

Case 200501013: Glasgow City Council

Summary of Investigation

Category

Local government: Roads & Transport; Traffic Regulation and Management

Overview

The complainant (Mr C) raised a number of concerns about the actions of Glasgow City Council (the Council) in relation to the introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme (CPS) in certain areas of Glasgow. Mr C had specific concerns about elements of the consultation and decision-making processes as well as the eventual introduction of the CPS.

Specific complaints and conclusions

The complaints which have been investigated are that the Council:

- (a) inappropriately asserted, prior to the consultation process, that the CPS would go ahead, and acted to that end before the committee vote (*not upheld*);
- (b) failed, during the statutory consultation period, to display and maintain all notices and information sources required by statute (*not upheld*);
- (c) mis-stated the reasons for the proposed measures (*not upheld*);
- (d) employed inappropriate methods during the consultation process that had the effect of reducing the number of objections registered in time and misrepresenting the number of submitted objections (*not upheld*);
- (e) inappropriately discussed the matter at a meeting of the Roads and Lighting Committee Convener's sub-committee (*not upheld*);
- (f) failed to implement the scheme as voted for by the Roads and Lighting Committee (*not upheld*); and
- (g) inappropriately failed to notify certain organisations of the proposals (*not upheld*).

Redress and recommendations

The Ombudsman has no recommendations to make.

Main Investigation Report

Introduction

1. On 14 July 2005 the Ombudsman received a complaint from a man, referred to in this report as Mr C. Mr C represents the Metered Parking Action Group. The complaint related to the actions of Glasgow City Council (the Council) regarding the introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme (CPS) in certain areas of Glasgow. Mr C was concerned that the Council had pre-empted the consultation and decision-making processes, had not conducted the consultation process properly or fairly, had not reached a decision on the scheme properly and had not, thereafter, implemented the scheme appropriately.

2. The complaints from Mr C which I have investigated are that the Council:
- (a) inappropriately asserted, prior to the consultation process, that the CPS would go ahead, and acted to that end before the committee vote;
 - (b) failed, during the statutory consultation period, to display and maintain all notices and information sources required by statute;
 - (c) mis-stated the reasons for the proposed measures;
 - (d) employed inappropriate methods during the consultation process that had the effect of reducing the number of objections registered in time and misrepresenting the number of submitted objections;
 - (e) inappropriately discussed the matter at a meeting of the Roads and Lighting Committee Convener's sub-committee;
 - (f) failed to implement the scheme as voted for by the Roads and Lighting Committee; and
 - (g) inappropriately failed to notify certain organisations of the proposals.

Investigation

3. The investigation of this complaint has involved obtaining and reading all the relevant information, including correspondence between Mr C and the Council, copies of Council information documents, minutes and internal correspondence, correspondence between Mr C and other interested parties, relevant legislation and responses to the consultation. I have not included in this report every detail investigated but I am satisfied that no matter of significance has been overlooked. Mr C and the Council were given an opportunity to comment on a draft of this report.

4. In March 2005 the Council publicised proposals for a CPS in certain areas of Glasgow. A consultation period of six weeks, lasting until 22 April 2005, was undertaken. Between May and June 2005 the proposals for the various individual areas were accepted. The CPS was implemented shortly afterwards. Mr C complained to the Council in August 2005 and correspondence between Mr C and the Council on this issue continued until October 2005. In November 2005 Mr C again submitted his complaint to the Ombudsman.

(a) The Council inappropriately asserted, prior to the consultation process, that the CPS would go ahead, and acted to that end before the committee vote

5. The Council ordered 100 parking meters in February 2005. These parking meters were suitable for use in A-listed conservation areas. The CPS proposals included A-listed areas. Mr C believed the ordering of these meters represented the Council asserting that the CPS would go ahead and acting to that end.

6. I asked the Council for their response to this complaint. The Council told me that the meters were purchased to replace the existing city centre stock. At that point it was envisioned that the replaced meters would be retained for use in the A-listed conservation areas of the proposed CPS in the event that the proposals were accepted. Following the acceptance of the proposals it was decided that the new meters would be used for the conservation areas. The Council gave two reasons for this change; firstly it was believed the new meters would be more in keeping with the conversation areas and secondly it was predicted that usage of the meters would be higher in the conservation areas than in other parts of the city and the new meters would, obviously, have a longer worklife-span than the meters that had already been in use for some time in the city centre.

(a) Conclusion

7. The Council have explained that when the new meters were ordered they were intended to be used to replace the city centre stock but, following the acceptance of the CPS proposals, it was decided for aesthetic and economic reasons to use the new meters in the conservation areas that now required them. Given this, I do not consider that the purchase of the new meters represented an inappropriate assertion that the CPS would go ahead and, therefore, I do not uphold the complaint.

(b) The Council failed, during the statutory consultation period, to display and maintain all notices and information sources required by statute

8. Mr C complained about a number of issues in this area. He did not feel that the information leaflet about the CPS proposals was adequately distributed. He had concerns that statutory notices regarding the CPS proposals were not properly displayed or maintained in each street affected by the proposals. Finally, he believed that the full proposals from the Belmont and Napiershall areas were not available at the advertised locations.

9. I asked the Council how the information leaflet about the CPS proposals ('Proposed Parking Controls – West of City Centre – Frequently Asked Questions') was distributed. The Council told me that the leaflet was available to all enquirers of the Land Services department, at all the locations where the order was available to view and was distributed at meetings of interested organisations to which Council officers were invited. Additionally the information contained in the leaflet was available on the Council's website.

10. Mr C complained, with specific reference to certain roads, that the Council had not placed notices at both ends of these roads or had not ensured that the notices remained in place for the duration of the consultation period.

11. The procedure that must be followed when advertising draft traffic regulations is set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 (the Regulations). Part II of the Regulations relate to procedures before the making of orders. Section 5 gives details of what a Council must do to publicise the proposals. Section 5(1)(b) notes that a Council shall take such steps as they consider appropriate for ensuring that adequate publicity about the order is given to persons likely to be affected by its provisions and gives some examples of actions a Council may decide to undertake. One of these examples is a display of notices in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Regulations. Part III, paragraph 3 of Schedule 2 of the Regulations states that the Council shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the notices remain in place and legible until the consultation period ends.

12. I asked the Council how they had achieved the requirements of Part II, section 5(1)(b) of the Regulations. The Council advised me that they had decided to accept the suggestion of displaying notices in roads affected by the

proposals. The Council told me that notices were displayed at both ends of each and every affected road and that the notices were inspected daily, and replaced when necessary, for the duration of the six week consultation period. The Council provided me with copies of their maintenance records for this period. The Council also told me that they believed it was not a statutory requirement to place or maintain the notices, but only a suggestion.

13. The maintenance records indicate that the notices were adequately monitored and replaced when necessary. Of the three specific roads Mr C cited, the maintenance records indicate that two had notices at either end throughout the process and the third was also maintained throughout the objection period, but did require replacement on 12 and 14 April 2005.

14. The full proposals for the Belmont and Napiershall areas were advertised as being available for viewing at Community Central Hall, Maryhill Road. Mr C told me that the full proposals were not available at this location and that, when the Council were advised of this, a replacement copy of the Belmont document only was thereafter available.

15. I asked the Council when the Belmont document was reported as missing and when it was replaced and whether the Napiershall document was ever replaced. The Council advised me that no record had been kept of when the replacement documents had been made available, but that Council officers did recall that both the documents had been replaced.

16. The Council told me that they received 1,800 written representations on the proposals, as well as numerous other enquiries of the Land Services Department and that Council officers attended a number of meetings of interested organisations and groups as part of the consultation process on the CPS proposals.

(b) Conclusion

17. Section 5(1)(b) of the Regulations makes clear that the decision on how to ensure that there is adequate publicity for the proposals is a matter for the Council, and that the placement of notices on affected roads is a suggestion not a requirement. However, if the decision is taken to place notices on affected roads, the Council is statutorily required to ensure they comply with Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The Council have told me that notices were placed on every affected road and maintained throughout the objection period, and they have

provided evidence of this maintenance. Mr C has told me that this was not done and, in the case of specific roads, provided evidence from others of this in the form of signed statements from other members of the public. In light of this conflicting evidence, I have not been able to reach a finding on this point. However, it is clear that the Council took reasonable steps in line with the Regulations to ensure the notices were in place. Similarly I believe the Council took reasonable steps to ensure that the information leaflet was generally available. With regard to the availability of the full proposals at Community Central Hall, Maryhill Road, it is unfortunate that records were not kept of the replacement of the documents when the Council became aware that they were no longer available and, as a result, I am also unable to reach a finding on this aspect of the complaint. However, it is clear that the Council made attempts to ensure that all those affected by the proposals were aware of them and I have decided, on the balance of the evidence, not to uphold the complaint.

(c) The Council mis-stated the reasons for the proposed measures

18. In a report to the Roads and Lighting Committee dated 15 March 2005 the Director of Land Services stated that the CPS would result 'in increased income and [provide] funding for prudential investment in the Lighting Network Renewal project' and noted 'Generate income of £302,000' in a column headed 'Targets'. Mr C complained that this income generation was not included in the reasons for the proposals listed by the Council during the objection period. He also complained that the reasons for the proposed times that parking controls would apply were not stated by the Council. Finally, Mr C complained that the information leaflet produced by the Council stated that the proposals were being introduced in response to requests from residents and businesses experiencing difficulties in finding parking spaces and from concerns raised by the Emergency Services and others about inconsiderate and obstructive parking, which Mr C does not believe was the case.

19. In relation to the Council's requirements to state reasons for the proposals, Schedule 2, Part I, paragraph 3 of the Regulations states that the any notice of the proposals must include 'A brief statement of the effect of the order in relation to the road or other place where it is displayed'.

20. In the proposals the reasons for making them are stated as follows: 'it is considered necessary to facilitate the passage of any class of traffic on the roads (including pedestrians) and for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs'.

21. I asked the Council to comment on the stated reasons for the proposals during the objection period with regard to the 15 March 2005 report. The Council told me that the target figure related to the anticipated income from the issue of penalty charge notices and that the revenue from parking charges (pay and display tickets and permits) was anticipated to meet administration and enforcement costs without any surplus.

22. The original proposals were that the restrictions would apply from 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturday. In six of the areas, this was subsequently altered to 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday.

23. The Council supplied me with over 100 separate items of correspondence that they had received prior to the CPS proposals being made. These included requests from the Emergency Services, residents and businesses that steps be taken to implement parking controls in the areas of the proposed CPS. They also supplied with a similar amount of correspondence expressing the writers' contentment with the CPS following its implementation.

(c) Conclusion

24. The Council have reasonably explained that the £302,000 income generation target related to the anticipated penalty charges as a result of the implementation of the CPS rather than any kind of 'profit' from the charges made to residents and visitors for the use of parking areas, which was anticipated to cover the administration and enforcement costs without surplus. The Regulations do not require that the Council necessarily give any statement of reasons for the timings of the proposals, but only that a 'brief statement of the effect of the orders' is included. Nonetheless, the eventual altering of the times of the restrictions in six of the areas indicates that the Council took on board the concerns of residents etc in those areas. Finally, the Council's assertion of the correspondence they received requesting some kind of parking control in these areas is borne out by the evidence I have seen. Given all of the above, I do not uphold the complaint.

(d) The Council employed inappropriate methods during the consultation process that had the effect of reducing the number of objections registered in time and misrepresenting the number of submitted objections

25. Mr C made a number of complaints relating to this issue. These were:

- (i) the location given as the receiving point for objections to the proposals was not staffed;
- (ii) the Council did not take adequate measures to ensure that all residents were aware of the proposals;
- (iii) the Council did not meet their statutory obligations with regard to publishing notification of the proposals in a newspaper;
- (iv) the Council did not take adequate steps to publicise the proposals to the housebound disabled;
- (v) the notices of proposals mounted on street furniture did not include information about the proposed restrictions to visitors' parking;
- (vi) the full details of the proposals were available in an unacceptably small number of places;
- (vii) the proposals did not mention the Council's website;
- (viii) the Council did not use all available Council publications to promote the proposals;
- (ix) translations for non-English speakers were not available;
- (x) the Transport Research and Policy Manager told a residents association meeting that each resident would be notified of the proposals individually by post but this did not, ultimately, happen;
- (xi) the Council unreasonably asked the Police to remove journalists' notebooks at a meeting to discuss the proposals;
- (xii) the Council employed unreasonable methods of counting objectors to, and supporters of, the proposals;
- (xiii) the Council unreasonably assumed that objections were withdrawn if objectors did not respond to a letter from them; and
- (xiv) the Council did not allow a reasonable time for objections to be lodged due to Bank Holidays and other non-postal service days falling in the objection period.

26. The notices of the proposals gave the address for objections to be sent to as Room 84, [street number and name]. The notice did not suggest that the room would be staffed. Mr C, and others, visited this location during the objection period and found it to be empty and not staffed (see paragraph 25(i) above).

27. The Council accepted that the location was not staffed for part of the consultation period but told Mr C that indication was given of where information could be obtained and a telephone was available for use at the location.

28. I asked the Council how written objections sent to this location were dealt with. The Council told me that when letters were received at the location, which was part of the Chief Executive's Department, they were logged and acknowledged by staff. They were then forwarded to the Land Services Department who compiled the responses. The Land Services Department returned the responses to the Chief Executive's Department who issued them to the objectors.

29. Mr C complained that, in his opinion, the Council made no attempt to ensure that all residents were aware of the proposals (see paragraph 25(ii) above).

30. Part II, Section 4 of the Regulations includes a table of which groups the Council must consult in regard to the proposals. The Council have provided evidence that the required groups were consulted.

31. Part II, Section 5(1)(a) states that the Council must 'publish at least once in a local newspaper circulating in the area in which any road or other place to which the order relates is situated a notice of proposals'. The Council published this notice in The Herald newspaper on 11 March 2005. Mr C complained that the circulation of The Herald was not sufficiently high for this to be a reasonable publication in which to publish the notice (see paragraph 25(iii) above).

32. Mr C was concerned that housebound disabled residents who relied on visiting carers would not be aware of the proposals and that the Council had not complied with the Disability Discrimination Act or Scottish Executive¹ Planning Advice Notes to ensure that the disabled were aware of the proposals. He also complained that organisations dealing with the housebound disabled had not been consulted about the proposals (see paragraph 25(iv) above).

33. The Council indicated to Mr C that they believed the publicity they had undertaken with regard to the proposals was sufficient to ensure that the housebound disabled would be aware of the proposals and that any visiting carers would be made aware of the proposals through the on-street notices.

¹ On 3 September 2007 Scottish Ministers formally adopted the title Scottish Government to replace the term Scottish Executive. The latter term is used in this report as it applied at the time of the events to which the report relates.

34. The table mentioned in paragraph 30 above does not specifically require that organisations dealing with the housebound disabled be consulted.

35. Mr C complained that the on-street notices of the proposals did not include information about the restriction to 40 visitors' parking permits per property per year. Mr C believed that this would be of interest to those residents who did not own a vehicle themselves but who may require more than 40 visitors' permits in a year. Mr C also had concerns that the availability of further visitors' permits beyond the 40 per property per year and the criteria for obtaining these was not publicly available (see paragraph 25(v) above).

36. The Council told me that visitors' permits had been restricted to 40 per property per year to discourage the routine use of visitors' permits by commuters but that any requests for further permits by residents would be considered sympathetically. They told me that 29 residents and four hotels had requested further permits. The applicants had been contacted, the reasons for the requests discussed and all the requests had been granted. Information relating to visitors' permits were not required to be displayed in on-street notices under the terms of the Regulations.

37. The Council's website contained information about eligibility for residents and visitors' parking permits, and a contact number to discuss permit issues with Council staff.

38. Mr C complained that the full details of the scheme were only available in an unacceptably small number of places (see paragraph 25(vi) above).

39. Part II, Section 5(c) of the Regulations indicates that the full proposals must be made available for public viewing but it does not include any requirement for the number or type of location.

40. Mr C complained that the Council's website was not mentioned in the on-street notices, and that the website did not contain the full proposals (see paragraph 25(vii) above).

41. The Regulations do not require that the website be mentioned in the on-street notices, nor that the website should contain the full proposals.

42. Mr C complained that the Council did not publicise the proposals in all of the newsletters, magazines etc that they publish (see paragraph 25(viii) above).

43. The Regulations do not require that the Council use all available means to publicise the proposals.

44. Mr C complained that translations of the various documents related to the CPS proposals were not available (see paragraph 25(ix) above).

45. I asked the Council how they had dealt with this issue. They told me that the Council's Race Equality Scheme ensures that all Council information is available in accessible formats and community languages on demand. In the case of the CPS proposals no requests had been made for any of the information to be provided in languages other than English.

46. Mr C complained that the Transport Research and Policy Manager told a residents association meeting that each resident would be notified of the proposals individually by post but this did not, ultimately, happen (see paragraph 25(x) above).

47. The Council told Mr C that the Transport Research and Policy Manager's recollection was that he had said that the residents association would be notified of the proposals, not each resident individually.

48. A meeting was held on 31 May 2005 in a hotel at which hotel proprietors, the Council, other residents and journalists were present. The Police were called to this meeting and journalists' notebooks were confiscated. Mr C complained that the Council unreasonably asked the Police to remove journalists' notebooks at this meeting (see paragraph 25(xi) above).

49. The Council told Mr C that they believed they had been invited to a small meeting to discuss the implications of the proposals on the hotel and bed-and-breakfast trade in the area. The meeting was attended by more people than the Council had expected and at its conclusion it became clear that journalists had been present throughout.

50. I asked the Council if they had been concerned about the presence of the journalists. They told me that their concern was that the journalists' presence had been unexpected and that, because it had not been anticipated that the

media would be present, the Council's Media Office were not represented and had not been consulted.

51. I asked the Council why the Police had been present and who had asked the Police to confiscate the notebooks. The Council told me that they did not believe any Council representative had either called the Police or requested that the notebooks be confiscated. The Council told me that they had contacted the Police to ask whether information they held on the incident contained any more details, but the Police did not have any information about who had called them or asked them to confiscate the notebooks.

52. Mr C complained that the Council counted each petition objecting to the proposals as one objection regardless of the number of signatures. He believed that this was unfair. He also believed that the Council had counted 70 letters sent individually from employees of one business as one objection (see paragraph 25(xii) above).

53. The Council told Mr C that each petition, whether objecting to, or supportive of, the proposals, was counted as one representation but that the number of signatories of each petition was also reported to the relevant committee.

54. I asked the Council how the 70 letters received individually from employees of one business had been dealt with. The Council told me that 58 letters had been received from the business Mr C specified, all of which gave the same name for response. However, the Council did send individual replies to all those whose names they could decipher with any certainty, a reply to the named respondee and an individual reply addressed to 'Employee of [the business]' for each of the letters whose senders could not be identified. The Council supplied me with evidence of this and evidence that these 58 letters had been reported to the committee as 58 separate objections.

55. Mr C complained that when objectors received responses to their objection they included the following sentences: 'I trust that these comments satisfactorily answer the points detailed in your correspondence. Accordingly, unless I hear from you to the contrary within 14 days from the date of this letter I shall consider your objection to be withdrawn'. Mr C believed that this requirement to indicate a continued objection contravened Part IV, Section 17(1)(b) of the Regulations and had the effect of reducing the number of objections reported to

the committee as objections from those who did not respond would be 'eliminated' by default (see paragraph 25(xiii) above).

56. Part IV, Section 17(1)(b) of the Regulations states that following the making of an order the Council must 'notify in writing each person, who has objected to the order in accordance with regulation 7 and has not withdrawn his objection, of the authority's reasons for making the order in spite of the objection'.

57. The Council told Mr C that all objections were reported to the committee, whether they wrote again or not and, therefore, no objections were 'eliminated' by default as he had suggested. I asked the Council to comment upon the complaint Mr C raised. The Council told me that the sentences were included to remove the need for objectors whose concerns had been allayed by the Council's response to write again to the Council to indicate this.

58. The consultation period coincided with the Easter period and Mr C complained that this meant that there were three days (Good Friday, the subsequent Saturday and Easter Monday) when normal postal collections and deliveries were not made and that people often take holidays away from home over this period. He believed the Council should have extended the consultation period to take account of this (see paragraph 25(xiv) above).

59. Part II, Section 7(3) of the Regulations indicates the statutory requirements for consultation periods. It does not require that the Council extend the period in the event of Bank Holidays or usual holiday periods.

(d) Conclusion

60. Mr C complained about a number of ways he believed the Council had employed inappropriate methods to reduce or misrepresent the number of objections registered. The Regulations specify those persons and groups who must be consulted, and the Council have demonstrated that these were consulted.

61. Mr C complained that The Herald was not a suitable newspaper in which to display a notice in under section 5(1)(a) of the Regulations. However, this section states only that the newspaper should be 'a local newspaper circulating in the area', therefore, a notice in the Herald fulfilled the requirements of this section.

62. Section 5(1)(b) states the Council shall take other such steps as they may consider appropriate for ensuring that adequate publicity is given about the order to persons likely to be affected. Clearly, it is a matter for the Council whom they contact or do not contact under this section and Mr C's complaints that organisations representing those with disabilities should have been consulted, that information about visitors' permits was not adequate on the notices, that the Council's internet site did not carry full details of the orders and that not all the Council's publications were used to promote the proposals are all matters which the Council have the discretion to undertake or not. They are not required by statute.

63. Mr C complained that the full proposals were only available to view in a small number of places. Section 5(c) of the Regulations indicates only that the full proposals should be available, it does not stipulate how many places it should be available.

64. Mr C complained that bank holidays, other non-postal service days and the time of year meant the timescales for objection were unreasonable. Section 7(3) of the Regulations gives the time limits to be observed and do not mention any need to extend this time limit for holiday periods.

65. Mr C complained that the housebound disabled would not be aware of the proposals and able to make necessary arrangements with their carers. The Council's opinion that carers would be aware by means other than by those requiring care informing them, is reasonable.

66. The Council have reasonably explained how non-English speakers would have been catered for, their methods of counting petitions, their response to the letters received from the business Mr C specified, and their reasons for requesting objectors who wished to maintain their objection following the Council's response to it, confirm this with them.

67. The Council have also explained their view of the events at the meeting in the hotel and the Transport Research and Policy Manager's comments to the residents association. While no definitive decision can be made on what happened at these meetings, the Council's explanations are reasonable.

68. Similarly, the Council's decision to administer objections via Room 84 is also reasonable. The fact that Room 84 was not directly staffed is equally reasonable as the notices did not suggest that information would be available from that address.

69. Given all of the above, I have decided that the Council acted reasonably and appropriately in terms of publicising the proposals or dealing with objectors and, therefore, I do not uphold the complaint. I recognise the Mr C strongly disagrees with this but his continuing dissatisfaction is not, in itself, a complaint of maladministration or service failure.

(e) The Council inappropriately discussed the matter at a meeting of the Roads and Lighting Committee Convener's sub-committee

70. Mr C complained that the first set of proposals (for the Belmont, Spiersgate and Cranstonhill areas) were discussed and approved by the Roads and Lighting Committee Convener's sub-committee rather than by the full committee. Mr C believed that this amounted to a 'fait-accompli' to ensure the remaining proposals would be approved by the full committee.

71. I asked the Council to explain why the various proposals were considered by differently composed committees. The Council told me that consideration by the sub-committee followed by the Council was the usual procedure at the time the proposals were discussed. Following a request to the chair of the committee, the remaining proposals were discussed, exceptionally, by the full Roads and Lighting Committee.

(e) Conclusion

72. I accept the Council's explanation and, therefore, I do not uphold the complaint.

(f) The Council failed to implement the scheme as voted for by the Roads and Lighting Committee

73. Mr C believed that at a meeting of the Roads and Lighting Committee on 7 June 2005 the Transport Research and Policy Manager stated that the boundaries of all the controlled parking areas would overlap slightly. Mr C believed that this had not been implemented.

74. The Council provided me with the minutes of this meeting. The minutes do not indicate that the Transport Research and Policy Manager made the

statement that Mr C remembered. The Council also advised me that the Transport Research and Policy Manager does not recall making the statement Mr C remembered, but confirmed that there is some overlap between the Park and Woodland areas.

(f) Conclusion

75. Mr C believed that the Transport Research and Policy Manager stated that the various zones would overlap. In the absence of a full transcript of the 7 June 2005 meeting, I cannot confirm what was said. However, there is some overlap and I am satisfied that the committee was not misled at the meeting. The fact remains that it was open to any committee member to ask for any further detail or clarification that they felt they needed before voting on the proposed scheme. The scheme has been implemented in line with the proposals approved and, therefore, I do not uphold the complaint.

(g) The Council inappropriately failed to notify certain organisations of the proposals

76. Mr C complained that the Heritage and Design section of the Council were not consulted about the proposals.

77. As noted in paragraph 30 above, the Regulations state which organisations must be consulted by the Council. The Council have supplied me with evidence that these organisations were consulted and provided copies of the correspondence relating to the proposals from the Director of Development and Regeneration Services.

(g) Conclusion

78. As noted in paragraph 30 above the Regulations names those persons and groups who must be consulted, and the Council have demonstrated that these were consulted. Therefore, I do not uphold the complaint.

Explanation of abbreviations used

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Mr C | The complainant |
| The Council | Glasgow City Council |
| CPS | Controlled Parking Scheme |
| The Regulations | The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 |

List of legislation and policies considered

The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999