

**PETITIONS & REPRESENTATIONS BOARD**  
**Wednesday 10 July 2019**  
**At 6.00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillors A. Hussain (Chair), Abid (Vice-Chair), Akbar, D. Chapman, Simmons and Taylor

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Christine Davy Network and Safety Manager  
 Bert Siong Democracy & Scrutiny Officer

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**Ward Councillors**

**Members of the Public** For Erin Close Petition (6.1):  
 12 Erin Close residents,  
 including the Lead Petitioner  
  
 For Pembroke Avenue (6.2):  
 The Lead Petitioner

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Skepelhorn

		<b>ACTION:</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>MINUTES (REF: 2.1 &amp; 2.2)</b>	
	<b>Resolved:</b> That the minutes of the meetings held on 14 November 2018 and 21 May 2019 be agreed as true records and the chair be authorised to sign them.	
<b>4</b>	<b>PETITION – SUSPENSION OF RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME – ERIN CLOSE, LUTON (REF: 6.1)</b>	
	<p>The Network and Safety Manager presented the report on a petition from residents of Erin Close requesting the suspension of the residents parking scheme.</p> <p>The Board was advised a petition signed by 20 residents of Erin Close and Erin Court had been previously submitted to the Council in 2017 requesting the Council to permit residents to have residents only parking in Erin Close due to commuters and local garages parking their vehicles dangerously and to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions at the junction of Erin Close and Douglas Road. The petition also expressed concern about non-residents using the bin store for Erin Court.</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p>That petition was reported to the Petitions and Representations Board on 21 February 2018 and 18 April 2018, which approved the introduction of a residents parking scheme in Erin Close during 2018-19 financial year and the 'no waiting at any time' restrictions at the junction of Erin Close and Douglas Crescent at the same time.</p> <p>The Network and Safety Manager went on to advise the Board about the current petition signed by 34 residents from 21 properties in Erin Close and Erin Court, requesting the residents parking scheme be suspended due to the negative financial impact on the people who the scheme was designed to help.</p> <p>She said the residents parking scheme and the parking restriction were advertised in January 2019, Letters were hand delivered to all residents giving them the opportunity to object. The letters detailed the cost of permits, which was £50 for the residents permit and £22 per book of 10 for visitors permits</p> <p>The cost of the permits was to contribute to the setting up of the scheme and ongoing administration of the scheme.</p> <p>One objection was received. The objector felt the parking scheme was required, but felt that the charge was unjust. The objection was considered, as per procedure, by the Portfolio Holder and Director of Public Realm and over-ruled. The scheme was introduced in April 2019 at a cost of approximately £3000.</p> <p>The Residents Parking Scheme regulated parking within the street, enabling each resident who owned a vehicle not exceeding the 5.3m in length, 2.25m in height and 3 tonnes in weight to purchase one parking permit, entitling them to park on the highway between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday. Outside these times any driver, including residents did not need a permit to park.</p> <p>25 Residents' Permits had been purchased and 5 applications had been received pending review/approval, as at 3 June 2019.</p> <p>Since the start of the scheme, Civil Enforcement Officers had visited Erin Close 18 times and issued 39 penalty charge notices to vehicles without a permit and 1 penalty charge notice to a vehicle parked on the no waiting at any time restrictions, as at 3 June 2019.</p> <p>The Network and Safety Manager advised the Board of its options, as follows:</p> <p>a. To continue with the scheme, given that its costs were clearly stated to resident at the time that the Traffic Regulation Order was advertised and there was only one objection. The scheme was regulating parking, as requested in the original petition. This was the recommended option;</p> <p>or</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p>b. To recommend to the Executive that the residents permit scheme be removed, at a further cost to the Council of approximately £2500. This was not recommended, as the issues highlighted in the original petition would not be solved.</p> <p>Responding to questions from Members, the Network and Safety Manager provided further information as set out in the following paragraphs.</p> <p>She re-iterated there were 25 permits issued but only 20 live at the current time. There were now none under review and concluded this was probably due to people moving.</p> <p>She was not aware if refunds were given for people who moved away.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces available had not changed from before the scheme was implemented, there being not enough for all vehicles.</p> <p>Every resident who qualified could apply for and be allocated a permit. Several people owning cars from one household could each apply for a permit, but one person from one household owning several cars could only have one permit.</p> <p>The Chair then invited spokespersons from the audience to speak for the petitioners.</p> <p>Katy Smith, the Lead Petitioner thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak in support of the petition and proceeded to highlight the key issues of concerns the residents had with the current scheme, which are summarised in the below paragraphs.</p> <p>The current scheme failed to take account residents drove to work during the day, when the parking restrictions applied (8am to 6pm, Monday to Saturday), leaving the street empty. Then, when they returned home from work after 6pm, residents could get no parking spaces, as outside the restricted hours, the two local garages and business premises nearby parked their cars in Erin Close, an original issue raised, which the scheme had failed to address. Some of the cars from the garages were thought to be in dangerous conditions.</p> <p>The only impact of the resident parking scheme was a financial one on the residents.</p> <p>Elderly and vulnerable people were feeling more isolated, as many of their visitors, some on welfare benefits themselves, could not afford to pay for the expensive visitor's permits or the fixed penalty notices for parking without permits.</p> <p>Residents felt they were being victimised by the Council and</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p>asked for fair treatment by having a review and suspension of the scheme.</p> <p>She said there had not been frequent movement of residents from Erin Close.</p> <p>One or two other residents in attendance spoke making the point that many residents, particularly the elderly and vulnerable ones did not understand about the issues or the costs of the scheme and did not attend meetings.</p> <p>Responding to Members' questions, the Network and Safety Manager provided further information as set out below.</p> <p>She re-iterated the letter, containing details of the scheme, including the costs was hand delivered to residents and proceeded to read its contents at the Board's request.</p> <p>About the implications of changing the time restriction or other changes to the scheme, she said the same process as that for setting up the scheme would need to be followed, in effect starting again.</p> <p>In relation to the local garages parking cars in for repairs in Erin Close, she said anyone can park a vehicle that was taxed and insured anywhere on the highways, where not restricted. If on the double yellow lines, enforcement actions would be taken.</p> <p>Asked why there was not a 2 hour free parking window for visitors, like other similar schemes elsewhere, she said there was not such a request for this scheme.</p> <p>Following discussion, a Member proposed that a decision on the petition be deferred for further information on the key issues and how to overcome them, particularly the problems caused by the garages, the 2 hour free parking idea and the general parking issue.</p> <p>The lead petitioner commented the parking issue was mostly an evening one, as during the day the street was empty of cars.</p> <p>It was agreed that the ward councillors needed to be involved in discussions with the residents and officers to reach a consensus on how to take matters forward and not have a solution imposed on residents that they did not want.</p> <p>Residents present agreed for the lead petitioner to act on their behalf, who in turn agreed to consult and keep them keep them informed of development. Contacts details were exchanged between the Network and Safety Manager and Katy Smith, the Lead Petitioner.</p> <p>The Chair moved that the determination of the petition be deferred to the next meeting of the Board at 6.00 pm on 12 August 2019, as proposed, for further information to be provided following</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p>discussions with residents by the Network and Safety Manager and the ward councillors to reach a consensus on how to take matters forward, which was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> That the determination of the petition (Ref: 6.1) be deferred to a future meeting of the Board, for further information to be provided following discussions with residents by the Network and Safety Manager and the ward councillors to reach a consensus on how to take matters forward.</p>	<b>CD</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PETITION - REQUEST FOR TRAFFIC CALMING - PEMBROKE AVENUE (REF: 6.2)</b>	
	<p>The Network and Safety Manager presented the report on a petition from residents requesting the immediate construction of traffic calming in Pembroke Avenue, following an incident on 22 May 2019, when a child was hit by a vehicle whilst crossing the road and slightly injured.</p> <p>Members were informed Pembroke Avenue was a residential road between Beechwood Road and Dordans Road, where there was a 20mph speed limit in force, set in 2007. She said a speed survey was carried out in January 2017 when the speed at which 85 percentile (the speed at which 85% of traffic was recorded as travelling at or under) was 29.3 mph. Due to complaints, additional signage was installed at the end of 2017.</p> <p>The speed survey was repeated in May 2019, when the mean speed was 22mph and the 85 percentile was recorded as travelling was 29 mph. A few vehicles were recorded travelling well in excess of the speed limit.</p> <p>Apart from the minor injury accident involving the child in May 2019, she informed the Board there had been one other slight injury accident in the last 5 years. She said information from the Police showed speed was not a contributory factor in the accident involving the child, who was crossing the road between parked cars.</p> <p>She informed the Board the Council prioritised such residents' requests in a fair and equitable way, given the considerable number received each year. Traffic calming for Pembroke Avenue was added to the list in July 2018.</p> <p>She advised in the current financial year, the work programme and budget were fully committed, but that all outstanding requests would be reviewed and prioritised towards the end of the year and those with the highest priority included in the next year's work programme (subject to the budget provision).</p> <p>The Board was requested to note that the work programme for 2019/20 was fully committed and support that the introduction of</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p>traffic calming in Pembroke Avenue being considered alongside all other requests for a future programme of works to ensure a fair and equitable selection of schemes.</p> <p>Alternatively, she said the Board could request that the Executive dropped another scheme from the 2019/20 work programme and introduce traffic calming measures in Pembroke Avenue at an estimated cost of £15,000, being mindful of the possible negative ramifications from the residents of the dropped scheme.</p> <p>Responding to a Member's question, the Network and Safety Manager said there were 101 households in Pembroke Avenue, with 239 electors.</p> <p>The Chair, then invited Hasan Quereshi, the Lead Petitioner to address the Board in support of the petition.</p> <p>Mr Quereshi said he had requested traffic calming measure for Pembroke Avenue the previous year and went to his MP, Mr Hopkins and the councillors, claiming there was insufficient response from Highways.</p> <p>He claimed Pembroke Avenue was the only road in the 20 mph zone without traffic calming measures, given he had seen some cars being driven at over 60 mph. He feared there would be a serious accident and the one involving the child had prompted him to knock on doors to get signatures for the petition, although he had not been able to do all the households.</p> <p>He added speed bumps were effective, as people could not afford to damage their cars.</p> <p>Responding to Members' questions, the Network and Safety Manager was not able to say why Pembroke Avenue was not provided with speed bumps, as she was not involved in the consultation for the scheme. She said there were about 150 requests on the list, which was getting longer day by day. She also advised that £30,000 of capital funding had been secured over 3 years, which would help pay for some of the schemes. She said Pembroke Avenue could move up the priority list, now that there had been one accident, in which a child had been injured.</p> <p>The Network and Safety Manager requested the Board to approve her recommendation in the report.</p> <p>Following discussion, the Board noted the request for traffic calming in Pembroke Avenue was accepted, but it was a question of how high it was on the priority list.</p> <p>The Chair moved that recommendations in the report be supported, which was agreed.</p>	

		<b>ACTION:</b>
	<p><b>Resolved:</b> (i) That consideration of the introduction of traffic calming for Pembroke Avenue, alongside many other similar requests for future programme of works given that the programme of highways works for 2019/20 is fully committed, be supported;</p> <p>(ii) That the Service Director Public Realm be instructed to advise the petitioners of the Board's decision.</p>	<b>CD</b>

**(Note: The meeting ended at 7.13 pm)**