

36. My view is that the Council did not act unreasonably by limiting the scheme to the Viaduct Rise area. This is because the majority of respondents in the Viaduct Rise area were in favour of the scheme, which was not the case in other areas that were consulted. Once residents of Springfield Road, Florence Road and the southern end of Southdown Avenue requested to be included in the scheme, the Council said that the proposal would need the support of a number of roads in the north area in order to be financially and geographically viable. I think this was not an unreasonable approach from the Council as, unlike the Viaduct Rise area, there is no natural boundary to Florence Road and Springfield Road. As there was not the same support for the scheme to the north of the station compared to the area south of the station, I do not think the Council acted unreasonably by limiting the scheme to the Viaduct Rise area.

*The Council made a decision on the scheme even though not all residents received the consultation papers*

37. The complainant says that the decision of the Council is unsatisfactory as not all residents were consulted about the scheme.

38. The Council has said that it used a database which collates addresses from ten systems held by the Council. The Council has also said that sometimes properties can be missed for example if a house has been converted into flats and not reported to the Council.

39. It seems to me that the Council has made reasonable attempts to contact all residents in the consultation area and therefore I do not think the Council was at fault on this basis. I have also placed some weight on the Council's comment that the reported number of residents who did not receive the documents would not have altered the outcome regardless of their comments.

*The Council took too long to agree to attend a public meeting organised by the complainant and Councillor Allen which meant that the meeting took place after the consultation process*

40. The complainant says that if the meeting had taken place before the consultation process, residents would have been better informed about the scheme and therefore may have responded differently.

41. The Council says that from experience it has learned that large, open public meetings do not allow opinions to be heard or allow for meaningful debate and explanation. I have placed some weight on the Council's comments. I am also satisfied that the Council made all reasonable attempts to contact residents about the scheme. Residents with concerns about the scheme could have raised them at the two exhibitions organised by the Council or by using the contact details on the leaflet. I am therefore satisfied that the Council made suitable arrangements to answer any questions or concerns of residents. Consequently, I do not think the complainant has been caused a significant injustice even if the Council delayed in arranging a public meeting.

*The Council has refused to postpone the implementation of the scheme starting on 6 September 2010, even though the Council's Strategic Review for Parking will not have been completed*

42. It seems that the complainant considers that the proposed scheme may be affected by the Council's Strategic Review for Parking.

43. The Council says that the timetable of proposed parking schemes was agreed by its Environment Committee in 2008. The Council also says that any strategic review would be looking at a future timetable of schemes, not the timetable that is already agreed. /...