Councillor Lisa-Marie Hughes: Councillor Scott Kerr: Councillor Jim Sharkey: Councillor Andy Steel:

Councillor Jennifer Marion Adam-McGregor (Convener): Councillor Michelle Campbell (Depute Convener):

Hybrid Meeting

Please note that this meeting is scheduled to be held in the Council Chambers. However, it is a hybrid meeting and arrangements have been made for members to join the meeting remotely should they wish.

Recording of Meeting

This meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Convener will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The cameras focus on the main participants. If you have any queries regarding this please contact Committee Services on 0141 618 7103 To find the webcast please navigate to <https://renfrewshire.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>.

Apologies

Apologies from members.

Declarations of Interest

Members are asked to declare an interest in any item(s) on the agenda and to provide a brief explanation of the nature of the interest.

Annual Report

- | | | |
|----------|---|--------------|
| 1 | Annual Report of Petitions received and their Outcomes | 1 - 6 |
|----------|---|--------------|

Report by Director of Finance & Resources.

Review

- | | | |
|----------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 2 | Review of Petitions Process | 7 - 14 |
|----------|------------------------------------|---------------|

Report by Director of Finance & Resources

Petitions

- | | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| 3 | Petition: Parking at Gartmore Road | 15 - 22 |
|----------|---|----------------|

Report by Director of Finance & Resources.

- | | | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| 4 | Petition: Ralston Community Sports Centre | 23 - 26 |
|----------|--|----------------|

Report by Director of Finance & Resources.



To: Petitions Board

On: 8 November 2021

Report by: Director of Finance and Resources

Heading: Annual Report of Petitions received and their Outcomes

1. Summary

- 1.1 The annual report highlights petitions considered by the Petitions Board during the period March 2019 to August 2021 during which the Board met on four occasions.
- 1.2 Following the meeting of the Board on 25 March 2019, eight meetings of the Board were cancelled due to lack of business. The first meeting of the Board thereafter was held on 1 February 2021 where one petition was considered.
- 1.3 The meeting of the Board scheduled for 29 March 2021 was cancelled due to lack of business. Meetings of the Board were held on 7 June and 30 August 2021. One petition was considered at each Board. The petition considered at the Board meeting on 30 August was continued to allow the petitioner to be in attendance.
-

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Report on petitions received and their outcomes, be noted.
-

3. Background

- 3.1 Four petitions were considered by the Petitions Board during the period covered by the report, one of which has been continued to this Board

meeting. Details of the petitions received and their outcomes, are set out in the appendix to this report.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – none
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – none .
3. **Community Planning** – none
4. **Legal** – none
5. **Property/Assets** – none
6. **Information Technology** - none
7. **Equality & Human Rights** - 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** – none
9. **Procurement** – none
10. **Risk** – *none*
11. **Privacy Impact** – none .
12. **Cosla Policy Position** – not applicable

List of Background Papers -

Author: Paul Shiach, Senior Committee Services Officer
tel: 0141 618 7103
email: paul.shiach@renfrewshire.gov.uk

	Subject of Petition	Outcome	Update/progress
1	Measures to improve safety and mitigate the perception of danger at the junction between Kelburne Oval and Glasgow Road, Paisley	The Board agreed that Council Officers investigate if measures could be taken to improve safety and mitigate the perception of danger at this particular junction be approved and that the matter be referred to the Infrastructure, Land and Environment Policy Board.	That the Petition Board's decision that Council officers investigate if measures could be taken to improve safety and mitigate the perception of danger at the junction between Kelburne Oval and Glasgow Road, Paisley, be approved; and (b) That a report on the outcome be submitted to this Policy Board in due course. Report submitted to the Environment & Infrastructure Policy Board on 29 May 2019
2	Admission Policy, Ralston Early Learning and Childcare Class	The Board agreed hat the Petition be referred to the Education Policy Board with the recommendation that that Board review the current admissions policy in relation to Early Learning and Childcare across Renfrewshire.	That it be noted that a review of the current Early Learning and Childcare Admissions Policy would be undertaken and that the findings would be reported to a future meeting of this Policy Board. Report submitted to the Education & Children's Services Policy Board on 18 March 2021
3	Traffic Calming Measures - Oxford Renfrew	The Board agreed that following the undertaking of a sample speed survey a report be brought to a future meeting of the Infrastructure, Land & Environment Policy Board for consideration	It was agreed that, as the 85th percentile speed did not exceed the posted speed limit of 30 mph, no further action be taken and that the petitioner be notified accordingly. Report submitted to the Environment & Infrastructure Policy Board on 25 August 2021
4	Parking - Gartmore Road	That consideration of the Petition be continued to the next meeting of the Petitions Board.	



To: Petitions Board

On: 8 November 2021

Report by: Director of Finance and Resources

Heading: Review of Petitions Process

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Council at its meeting held on 13 September 2007 agreed a procedure in relation to the submission of petitions, including parameters for determining valid petitions.
- 1.2 The petitions procedure is part of the Council's commitment to give people a more formal and direct involvement in decision making and to allow them to raise issues with the Council and potentially influence policy on issues which matter to their communities.
- 1.3 The Council originally agreed that the procedure for submission of petitions be reviewed on an annual basis. Following these reviews action plans were developed and implemented and a number of changes made to improve engagement with and participation of the public in the petitions process. The former Audit, Scrutiny and Petitions Board subsequently agreed that the petitions process be reviewed biennially. The previous review was in 2018 and a review should have taken place in 2020. However, this was not undertaken due to the Covid19 Pandemic.
- 1.4 As part of the current review, consultation was undertaken with elected members, senior officers within the Council, community council representatives and members of the public via a questionnaire to obtain feedback to further improve awareness of, access to and participation in the petitions process.

- 1.5 In total 16 responses were received compared with 26 in the previous survey. As a result of the current consultation an action plan has been developed, which forms the Appendix to the report, to address some of the issues raised.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the consultation responses be noted;
- 2.2 That the suggestions for improvement, in particular with regard to publicising the process in a variety of media, be noted;
- 2.3 That the action plan which forms the Appendix to the report be approved; and
- 2.4 That it be noted that the next review of the Petitions process should have been due to take place in 2022 but will now take place in 2023. _

3. Background

- 3.1 The petitions procedure was introduced in 2007 and has been reviewed on a regular basis, following which a number of changes have been made.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 The consultation was based around the undernoted questions.

(a) Are you aware of the Council's petitions process and how could we improve awareness?

From the responses received 68.75% were aware of the procedure compared to .38.46% previously.

(b) How can we improve processing of petitions?

Responses included by having a "tab" or flag on the council's website to take you directly to the relevant page on how to start a petition; more social media coverage; Council needs to make sure information is there for those who need it; without knowing what it is its difficult to suggest ways to improve awareness as I do not know who your target audience is; publicise the outcomes of submitted petitions; give out information to Councillors on outcomes; and greater visibility of process.

(c) Did you find the information about the process helpful, understandable and accessible?

In response to the above, 56.25% found the information about the process helpful, understandable and accessible, which compared favourably with

47.8% from the previous review.

(d) If not, how can we improve the information we make available?

Responses included making it easier to find information on the website; constituents finding the process dense and hard to penetrate even when aware of the process; making available to all Councillors; and the introduction of a prominent Petitions webpage.

(e) Thinking of the overall processing of petitions, how can we improve this

Responses to the above were: -

Actual outcomes so the petitioner is not left frustrated; ask teenagers if they like it; bring road traffic/speeding Petitions to the Infrastructure & Environment Policy Board to speed up decisions; the overall process works, as long as it's clearly stipulated what recommendations are made by the Petitions Board, so the deciding board have all relevant information before them.

(f) Has anything hindered your access to the process?

In relation to this section, respondents indicated that there were difficulties in finding the details and forms on the website, and insufficient information was provided.

Additional comments included the council website is labyrinthine and it is difficult for "occasional" users to navigate and find what they are looking for; too much of current political administration is about diverting reform or change while paying lip service to both. The current committee only exists to ape the Holyrood one and should be re-merged with the Audit and Scrutiny and given a meaningful budget; and open it to public.

5. Next Steps

Analysis of the responses received indicates that raising awareness is required to ensure that the petitions process is more easily understood and accessible.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – none
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – none
3. **Community/Council Planning** – none
4. **Legal** - none.
5. **Property/Assets** – none
6. **Information Technology** - none
7. **Equality & Human Rights** - 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** - none
9. **Procurement** - none
10. **Risk** - none.
11. **Privacy Impact** – none
12. **Climate Risk** - none
13. **Cosla Policy Position** – not applicable

List of Background Papers

Responses to consultation

The foregoing background papers will be retained within Finance and Resources for inspection by the public for the prescribed period of four years from the date of the meeting.

Author: Paul Shiach Senior Committee Services Officer
(tel: 0141 618 7103/email: paul.shiach@renfrewshire.gov.uk)

Suggestions received	Proposed action	Completion date	Previous actions on similar Suggestions
Improve awareness of the Council's Petitions process	Arrange for appropriate publicity in local press and Council publications.	Dec 2021	This has already been done following a previous review but will be repeated
	Arrange to insert a "tab" or flag on the council's website to take you directly to the relevant page on how to start a petition.	Dec 2021	This will be implemented
Outcomes to be notified to the Petitioner	Email and letter to Petitioner following the Board decision together with any follow up action.		This has been implemented
Bring petitions to the Infrastructure & Environment Board to make decisions without delay	This would be a matter for the Administration Group		The role of the petitions board is to consider each petition, listen to the Petitioner, ask questions and take the relevant action for each petition. The options open to it are take no action, in which case the Petitioner will be given the reasons; pass the Petition to the relevant director or policy board to investigate, with or without any specific recommendation; or if the petition relates to another public organisation, pass it on to that organisation with or without any specific recommendation when the Board recommends that a petition be forwarded to a specific Board, it is submitted to the next relevant meeting of the

			relevant board, attaching the report which went to the Petitions Board, the outcome of the petition and any recommendations by the Petitions Board.
--	--	--	---



To: Petitions Board

On: 8 November 2021

Report by: Director of Finance and Resources

Heading: Parking at Gartmore Road

1. Summary

1.1 The Council has agreed procedures in relation to the submission of petitions including parameters for determining valid petitions and those areas where petitions would not be valid.

1.2 All valid petitions are to be submitted to the Board for consideration and a summary report is to be prepared on any petitions which are not considered to be valid in terms of the procedures. It is for the Board to determine the validity of such petitions.

1.3 A petition containing 43 signatures has been received from Mr H Lister in the following terms: -

“Cars parked in Gartmore Road (mainly, parking by residents living in Hawkhead Road, not using their own driveways) near or on the corner are forcing motorists entering or exiting into a narrow slot which has led to cars just avoiding head on collisions. Motorists parking and using Gartmore Road ignore the access only signs. School children crossing the road are being put in danger as cars parked block a driver's view. As we have a number of schools with pupils using Hawkhead Road this problem of child safety requires your urgent attention. A child's view when crossing Gartmore Road is restricted by parked cars.

We the Residents of Gartmore Road wish the Council to Double Yellow Line the entrance to our road up to the bollards. To consider a solution to stop motorists using our road as a shortcut to avoid the lights at the junction of Glasgow Road and Hawkhead Road. Through traffic using Gartmore Road is on the increase. The large number of houses being built on Hawkhead Road will only increase the foregoing

problems. Your early attention would be appreciated. Can an Access only Road be backed by law and drivers warned or fined?

Note: - Even numbers start at 40. Odd numbers have gaps and numbers 25, 27 and 41 to 55 have not been used. Stopped at Alton Road and did not take in houses in Gartmore Road beyond this point as they tend to exit Glasgow Road.

Resident in number 3 agreed that there was a serious problem parking and his reason for not signing was the cars would be parked further up the road. Could lead to problems with accessing or exiting his driveway. Extended yellow lines might be a solution.

The response from the residents signing to support the need for double yellow lines was very positive and many were angry that our road was being used for parking by people living in Hawkhead Road”.

- 1.4 The Development Manager, Environment and Infrastructure has advised that inspection of the end of Gartmore Road at its junction with Hawkhead Road suggested that the traffic calming necking was located some distance away from the give way marking so that two cars could safely pass side by side at the junction, assuming parked cars were not compromising visibility or the available width of the road. He has also indicated that justification for yellow line restrictions was typically an identified road safety issue. A check of the accident record for this junction showed one slight injury accident in the last three years.
- 1.5 The Development Manager, Environment and Infrastructure has advised that an officer will inspect the location to understand the severity of the problem but if all is as described, the Council would promote a ‘no waiting at any time’ restriction at the location requested. It should be noted that the traffic order needed to enforce the yellow line restriction was open to public consultation and its success could not be guaranteed. The traffic order process can take up to 12 months to pass through its consultation and reporting phases before any yellow lines can be marked. He has also intimated that Gartmore Road is part of the public road network. The Council is unable to prevent road users from using it, irrespective of whether it is used as a short cut. A ‘no vehicles except for access’ restriction already applies at the junction. As disobeying this restriction is a moving traffic offence, enforceable only by the police, the petitioner was advised to enquire of Police Scotland if such a restriction “could be backed by law and drivers warned or fined”.
- 1.6 The role of the Board is to consider the petition 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. The principal petitioner, together with one supporter has been invited to attend the meeting.
- 1.7 The Petitions Board at its meeting on 30 August 2021 agreed that consideration of the Petition be continued to allow the Petitioner to be in attendance.
- 1.8 Subsequently a third-party representation was received. In terms of the process, the Petitions procedure is silent on submissions made by third parties. The Chair has the power to decide all questions of procedure for which no express provision is made in standing orders. The Chair has agreed that in the interests of transparency the third-party representation should be attached as an appendix to this report,

together with comments from the Transport and Development Manager.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Board hears from the principal petitioner.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – none
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – none
3. **Community/Council Planning** - none
4. **Legal** – none
5. **Property/Assets** – none
6. **Information Technology** - none.
7. **Equality & Human Rights** - none

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** - none
9. **Procurement** - none
10. **Risk** - none.
11. **Privacy Impact** - none
12. **Cosla Policy Position** – not applicable.

List of Background Papers

- (a) Background Paper - 1 Petition
 - (b) Third party representation
-

Author: Paul Shiach, Senior Committee Services Officer
Tel: 0141 618 7103 Email: paul.shiach@renfrewshire.gov.uk

14th October 2021

Dear Petitions Board,

Petition regarding Parking at Gartmore Road

I was dismayed to discover through the local press that the above petition has been lodged with Renfrewshire Council. As someone who is directly impacted by this, I would have thought that I would have been alerted through formal channels and not left to find out by chance. Thankfully the petitioner did not attend your last meeting, allowing me the opportunity to write to you.

I frequently park my car in the area referred to in the petition so I would be directly impacted by any changes to the current arrangements. There are a number of issues with this petition that concern me and I would like to bring them to the attention of the committee.

1. I am disappointed the language of the petition is so aggressive. At no point in this process have any of the affected parties been approached to discuss the issues that the residents of Gartmore Rd are allegedly experiencing. This may have allowed an amicable solution to the issue. Using the blunt instrument of a petition is not in the spirit of being a 'good neighbour' and does not engender good community spirit.
2. The first sentence of petition states that my neighbours and I are not using our drives to park our cars. This is the underlying thrust of the petition and is an untrue representation of the facts. I know I, and my neighbours, use our driveways to park cars every day/night. If the petitioner had taken the time to look at the issue in a bit more detail, he would have found that cars parked on Gartmore Rd are overflow from driveways. It is also worth noting, cars are not parked over corners, pedestrians have full view of traffic, both on Hawkhead and Gartmore Roads. Again this is a misrepresentation of the facts.
3. The petitioner has commented on the 'Access Only' signs. The residents of Hawkhead Rd are using Gartmore Rd in exactly the same manner as the residents of Gartmore Rd, to get access to park their car. The Hawkhead Rd residents pay Motor Vehicle Tax and are entitled to do this and are not breaking any laws. They are not using Gartmore Rd as a short cut to Glasgow Road, the reason for this sign.
4. The petitioner acknowledges Hawkhead Road is a main thoroughfare by his comments regarding pedestrians. He fails to acknowledge it is also a main arterial route for vehicles traveling south from the motorway into the south / southeast side of Paisley and beyond. Due to this, the option for on street parking is not one that is available to the residents of Hawkhead Rd.

If the residents of Hawkhead Rd parked their overflow cars on the street, this would seriously affect the flow of the traffic through the town as it would cause congestion on Hawkhead Rd and the surrounding area. It is not acceptable to park on the pavement. A further issue from the volume of traffic is that on the few occasions I have parked on the street, my car has been damaged twice by passing traffic and has required repair at my own expense, another reason why I park our second car on Gartmore Rd.

5. The issue highlighted in the petition is not unique to Gartmore Road. It is prevalent in both Lanfine and Newtyle Roads, the latter has more serious issues as it is a narrower road.
6. Whilst parking our car, we have become aware of people parking who are overflow from Hawkhead Station. This is also true of Newtyle Rd. This highlights issues in this area too.
7. The north end Hawkhead was constructed over 100 years ago when traffic was mainly horse and cart and it was not a through road. It was not constructed for either the volume of traffic that it now carries or that most households have a number of cars.(I note the petitioner has a driveway that is wide enough to accommodate his two cars, I don't have that luxury).

I moved into my house 24 years ago and the volume of traffic has increased incredibly in that time yet there has been no change to the infrastructure. For example, a Transport Assessment was carried out in 2016 by the developers prior to the building of the new houses on the old BASF site. On page 14 of this document there is acknowledgement that Hawkhead Rd is used by a far higher volume of traffic than it was designed for. It also highlights on page 15 that the mini round about at Hawkhead Rd/Seedhill Rd, was no longer suitable and had been designed for a peak vehicle flow of 500 vehicles per hour. In 2016 it was 2,017 vehicles per hour. That number has only increased since the new estate opened and those in Barrhead and Neilston were completed. **Nothing has been done to address this issue. I have included the Assessment for your information.**

There is one issue I agree with, that is the number of drivers that use Gartmore and Newtyle Roads to avoid the traffic lights at Glasgow Road. This will become a greater issue in light of the current cycle lane consultation. Any of the proposed options will only drive more vehicles down these roads. Maybe putting a fire gate in or closing off one end may help here? But then, that would inconvenience the residents of Gartmore Rd!

This is an issue that deserves a more detailed solution than the painting of a couple of yellow lines on Gartmore Rd. It needs a full traffic management plan that meets the needs of all the residents of Hawkhead, Lanfine, Gartmore and Newtyle Roads and I would encourage Renfrewshire Council to address it in the whole, rather than as a small element of the larger issue.

Make Hawkhead Rd a safe place and reduce the traffic issue and I, and my neighbours, will park our cars on street. Until then I will continue to park safely on Gartmore Rd.

The petitioner says many residents are angry, do they fully understand the situation? If it's any consolation I am angry too...that my situation and that of my neighbours, which I think is more serious, is being disregarded by a number of my fellow Ralston residents.

I would hope my letter is taken seriously and the issues raised in point 7 are addressed.

Yours faithfully,

Kenny Gough

The Roads department's primary concern and the reason why it is prepared to promote a traffic order banning parking at the entrance to Gartmore Road between Hawkhead Road and the traffic calming necking in Gartmore Road, is the ability for vehicles to pass each other safely in the mouth of the junction, without delay. The traffic calming necking is designed to dissuade through traffic from using Gartmore Road and provides a useful end point for the extents of any proposed parking ban.

Parked cars in the mouth of the junction either slow down (or if a car is coming the other way) prevent cars entering Gartmore Road and cause queuing back into Hawkhead Road, a road which is busy (as the writer points out) and would benefit from being kept as free flowing as possible. I would agree with the writer that parking on Hawkhead Road is to be avoided for the same reason and parking on the pavement is unacceptable.

The Roads department is aware of the similar issue at Lanfine Road and Newtyle Roads and would be prepared to promote similar traffic orders banning parking here also, on similar road safety grounds.

It is recognised that the mini-roundabout junction of Seedhill Road and Hawkhead Road does require upgrading. The developer of the BASF site was to have been tasked with making the necessary alterations through the planning process. However, the developer did not own or control the land required to do that. The land is owned by the Ministry of Defence and the Roads Department is now in the process of trying to negotiate the acquisition of the land to improve the junction.

Albeit, the true solution to the congestion we experience is to encourage people to travel sustainably in future, hence the cycle route, and not to own second cars. If car ownership continues to rise unchecked, the roads Department will have to use all of the available network of roads to cope, and the attempted restriction of some roads to residential traffic only like Gartmore Road, Lanfine Road and Newtyle Road may prove impossible.



To: Petitions Board

On: 8 November 2021

Report by: Director of Finance and Resources

Heading: Petition: Ralston Community Sports Centre

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Council has agreed procedures in relation to the submission of petitions including parameters for determining valid petitions and those areas where petitions would not be valid.
- 1.2 All valid petitions are to be submitted to the Board for consideration and a summary report is to be prepared on any petitions which are not considered to be valid in terms of the procedures. It is for the Board to determine the validity of such petitions.
- 1.3 A petition has been received in relation to an application for the transfer of Ralston Sports Community Centre to private ownership.
- 1.4 The Head of Economy and Development has advised that a Community Asset Transfer application has been received from Kelburne Hockey Club for Ralston Sports Centre. This application has yet to be validated by the Council due to a number of factors. Only when an application is validated does the statutory process kick-in in terms of wider consultation with local community and other stakeholders, but we are not there as yet for Ralston.
- 1.5 The Head of Corporate Governance considers that the petition is not valid in terms of paragraph 3 (ii) of the procedures:

"Petitions about individual planning, licensing or other applications (including decisions already taken) where there are already procedures in place".
- 1.6 It is for the Board to determine the validity of the petition and whether they wish to hear it.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Board determine the validity of the petition and whether it wishes to hear it.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – none
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – none
3. **Community/Council Planning** - none
4. **Legal** – none
5. **Property/Assets** – none
6. **Information Technology** - none.
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** – none
9. **Procurement** – none
10. **Risk** - none.
11. **Privacy Impact** - none
12. **Cosla Policy Position** – not applicable.
13. **Climate Risk** - none

List of Background Papers

- (a) Background Paper - 1 Petition

Author: Paul Shiach, Senior Committee Services Officer
Tel: 0141 618 7103 Email: paul.shiach@renfrewshire.gov.uk

