

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION

17 March 2010

Meeting held at Committee Room 4 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Keith Burrows</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: David Knowles, Steve Austin and Nikki Stubbs</p>	
1.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. (Agenda Item 1)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That all items be considered in public.</p>	<p>Action by</p>
2.	<p>WILLOW TREE LANE, YEADING - PETITION OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS (Agenda Item 3)</p> <p>As neither the petition organiser nor any of the petitioners were present at this meeting, Councillor Burrows considered the petition and report in their absence.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. noted the petition and the objection to the waiting restrictions; and2. asked officers to investigate alternative proposals to address the concerns of the shopkeepers. <p>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>To understand the residents' concerns and investigate further.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p>No other alternatives.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>David Knowles / Steve Austin</p>
3.	<p>CENTRAL AVENUE, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING FOOTWAY PARKING EXEMPTION (Agenda Item 4)</p> <p>Councillor Lynne Allen attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residents advised that they had been parking on the footway since at least 1991 and had recently started receiving parking tickets for doing this;	<p>Action by</p> <p>David Knowles / Steve Austin</p>

- *When the Council was contacted, residents were advised that they had no official permission to park on the footway;*
- *Concern was expressed that it was not safe for vehicles to park on the road as it was narrow and would hinder emergency vehicles from travelling along the road;*
- *Residents preferred not to have white lines to designate footway parking bays as this would save the Council time and money;*
- *Residents felt that the Council's requirement for no parking within 15m of a junction would significantly reduce the number of vehicles able to park in the road as there were a large number of junctions and roundabouts. Drivers were currently parking on the footway within 10m metres of the junctions and there had not been any accidents;*
- *The pavement was up to approximately 3m wide which would enable footway parking and still leave at least 1.5m for pedestrians; and*
- *Following a fatal accident some years ago, a design was draw up to improve road safety in the area. However, this scheme did not identify parking and residents were told by a Council officer at the time that they could continue to park on the footway. This had not been put in writing.*

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. It was noted that the Department of Transport had recently implemented changes as specified within the Highways Act to offer councils more flexibility – officers would investigate whether or not these changes affected the marking of footway parking bays.

Although the Highway Code specified no parking within 10m of a junction, the Council policy was for no parking within 15m of a junction. Although it was agreed that the footway parking enforcement would be suspended in Central Avenue, residents were asked to park a sensible distance from the junctions.

The Cabinet Member stated that it was important for residents to respond to the consultation that would be undertaken (potentially in the next two months) to ensure that residents' views were considered. Officers would then be able to come up with a sensible and practical solution to address the concerns of the residents.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. noted the petition request; and**
- 2. approved the investigation of a Footway Parking Exemption Scheme for consultation with residents of Central Avenue and that enforcement be suspended in the interim providing parking takes place in accordance with the Council's criteria.**

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

It would appear it has been common practice to park on the footways of Central Avenue due to the narrow width of carriageway and this is supported by the large petition from residents of Central Avenue. The

	<p>footways of Central Avenue are sufficiently wide to allow cars to park on them.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p>None as petitioners have made a specific request for parking on the footway.</p>	
4.	<p>RUISLIP MANOR TOWN CENTRE - PETITION OBJECTING TO A PROPOSED 'STOP & SHOP' PARKING SCHEME (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Doug Mills and Mike Cox attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Residents expressed concern that the introduction of a 'Stop & Shop' scheme in Ruislip Manor Town Centre would affect the area by 'clogging it up' for staff, customers and residents;</i> • <i>Petitioners advised that Ruislip Manor was very different from Ruislip as it had a much lower footfall and did not have any banks. The businesses that did operate in Ruislip Manor were reliant on residents being able to access their services as easily as possible. It was thought that the introduction of a 'Stop & Shop' scheme would have a detrimental impact on the traders;</i> • <i>Councillor Cox had undertaken his own survey in the area which had shown a clear objection to the introduction of this scheme;</i> • <i>Members of the Chamber of Commerce were keen to work with the Council to identify a solution to the parking problems;</i> • <i>It was suggested by residents that the introduction of a 'Stop & Shop' scheme would hinder the through-flow of traffic (including buses) and would not prevent commuter parking;</i> • <i>Traders were finding that commuters were parking outside the shops preventing customers from parking there; and</i> • <i>Business owners suggested that the 4.30pm-6.30pm parking restrictions be withdrawn as this would enable traders to compete with Tesco whilst also deterring commuter parking.</i> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. It was noted that a petition requesting a 'Stop & Shop' scheme in Ruislip Manor had been considered by Councillor Burrows in 2009. Since the scheme proposals had been published, it appeared that there was no longer a general consensus supporting the scheme.</p> <p>Officers advised that Transport for London (TfL) was developing proposals for town centre improvements in Ruislip Manor. It was agreed that further consideration be given to the parking issues experienced in the area once the TfL proposals had been published. Traders were reassured that the comments of Councillors', residents' and traders' would feed into the TfL proposals. The withdrawal of the 4.30pm-6.30pm parking restrictions would be considered as part of this consultation.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>David Knowles / Steve Austin</p>

	<p>It was noted that the banks had been contacted but that they were not currently planning to open branches in Ruislip Manor.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. met and discussed with petitioners their concerns with the proposed “Stop & Shop” parking scheme. 2. asked officers to take the petition into account, including relevant points raised by the petitioners at the petition evening, with all other representations from the public in the forthcoming town centre improvements and any consultation results from this. <p>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>The Council has given Public Notice of the proposals for a “Stop & Shop” parking scheme in Ruislip Manor town centre. It is a requirement that all objections must be considered by the Council before making a final decision on proposals. The petitioner’s objections should be considered along with all other representations submitted to the Council before it makes a final decision.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p>None at this stage, as the Cabinet Member when considering the report containing all other objections can decide to either approve the scheme or modify it or take no further action.</p>	
5.	<p>IVER LANE, COWLEY - PETITION REQUESTING A RESIDENTS' ONLY PARKING SCHEME (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Judith Cooper attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents advised that students often parked in Iver Lane, Bullrush Grove, Curran Close and Heritage Close for a couple of weeks at a time; • Students had been seen emptying their ashtrays and fast food litter out of their vehicles onto the street; • Residents found that, if they went out during the day, they were frequently unable to park when they returned. It was noted that visitors to the residents in the road also often could not park in the road; • The introduction of ‘Stop & Shop’ parking in Cowley and residents’ parking in Ferndale Crescent had displaced drivers to park in Iver Lane; • Cars parking at the narrow part of Iver Lane posed a safety hazard as it made it difficult for two vehicles to pass (particularly when one of these vehicles was a bus) and made driving visibility difficult; • Some drivers parked over dropped kerbs and driveways making it difficult for pedestrians to cross the road and for some residents to get off their driveways; 	<p>Action by</p> <p>David Knowles / Steve Austin</p>

- *Residents were concerned that the Council had not taken into account the increase in the number of students (and their vehicles) that would be housed in the new student accommodation being built by the University when planning permission was granted; and*
- *Although there was a weight restriction on the bridge in Iver Lane, residents were concerned that these restrictions were not adhered to.*

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Yellow lines had been introduced outside the Malt Shovel and over the bridge to prohibit parking and had improved road safety. It was agreed that double yellow lines could be implemented on the dangerous bend immediately.

With regard to the parking available on campus for students, residents were reassured that the Council had requested the maximum number of spaces possible during the planning application process. Additional bus routes had been scheduled to the front and back of the campus.

Residents were advised that residents parking schemes were funded from the Parking Revenue Account. It was agreed that informal consultation be undertaken with residents in Bullrush Grove, Curran Close and Heritage Close as well as Iver Lane within the next four weeks. To enable this consultation to be undertaken this quickly without impacting significantly on the officers' workload, Ward Councillors agreed to hand deliver the consultation to each household in these roads. Residents were reminded of the importance of responding to the consultation once it had commenced.

Once the consultation had been completed, the Council was obligated to undertake a formal consultation lasting 21 days. Once this had been done, the parking management scheme would be progressed as quickly as possible.

Residents were advised that each household's first parking permit was free and that any subsequent permits required by the household would cost £40 each year. Each household would also be given a book of 10 visitor permits each year with the possibility of purchasing additional books at £5 each. It was also noted that there was a size restriction on the vehicles that were eligible for a parking permit. It was possible for those residents with company cars to get a parking permit but additional criteria would need to be met.

The information that overweight lorries were crossing the bridge in Iver Lane would be passed onto the enforcement team.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

1. **discussed with residents their concerns with parking in Iver Lane, Bullrush Grove, Curran Close and Heritage Close outside their homes; and**
2. **asked officers to add the request to the Council's overall parking programme so that consultation could be progressed for a Parking Management Scheme at the**

	<p style="text-align: center;">earliest opportunity.</p> <p>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>Following discussions with the Cabinet Member, and subject to residents still wanting a “Residents only” scheme in this area of Iver Lane, the Cabinet Member can decide if it should be added to the Council’s parking programme and progressed following completion of committed schemes already on the programme.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p>The petitioners have made a specific request for a Residents Parking Scheme but further options may emerge following discussions with the Cabinet Member.</p>	
6.	<p>DELLFIELD CRESCENT, COWLEY - PETITION REQUESTING CONTINUOUS PARKING BAYS (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Judith Cooper attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The number of households with young people that were getting their driving licences had increased, as had the number of households paving their front gardens to enable them to park outside their homes;</i> • <i>The road currently had a continuous yellow line which came into operation in August 2009. Some residents were happy with this whilst others were not;</i> • <i>Petitioners preferred resolution was the replacement of the yellow line with white lines; and</i> • <i>It was acknowledged that what might work for residents on one side of the road might not work for residents on the other side.</i> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Residents were advised that it would be quicker to wait for the review of the scheme (which was undertaken within 12 months of implementation) than to start afresh with a new scheme. Officers would undertake consultation as part of the review to establish the thoughts of residents on the effectiveness of the scheme over the last 12 months. Effort would be made by officers to ensure that residents were aware of the differences between white lines and yellow lines.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the petition request; and 2. Asks officers to take into account the petition request as part of the subsequent review of the parking scheme which will be carried out within 12 months from its operational start date. 	<p>Action by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">David Knowles / Steve Austin</p>

	<p>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>It is the Council's usual practice to review all new parking schemes within 12 months from coming into operation. The petition request can be considered as part of this review to determine if the majority of residents in Dellfield Crescent want to change the layout of parking bays in their road.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p>None as the petitioners have made a specific request for the introduction of continuous parking bays.</p>	
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.25 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nikki Stubbs on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.