



Council Offices, Almada Street
Hamilton, ML3 0AA

Friday, 15 October 2021

Dear Councillor

Petitions Committee

The Members listed below are requested to attend a meeting of the above Committee to be held as follows:-

Date: Monday, 25 October 2021
Time: 11:00
Venue: By Microsoft Teams,

The business to be considered at the meeting is listed overleaf.

Yours sincerely

Cleland Sneddon
Chief Executive

Members

Jackie Burns (Chair), Maureen Chalmers, Mary Donnelly, Fiona Dryburgh, Ian Harrow, Mark Horsham, Eileen Logan, Lynne Nailon, Graham Scott

Substitutes

John Anderson, Robert Brown, Stephanie Callaghan, Gerry Convery, Martin Grant Hose, Monique McAdams

BUSINESS

- 1 **Declaration of Interests**
- 2 **Minutes of Previous Meeting** 3 - 4
Minutes of the meeting of the Petitions Committee held on 25 August 2021 submitted for approval as a correct record. (Copy attached)

Item(s) for Decision

- 3 **Petition Requesting Resident Only Parking in McNeil Street, Larkhall** 5 - 12
Report dated 5 October 2021 by the Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources). (Copy attached)

Urgent Business

- 4 **Urgent Business**
Any other items of business which the Chair decides are urgent.

For further information, please contact:-

Clerk Name: Carol Lyon

Clerk Telephone: 01698 455652

Clerk Email: carol.lyon@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

PETITIONS COMMITTEE

2

Minutes of meeting held via MS Teams on 25 August 2021

Chair:

Councillor Jackie Burns

Councillors Present:

Councillor Maureen Chalmers, Councillor Mary Donnelly, Councillor Mark Horsham, Councillor Graham Scott, Councillor Monique McAdams (*substitute for Councillor Eileen Logan*)

Councillors' Apologies:

Councillor Fiona Dryburgh, Councillor Ian Harrow, Councillor Eileen Logan, Councillor Lynne Nailon

Attending:

Community and Enterprise Resources

S Laird, Traffic and Transportation Engineer

Finance and Corporate Resources

C Lyon, Administration Officer; G McCann, Head of Administration and Legal Services; L Wyllie, Administration Assistant

1 Declaration of Interests

No interests were declared.

2 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Petitions Committee held on 27 August 2019 were submitted for approval as a correct record.

The Committee decided: that the minutes be approved as a correct record.

3 Petition Requesting Installation of Major Traffic Calming Measures in Crossford

A report dated 4 August 2021 by the Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources) was submitted to allow consideration of a petition lodged by A Carnegie (Lead Petitioner) requesting the installation of major traffic calming measures in Crossford.

The Petition had been assessed and met the criteria for being considered by this Committee.

Comments had been received from Roads and Transportation Services and were highlighted in the report. Comments from the Lead Petitioner, who was present at the meeting, were also detailed in the report.

The Lead Petitioner referred to:-

- ◆ the speed of the traffic travelling through the village
- ◆ concerns expressed by the school and other parents regarding the speed of vehicles, particularly near the school, therefore, measures were needed to slow traffic on this stretch of road
- ◆ the slow down sign on entry to the village was not operational
- ◆ an incident where he was nearly hit by a van travelling at speed
- ◆ the fact that he felt that it was unsafe for his child to walk to school

- ◆ the paths being too narrow to walk a child to school or for people with prams etc
- ◆ a number of dead animals on the roads which had been hit by vehicles travelling at speed
- ◆ the possibility of the school carrying out a project to make signs etc to encourage vehicles to slow down
- ◆ the dangers to children and the elderly when crossing the road

Officials from Roads and Transportation Services advised:-

- ◆ that the speed limit on the road was 30mph, with part-time 20mph at the school at the times children went into and came out of school
- ◆ that the nearest vehicle counter at Rosebank had been checked and showed a 5 day average, (Monday to Friday) of 7,000 vehicles a day passed through the village. Those were mainly cars and light vehicles
- ◆ that there had been zero injury accidents over the last 3 years.
- ◆ of the criteria and methodology used for identifying and prioritising roads engineering works
- ◆ that a speed limit review was undertaken 8 to 10 years ago on all A and B class roads within South Lanarkshire. From that, certain roads, including the A72, had sections of roads reduced to 40mph
- ◆ that a joint campaign involving the Council, Police Scotland and the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service on traffic speed within urban and rural environments was being considered
- ◆ that the Roads Service was unaware that a slow sign was not working and arrangements had now been made to have the sign inspected and repaired
- ◆ that the Roads Service had been liaising with Police Scotland and it had been agreed that an enforcement campaign would be carried out. If the issue of speeding was evident, then another campaign would be undertaken at a future date
- ◆ that the school travel plan was last updated in 2016 and the school would review the plan this term. This would include a questionnaire being sent to all pupils, staff and parents/carers. Thereafter, the school would identify issues and actions required. Should speeding be identified as an issue, further consideration would be given to initiatives and measures to address this issue

The Committee decided:

- (1) that the Roads Service would progress the speed enforcement programme with Police Scotland;
- (2) that the Roads Service would assist the school in progressing the review of its travel plan;
- (3) that the Roads Service would carry out a speed survey;
- (4) that a report be submitted to the Community and Enterprise Resources Committee on 7 December 2021 providing an update on actions taken; and
- (5) that members of the Committee and Mr Carnegie be kept updated with progress.

4 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

Report

3

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Report to: | Petitions Committee |
| Date of Meeting: | 25 October 2021 |
| Report by: | Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources) |

| | |
|----------|---|
| Subject: | Petition Requesting Resident Only Parking in McNeil Street, Larkhall |
|----------|---|

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ allow the Petitions Committee to consider a petition lodged by Yvonne Johnston (Lead Petitioner)

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Petitions Committee is asked to:-

- (1) give due consideration to the petition lodged requesting resident only parking in McNeil Street, Larkhall.

3. Background

3.1. A petition has been lodged with the Council which meets the Guidelines as:-

- ◆ the matter has been raised with the Council prior to submission and relates to issues that affect the community
- ◆ the number of petitioners exceeds the minimum limit of 50

4. Petition Details

4.1. The petition requests resident only parking in McNeil Street, Larkhall and the statement by the lead petitioner states that:-

“McNeil Street in Larkhall is mostly occupied with residents over 50 years of age and/or have mobility issues. They chose to buy property in this area as it is close to amenities and the majority are on one level. Larkhall population is increasing with new developments, which is a good thing, however, with an increased population it leads to more traffic on our roads. Since the rail line was re-opened in Larkhall the old railway yard was turned into a car park to help accommodate the rail users which has been a success and is busy most days Monday to Friday but there are still those who do not use this car park and choose to park in McNeil Street instead. People are parking their cars and going on the train or going to work for roughly 7 hours each day and there is no particular time frame as some work shifts.

There are only a limited number of residents who have off street parking but the majority must rely on street parking. We feel that there are sufficient commuter parking facilities already provided which includes the new station car park, King Street and Caledonian Road.

There have also been a few altercations with residents and commuters over this matter.

We request that South Lanarkshire Council consider imposing resident only parking which we believe would have a positive effect, giving residents a fair opportunity to park within a reasonable distance of their home.

Photographs, which are date and time stamped to evidence what is happening on a daily basis are attached at Appendix 1.”

5. Support for Petition

- 5.1. The petition contains 56 names, all from McNeil Street, Larkhall.

6. Comments from Roads and Transportation Services

- 6.1. As further background on the terms of the petition, Roads and Transportation Services have provided the following comments:-

- ◆ The issue which appears to have prompted the petition is in relation to on-street parking by non - residents on McNeil Street. The parking which takes place on these streets is unfortunately a common issue across a number of roads in South Lanarkshire, particularly where there is a community facility such as a railway station and town centre shopping area within an already densely populated area. The parking needs of commuters, residents, visitors and users of the town centre facilities can often result in a high demand for both short-term and long-term parking within the area.
- ◆ In situations such as this, the introduction of parking restrictions in the form of Resident Permit Parking Zones (RPPZs) may seem like the appropriate solution to discourage non-residents from parking in residential areas.
- ◆ It is accepted that RPPZs can be an effective demand management tool in areas where there is a high level of conflict in terms of parking demand between residents and non-residents. It should also be noted that RPPZs can produce several unwanted side effects, such as restricting parking for residents’ visitors or carers, or displacing the parking elsewhere. Furthermore, RPPZs are not always supported by shoppers/local businesses or commuters, and, in some cases, by residents, especially in areas where demand is such that it is necessary for some permits to incur a charge. Careful consideration is, therefore, required when pursuing the potential introduction of a new RPPZ.
- ◆ The introduction of parking restrictions, including RPPZs, is subject to a statutory process requiring the promotion of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Under this process, which usually takes between 6 to 9 months, the Council is obliged by law to consult with various organisations, advertise the proposals to the general public and consider any objections raised. Following the public consultation stage, the Council is obliged to consider any objections received, which can result in delays to or even abandonment of the TRO process.
- ◆ The TRO process and administration of parking permits are resource intensive. An RPPZ, therefore, is generally used to manage parking demand over wider areas where a significant conflict between residents and others (such as commuters) has been identified. It is not usually appropriate to promote an RPPZ for a small area such as a single street.
- ◆ Whilst we acknowledge the parking pressures on McNeil Street, Roads and Transportation Services must balance the needs of all road users, including residents, commuters, and users of the local facilities.
- ◆ The Roads Service does not intend to progress with the introduction of a residents only parking zone on McNeil Street at this time.

- ◆ It is proposed to undertake a review of restrictions across various towns within South Lanarkshire. It is anticipated that, over the next 18 months, parking in Larkhall will be reviewed and the issues raised in the petition would be considered as part of this process.

7. Options open to the Committee

7.1. In terms of the approved guidance, the Petitions Committee can:-

- ◆ agree that the issues raised deserve further action and agree to refer the petition to another Council Committee, officer or other organisation with recommendations
- ◆ agree that the issue raised does not merit further action
- ◆ refer back to the Resource with recommendations for further action

8. Employee Implications

8.1 There are no employee implications as a result of this report.

9. Financial Implications

9.1. There are no financial implications at this time.

10. Climate Change, Sustainability and Environmental Implications

10.1 There are no implications for climate change, sustainability or the environment in terms of the information contained in this report.

11. Other Implications

11.1 There are no implications for risk in terms of the information contained in this report.

12. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements

12.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and, therefore, no impact assessment is required.

12.2. There is also no requirement to undertake any consultation in terms of the information contained in the report.

Paul Manning

Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources)

5 October 2021

Link(s) to Council Values/Ambitions/Objectives

- ◆ Accountable, effective, efficient and transparent

Previous References

- ◆ None

List of Background Papers

- ◆ None

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Carol Lyon, Administration Officer

Ext: 5652 (Tel: 01698 455652)

E-mail: carol.lyon@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

9 Sep 2020 at 10:2

McN
La
Sco

3

United King



9 Sep 2020 at 10:30
McN
La
Sco

United King



9 Sep 2020 at 12:50:45

McNeil St

Larkhall

Scotland

ML9

United Kingdom



