



**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

14<sup>th</sup> 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.