

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

16 April 2024



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Jonathan Bianco, Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport</p> <p>Officers Present: Steve Austin, Traffic Parking Road Safety School Manager Poonam Pathak, Head of Highways Rebecca Reid, Democratic Services Apprentice</p> <p>Ward Councillors Present Cllr Elizabeth Garelick, Wood End Ward Cllr Kamal Kaur, Wood End Ward Cllr Stuart Mathers, Wood End Ward</p>
20.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i>
21.	TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i>
22.	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED: <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i>
23.	<p>REQUEST FOR 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT ON ABBOTSBURY GARDENS, EASTCOTE <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>The Cabinet Member considered a petition requesting a 20 mph speed limit on Abbotsbury Gardens, Eastcote.</p> <p>The lead petitioner put forward to the Cabinet Member some reasons to action the request for a 20 mph speed limit on Abbotsbury Gardens, Eastcote. Key points raised by the petitioner included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Many drivers frequently used Abbotsbury Gardens as a shortcut, primarily to access Eastcote Road and continue to Pinner. This residential road was home to a mix of elderly residents and families with young children. Notably, some of these young children walked to the nearby Canon Lane Primary School, which was at the end of the road of Abbotsbury Gardens.• In response to growing concerns about the potential for serious accidents or fatalities due to speeding, the lead petitioner contacted one of their Ward Councillors in December 2023 to express their concerns. The Councillor advised the lead petitioner to gather evidence for their proposal of a 20 mph speed limit on Abbotsbury Gardens by raising a petition.

- Following this advice, the lead petitioner visited 113 households over several days and engaged with 74 households, while the remaining households were either not at home or unable to answer the door.
- The lead petitioner reported that 71 out of the 74 households they spoke to had signed the petition, reflecting 96% unambiguous support for the proposed speed limit of 20 mph on the road.
- The lead petitioner noted he had lived on Abbotsbury Gardens for 17 years. Additionally, two of his neighbours, who were also petitioners, had lived on the same road for 7 years and 46 years, respectively. The consensus was that speeding was becoming worse.
- The lead petitioner attributed increased speeding to recent Council changes. The first was the changing of the speed limit on Field End Road through Eastcote High Street purportedly due to the addition of extra pedestrian crossings. Consequently, drivers heading north through Eastcote on Field End Road at 20 mph and then turning into Abbotsbury Gardens encountered signage indicating a 30 mph limit, which effectively encouraged them to accelerate to a 50% higher speed on a residential street. This situation had become a growing concern among residents.
- The second change involved the imposition of a £75 fee on residents for parking their cars on the street. In consequence, most households now opted to park their vehicles on their driveway, resulting in very few cars being parked on the street. This, then, became an invitation for some drivers to speed. The resident cited that data from the Department of Transport supported this observation, revealing that on so-called free flowing roads lacking bends, speed humps, cameras, and other restrictions, 50% of cars exceeded the 30 mph speed limit.
- The lead petitioner highlighted point 10 of the petition report and expressed concerns regarding the claim that 20 mph speed limits only result in a 1 mph reduction in speed.
- The petitioner also conveyed that a pedestrian struck by a car traveling at 30 mph was eight times more likely to be killed than a pedestrian hit by a car moving at 20 mph. Furthermore, for every 1 mph reduction in average speed, there was a 6% reduction in casualties and injury severity.
- Additional reference was made to the petition report by the lead petitioner, which emphasized that the responsibility for enforcing speed limits rested with the police. Consequently, the lead petitioner engaged in a discussion with a local police officer, who conveyed that the police faced resource shortages in terms of both personnel and equipment. Following the officer's request for the lead petitioner to send an email, the petitioner had not received any response thereafter.
- It was noted that while police presence was one method of enforcing speed limits, it was not the sole approach. Last year, a significant number of residents with dash cam recorders in their car submitted over 33,000 videos to the police

through the National Dash Cam Safety Portal. Over 70% of these videos resulted in police action, leading to warnings, penalty points, or prosecutions.

- The lead petitioner summarized that the changes implemented by Hillingdon Council had inadvertently heightened hazards for Abbotsbury Gardens residents. The petitioner cited that according to Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, local authorities bore a statutory duty take steps to prevent accidents.
- The lead petitioner's conclusive plea was for a 20 mph speed limit on Abbotsbury Gardens to reduce the risk of fatalities or serious injuries to both residents and visitors.

The Cabinet Member expressed familiarity with the Eastcote area and specifically, the road on Abbotsbury Gardens. Upon receiving the submitted petition, the Cabinet Member had visited Abbotsbury Gardens to assess the situation personally.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the concerns raised by the lead petitioner but expressed reservations regarding the implementation of 20 mph zones, as these were not enforceable by the Council but by the police, as the lead petitioner had already discovered himself.

He further noted that, aside from the Council's inability to enforce 20 mph zones, it was also lacked jurisdiction to enforce speed limits using tools, such as speed cameras and speed guns. Currently, the Council's willingness to implement 20 mph zones was limited to areas surrounding schools where none were already in place.

He suggested alternatives such as vehicle-activated signs (VASs) and conducting a speed survey on Abbotsbury Gardens to gauge the extent of the issue.

The Traffic Parking Road Safety School Manager encouraged the lead petitioner to indicate on the location plan where the speed issues were most severe. Once pinpointed, an independent 24/7 traffic and speed survey would be initiated.

In response to the Cabinet Member further emphasising that speed limits could not be enforced by the Council, the lead petitioner proposed equipping cars parked on the road with dash cam recorders, enabling enforcement by submitting their footage to the police.

The Cabinet Member heard from two additional Abbotsbury Gardens residents expressing their concerns about speeding on the road. Further discussion addressed residents' suggestions, including the installation of vehicle-activated signs.

The Cabinet Member further noted that the Council's £75 parking permit charge was amongst the lowest in London, comparing favourably with neighbouring local authorities.

Following general enquiries by petitioners around the nature and function of speed cameras, the Cabinet Member clarified that speed cameras were managed by the police and typically placed on main road to generate revenue.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listened to their request to reduce the speed limit in Abbotsbury Gardens to 20 mph.**
- 2) Asked officers to explore the feasibility of implementing vehicle-activated signs (VASs) to regulate speed**
- 3) Requested officers to commission independent 24/7 traffic and speed surveys on Abbotsbury Gardens at locations agreed with petitioners and ward councillors, and to report back to the Cabinet Member on the outcome.**

24. PETITION SEEKING PARKING PERMITS AND TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON TUDOR ROAD, HAYES (Agenda Item 5)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition seeking parking permits and traffic calming measures on Tudor Road, Hayes.

The lead petitioner, unable to attend the Petition Hearing on 16 April 2024, submitted a written representation detailing reasons to action the request for parking permits and traffic calming measures on Tudor Road, Hayes to present to the Cabinet Member.

The written representation addressed concerns about parking congestion and traffic safety on Tudor Road. The lead petitioner highlighted critical levels of congestion causing frustration and safety risks, exacerbated by the absence of traffic calming measures. He suggested implementing a parking permit system to regulate parking and prioritize access for residents, particularly during peak times, and installing speed bumps to mitigate speeding and enhance road safety for Tudor Road residents.

Councillor Kaur, representing Wood End Ward, expressed her support of the petition.

- Prior to the submission of the current petition requesting parking permits and traffic calming measures on Tudor Road, there was a previous e-petition on July 15th, 2023, seeking speed bumps on Tudor Road. Preceding this, in June 2023, Councillor Kaur had received a letter from a resident, which was subsequently forwarded to Members' Inquiries. The letter expressed concerns about ongoing accidents, stating: 'As I am writing this email, yet another serious accident has happened, the second time in 2 days. Can you please take action before a fatality occurs? As a resident, I propose installing a speed bump and a camera to mitigate the impact, but increased awareness and clear signage would also be beneficial.' The concerns that the lead petitioner had raised, and the visit by Councillors to Tudor Road reflected previous cases.
- Tudor Road was a road that connected Judge Heath Lane at one end to Kings Way Road at the other.
- Speeding issues were resulting in numerous safety hazards on Tudor Road.

Despite its narrowness, this did not discourage vehicles from traveling at high speeds.

- The petitioners and Ward Councillor were advocating for traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps or lowered speed limits, to address their worries regarding safety and speeding.

Councillor Garelick, representing Wood End Ward, also expressed her endorsement of the petition.

- Speed bumps were renowned for their ability to reduce speed.
- Numerous residents had reported vehicle damage on the road, such as lost wing mirrors or scratches.
- The road also posed dangers for residents attempting to cross safely, underscoring the potential benefits of installing speed bumps.
- In light of the insufficient parking situation on Tudor Road, there was uncertainty about endorsing a parking management scheme due to concerns that it might not guarantee an adequate amount of parking space, which mirrored a similar situation on adjacent roads.
- Encouragement was given by Cllr Garelick for a survey among residents due to the relatively small number of signatories on the petition compared to the total number of households on the road. Consequently, additional investigation would be required to establish a consensus among the majority of residents regarding their preferences.

Councillor Mathers, also representing Wood End Ward, further expressed his support of the petition.

- An informal consultation to gauge residents' opinions on parking management systems would be beneficial.
- Given the considerable length of Tudor Road, a more substantial response could be obtained compared to the current petition.
- Emphasis could be best placed on monitoring higher speeds rather than average speeds during speed monitoring initiatives.

The Cabinet Member remarked that should a parking management scheme be introduced, it would result in less available parking spaces, owing to engineering considerations and requirements regarding bay sizes and similar factors.

In addition, the implementation of a parking management scheme only in Tudor Road would likely trigger a ripple effect, prompting adjacent roads to also consider petitioning for similar schemes to be introduced on their own road.

A survey would be undertaken to ascertain residents' views on the potential implementation of a parking management scheme.

The Cabinet Member advised officers to discuss with the lead petitioner if pursuing a parking management scheme was the direction he wished to take.

Speed monitoring activities would be conducted. The Cabinet Member reaffirmed the Council's stance on enforcing speed. That the Council lacked jurisdiction to enforce speed limits using tools, such as speed cameras and speed guns, as this responsibility fell under the jurisdiction of the police.

The Cabinet Member expressed reluctance to install speed bumps to reduce speed on the road due to residents' changing preferences, as residents often wanted them removed from outside their houses because of the noise caused by vans and skip lorries passing over the speed bumps.

Suggestions were made around vehicle-activated signs (VASs) to deter speeding.

The Cabinet Member requested officers to provide Ward Councillors with helpful information on parking management schemes to discuss with the lead petitioner and residents.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listened to their request for Parking Permits and Traffic Calming Measures on Tudor Road, Hayes.**
- 2) Asked officers to commission independent 24/7 speed and traffic surveys on Tudor Road at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors.**
- 3) Requested officers to consult with the lead petitioner to determine if proceeding with a parking management scheme was the desired course of action. Subject to this outcome, instructed officers to add this request to the Council's extensive Parking Scheme Programme for further investigation and possible informal consultation in an area agreed with Ward Councillors.**

25. **PETITION REQUEST TO REPAIR THE PAVEMENTS ON ARLINGTON DRIVE, RUISLIP** (*Agenda Item 6*)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition request to repair the pavements on Arlington Drive, Ruislip.

The lead petitioner put forward to the Cabinet Member some reasons to action the request to resurface the pavements on this road.

- The petition organiser expressed gratitude for the hearing and shared a personal story about her dental appointment coinciding with the notification of the Hearing. She detailed her struggle with dental implants after losing a front tooth and breaking another due to a fall on uneven paving stones on Arlington Drive, costing over £5,000.

- The lead petitioner stressed the dangers of the road, citing incidents involving themselves, their sister-in-law, and children, emphasizing the need for pavement replacement for safety.
- The petitioner proposed using the proceeds from the sale of assets, such as golf courses and libraries, for the purpose of repairing the pavements on Arlington Drive, and further highlighted that the pavements were not fit for purpose.
- An additional petitioner added that the presence of trees along the road, while aesthetically pleasing, contributed to the movement of pavements due to root growth. He had participated in Residents' Association meetings in Ruislip, where a Councillor had delivered a lecture highlighting the benefits of using tarmac over paving stones. The petitioner noted that Fairfield Road was a good example of the kind of look he hoped the road, Arlington Drive, could have.
- It was conclusively noted that all residents had signed the petition in support of the request for the repair of pavements on Arlington Drive.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the points raised by the petitioners, noting that the Council's allocation of funds for local roads and pavements had increased this year, marking an upward trend.

The Cabinet Member further noted that Hillingdon Council ranked as the second-largest council in London, resulting in overseeing the longest stretch of road surface and pavements compared to most other councils in the city. Therefore, maintaining them was a substantial undertaking.

The Council routinely surveyed all streets and pavements. A third-party specialist had recently conducted a bi-annual survey, assessing the condition of every road in the Borough, and provided recommendations.

The Council prioritised its approach to repairing roads and pavements based on urgency.

Officers had been looking into the condition of Arlington Drive, identifying several local areas where minor repair work would be undertaken.

The duty of officers was to traverse the Borough's streets, identifying defects meeting a certain threshold, which would then be promptly addressed.

The Council aimed to inspect all roads annually, with more frequent checks for busier roads. Arlington Drive fell into the yearly inspection routine.

The Cabinet Member informed that officers would address several defects on the pavements of Arlington Drive in the coming months. Regarding urgency, Arlington Drive, was not high on the priority list for resurfacing; it was currently scheduled for year 6 of the programme prepared.

In response, the lead petitioner stressed that there were pavement humps and cracks on the road, emphasizing the urgent need for resurfacing.

The Head of Highways detailed the Council's policy regarding reactive maintenance. For planned works, a separate set of criteria was employed, which involved assigning a

numerical value to each defect, which was then used to calculate the total condition score for each road. She added that officers had elevated the criteria for Arlington Drive in response to the petition received. Taking this into account, alongside other factors within the Council's value management prioritisation criteria, the road's priority level for resurfacing work had been increased.

As per the Cabinet Member's instruction, officers would investigate carrying out defect repairs on Arlington Drive.

The additional petitioner raised concerns about tarmac strips placed between paving stones, citing them as potential trip hazards, and inquiries about alternative approaches to pavement repairs. Officers were to conduct further review on this matter.

The Cabinet Member reaffirmed that where there were any defects exceeding the established base criteria for repair work, officers would attend to them promptly.

The estimated timescale for reviewing defects on Arlington Drive was one month.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listened to their request for replacement of paving slabs on Arlington Drive, Ruislip; and**
- 2) Requested officers to investigate and review identified defects on the pavements of Arlington Drive and undertake any necessary minor repair work.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.00 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services at petitions@hillington.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.