

## Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,  
Transportation and Recycling  
Wednesday, 15 June 2011  
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**



**Published on: 24 June 2011**

	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Councillor Keith Burrows</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> David Knowles, Danielle Watson and Nav Johal</p> <p><b>Also Present</b> Councillors' Richard Mills, Dominic Gilham, Peter Kemp, Paul Harmsworth, Raymond Graham, Michael White and John Hensley</p>	
1.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b></p> <p>It was confirmed that the meeting would take place in public.</p>	Action by
2.	<p><b>ROBINWOOD GROVE, HILLINGDON - PETITION REQUESTING A RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME</b></p> <p>Councillor Richard Mills attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mr Darren Grant, the Lead Petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioners. He spoke on behalf of residents at Robinwood Grove and Greensleaves.</li><li>• The Officer report stated that 77% of households at Robinwood Grove supported the application of Robinwood Grove Residents Limited to have Robinwood Grove designated a Residents' Parking Permit Zone. Mr Grant suggested that this would have been 100% if all residents were at home to see the application.</li><li>• There were 26 apartments at Robinwood Grove. It was a small community and a cul du sac.</li><li>• The area was in close proximity to Hillingdon Hospital, Brunel University and Bishopshalt School. There was an overflow of non-residential parking on the road, particularly between the hours of 8am until 5pm.</li><li>• The increase in use of vehicles on the road had become a concern for residents. There were as many as 11 vehicles parked</li></ul>	Action by

on one side of the Grove.

- Residents that wished to access the road were inconvenienced due to the increase in people parking on the road.
- The residents of Greensleeves had people parking cars on either side of the entrance to their homes. This meant that residents often had to mount the kerb to exit or enter the road.
- The road was only 17 feet wide which meant it became very congested especially when cars were parked.
- There were often occasions when cars were not parked close to the kerb which made it difficult for cars to pass in an already narrow road.
- There was a problem in regard to emergency vehicle access to the properties. For example, a fire engine may not be able to drive through when cars were parked.
- There had been an occasion when a refuse lorry had not been able to access the properties.
- Some people that parked their cars on the road would leave litter on the road.
- Petitioners felt that with a controlled parking zone/permit scheme, that this issue on the road could be controlled.
- Having spoken to several residents the petitioners felt that the road could be hazardous to drive on, particularly during the school-run.
- Petitioners queried the controlled parking zone timing.

Ward Councillor Richard Mills spoke and raised the following points:

- Councillor Richard Mills stated that all three Ward Councillors were in support of the residents.
- He had visited the road during lunchtime and it was clearly evident that parking was an issue.
- There was a parking management scheme in place in the Brunel area and this forced workers to park further away including within the Grove.
- He asked that the residents considered the various options of controlled parking, and that a permit zone may not be the ideal option. This needed to be explored.
- Councillor Mills felt that an appropriate measure needed to be put in place in the area.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised:

- The Cabinet Member asked officers to check whose responsibility the hedges in the road were as these needed trimming and would help with visibility.
- He asked petitioners how often during the day residents or visitors parked on the road during the day. Petitioners replied that this was rare.
- The Cabinet Member informed petitioners that a yellow line with hours of parking permitted was a measure that had worked well in

similar areas and this could be considered by residents.

- The Cabinet Member explained that any consultation sent to residents would set out the different options available. Residents could respond after considering the various options available to them in order to decide what they felt the most suitable option would be.
- The Cabinet Member ensured petitioners that enforcement officers visit would periodically provide a sweep of the area to enforce any parking restrictions.
- He explained to petitioners that a yellow line option would be applicable to all drivers.
- That if the residents wished to discuss the options available to them that officers and Ward Councillors could assist them.
- The Cabinet Member agreed that as 77% of the residents had signed the petition the Council would move forward to a statutory consultation, rather than an informal consultation as strong support was already evident.

Officers advised that:

- As part of the statutory Traffic Order consultation, they would put up notices in the area and place an advert in the local paper.
- That as the Cabinet Member had agreed to move straight to a statutory consultation this should speed up the process.
- Anyone who wished to object would have the opportunity to. If the Council received any objections then this would go through the formal process whereby a report would be produced for the Cabinet Member, who would make a decision on whether or not to proceed with making the order.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Discussed with petitioners their concerns with parking in Robinwood Grove.**
- 2. Asked officers to place this request on the Council's parking programme for subsequent detailed investigation and consultation.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

Residents were asking for a residents' parking scheme; however following further discussions with petitioners other options could have been identified which may have been more appropriate to address their concerns.

**Alternative Options Considered**

The residents had made a specific request for a resident permit parking scheme. However an informal consultation with residents allowed consideration of various options for measures to control parking in their

	road.	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>COLHAM MANOR PRIMARY SCHOOL - PETITION REQUESTING SCHOOL PERMIT SCHEME</b></p> <p>Councillors Dominic Gilham, Peter Kemp and Paul Harmsworth attended as Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms Clarke, the lead petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioners.</li> <li>• The lead petitioner noted that a parking management scheme for resident parking was put in place last summer as the road was near Hillingdon Hospital.</li> <li>• At the time of the scheme was implemented Ms Clarke felt that the difficulties with parking during term time had not been fully discovered.</li> <li>• Ms Clarke was a childminder and had seen similar successful schemes to what they had petitioned for. One such scheme had been implemented near St Andrew's school.</li> <li>• Nearby roads were being consulted for resident parking zones. If these were implemented then parking for Colham School would be even more difficult for parents and child minders.</li> <li>• The petitioners requested the Cabinet Member considered a pay and display option for the road, and a school permit scheme.</li> <li>• Timing for parking was varied with nursery and school timings needed to be considered.</li> <li>• Public transport was not an easy option for the petitioners to travel to the school as some were childminders and with more than one child with them. That it would often be more than one bus journey to take and walking was not ideal with the children.</li> <li>• A letter had been sent from the headteacher of Colham School that stated the school was expanding which meant the catchment area would increase. More people would be travelling from further away and by car into the school.</li> </ul> <p>Ward Councillor Peter Kemp spoke on behalf of residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Kemp spoke against the petition. He stated that residents had fought hard for a resident parking scheme to be put in place.</li> <li>• The nearby hospital had caused a parking overflow onto the surrounding roads and schemes were designed to mitigate this.</li> <li>• With more parking schemes that could be put in place in the future, this could further assist with controlling parking measures.</li> <li>• The school could explore the use of their own land for parking for users.</li> <li>• The school should be looking at a Green Travel Plan.</li> <li>• Resident concerns were paramount.</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>

Ward Councillor Paul Harmsworth spoke on behalf of residents:

- Councillor Harmsworth spoke against the petition and in support of the residents who had requested a controlled parking zone.
- He stated that a lot of time had been spent to get the parking scheme implemented and they did not want to take that away from residents.
- The Ward Councillor asked the petitioners to consider all options for getting to and from the school, and not just driving.

Ward Councillor Dominic Gilham spoke on behalf of residents:

- Councillor Gilham was aware of the problems at the school regarding parking and he was in support of the recommendations contained in the officer report.
- He supported the local residents of Yiewsley who could not park in their own street until the parking scheme was put in place.
- Councillor Gilham informed the petitioners that Ashwood and Beechwood had said no to a proposed parking scheme in the area.
- He wished to show his support to the petitioners as Borough residents but also expressed his support to his Ward.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised:

- The Cabinet Member advised that the scheme at St Andrew's school was primarily a drop and go scheme. He asked officers to check this for clarification.
- A previous petition that the Cabinet Member had heard was in strong support for a resident parking scheme due to the parking issues caused by the nearby school and hospital.
- Ward Councillors fought hard for a parking scheme and were acting on behalf of the residents.
- He was sympathetic to the petitioners' concerns and stated that a parking stress survey and discussion with the school could give alternative options.

Officers advised that:

- Officers would carry out a parking stress survey at various times during the day and produce a report.
- A parking stress survey would be carried out on a daily basis, survey the roads, cars would be observed, the length of time parked, how many cars, and patterns looked at. This would be done in the whole area and not just one street.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Discussed with petitioners and listened to their request for a School Permit Scheme.**

	<p><b>2. Instructed officers to carry out parking stress surveys in roads close to the school to determine availability of spaces and to report the results back to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.</b></p> <p><b>3. Instructed officers to liaise with Colham Manor School on issues related to transport and parking, and report back to the Cabinet Member.</b></p> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>Parents and guardians had made a direct request for a school permit scheme that allowed permits parking within the residents parking scheme.</p> <p><b>Alternative Options Considered</b></p> <p>These were discussed with petitioners.</p>	
4.	<p><b>QUEENS WALK, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING</b></p> <p>Councillors Raymond Graham and Michael White attended as Ward Councillors in support of the petitioners.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Raymond Graham spoke on behalf of the petitioners.</li> <li>• The petition submitted considered the thoughts of the residents and had acquired 78 signatures, but this figure could have been higher.</li> <li>• The area proposed within which petitioners were requesting a pedestrian crossing was near St Swithun Wells Primary School.</li> <li>• The surrounding area carried a lot of traffic and this traffic travelled at a considerable speed.</li> <li>• There was much traffic to and from the school nearby.</li> <li>• There was a slight hill on Queens Walk which led drivers to drive at a fast speed.</li> <li>• The Ward Councillor fully supported the petitioners in their request for a pedestrian crossing just north of West and East Mead junction.</li> <li>• There had been a number of accidents in the road.</li> <li>• An overriding factor for the request was child safety; it was a very busy crossing place.</li> <li>• A pedestrian crossing was a necessity,</li> <li>• There had been a lot of near misses on the road and the main</li> </ul>	Action by

thought was the safety of people crossing.

- Cars were coming from four different directions at the junction.

Ward Councillor Michael White spoke on behalf of petitioners:

- Councillor White stated that Queens Walk had particular features that distinguished it; it had width restrictions at one end and a hill in another part.
- There had been several accidents on the road.
- A pedestrian crossing could be a safeguard for children and the elderly.
- It would visually slow down traffic and would have traffic calming measures.
- The crossing was a need; Councillor White echoed the concerns of the petitioners and Councillor Graham.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised:

- The Cabinet Member asked officers to check the number of Killed & Seriously Injured (KSI) reported on the road.
- The Safer Neighbourhood Team could look at 'hot spots'.
- A feasibility study was required and would be undertaken.

Officers advised that:

- They would engage with the Police and Emergency Services and take their views into account.
- The school had included in its Travel Plan an aspiration to have a crossing and therefore they had supported the petitioners' request. The school would be involved in discussions.
- Officers would discuss timings of a speed survey with the Safer Neighbourhood Team.
- Realistic timing for the installation, if carried out, could be in the half term of October/November.
- The Council had to follow legal/statutory processes; therefore views from residents who lived in the area would be sought.
- Road safety would be the overriding concern for the Council.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Met and discussed with petitioners their request for the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Queens Walk, near the junction of West Mead.**
- 2. Asked officers to undertake a feasibility study for the possible installation of a pedestrian crossing taking into account the School Travel Plan Programme under the Road Safety Programme and report back to the Cabinet Member.**
- 3. Instructed Officers to contact the SNT and discuss the issues raised by petitioners.**

	<p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>These were identified from the discussions with the petitioners.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>32 AND 56 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - PETITION REQUESTING A SINGLE YELLOW LINE WAITING RESTRICTION</b></p> <p>Councillor John Hensley attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Victor Deane spoke on the petitioners behalf.</li> <li>• He stated that over recent years the parking issues had escalated in the road.</li> <li>• The main issues were the hazardous and inconsiderate parking mostly by commuters.</li> <li>• There were safety issues to consider, these were stated in the letter with the petition submitted.</li> <li>• Residents included the elderly, some of which required parking outside their homes in case of an emergency.</li> <li>• Petitioners had discussed the single yellow line option with Councillor Hensley, who had also brought to their attention the option of a resident parking permit scheme.</li> <li>• Petitioners were frustrated with not being able to park outside their own homes.</li> <li>• Residents from Milton Court had experienced similar problems and had submitted a separate petition to the Cabinet Member on the day of the petition hearing.</li> <li>• There were incidents of cars being parked on the street for days, weeks and even months without being moved.</li> <li>• People parked their cars on the road and get a train to work, and sometimes to go on holiday.</li> <li>• There was a car dealer that parked cars on the street that were for sale.</li> <li>• Petitioners also raised concerns with regard to speeding in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Ward Councillor John Henley spoke on the petitioners behalf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Hensley submitted a petition on behalf of Milton Court residents for the Cabinet Member to consider with the petition that was heard.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>



- Residents were unaware of the different options available to them and Councillor Hensley had discussed this with the petitioners.
- A yellow line would restrict the residents in the street as well as commuters.
- A Residents Parking Scheme would in effect give residents back their street.
- This area was open to day time parking abuse and the 'Stop and Shop' scheme that was implemented in Swakeley's Road, whilst benefited the local area, had exacerbated the commuter parking problem for some residents.
- Councillor Hensley asked that petitioners be given suitable options in the consultation.
- Petitioners were advised to discuss this with other residents in the area.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.

- The Cabinet Member stated that issues related to sale of cars on the side of the road was an enforcement issue and would be dealt with separately.
- He explained the Resident Parking Scheme to petitioners. They would receive visitor parking tickets that they could give people that visited them. Tickets did not need to be issued if people were visiting them outside the parking time restriction hours.
- Additional books for residents would cost £5 if they required extra visitor parking tickets, each book contained 10 tickets.
- This scheme gave residents their road back.
- The 'Stop & Shop' scheme had helped the local businesses and they were extremely happy with it.
- It would be of benefit to all residents if the Council carried out a wider consultation which included the residents of Milton Court.
- The consultation would give residents options. This would include waiting restrictions, yellow lines and resident parking in more detail.
- The Cabinet Member would then review the details of the consultation response before a decision would be made.
- He advised that sufficient numbers in support would be required for a decision to be made.
- The Cabinet Member explained to residents that any parking scheme that would be implemented would later be reviewed by officers.

Officers advised that:

- If residents had driveways they could allow visitors to park on the driveway and did not need to use their visitor parking tickets.
- Officers further explained the options available to residents and the process that would be followed.
- The consultation would give all the residents an opportunity to comment on the options that were open to them.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A report would be produced for the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors to consider once the consultation had been carried out.</li> <li>• A legal statutory stage would then be required; notices would be put up and then a 21 day period for the right to object to any proposal. This objection period would be open to anyone, not just residents.</li> <li>• Officers would consult with the Police the petitioners concerns regarding speeding in the area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Met and discussed with petitioners their request for the installation of limited waiting restrictions on both sides of the service road fronting Nos. 30-56 Long Lane, Ickenham.</b></li> <li><b>2. Asked officers to prepare options for an appropriate wider consultation with residents and report back the results to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>To fully investigate the request from petitioners who lived in this section of Long Lane, Ickenham.</p> <p><b>Alternative Options Considered</b></p> <p>The residents had made a specific request for limited waiting restrictions. However an informal consultation with residents allowed consideration of various options for measures to control parking in their road.</p>	
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 19.00 p.m., closed at 21.32 p.m.</p>	
	<p>These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.</p>	