

## Minutes

### PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING

14 September 2011



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

	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Steve Austin, Planning, Education, Environment and Community Services Nadia Williams, Democratic Services</p> <p><b>Also Present</b> Councillors John Hensley, Bruce Baker, Mo Khursheed and Brian Crowe</p>	
24.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved: That all items be considered in public.</b></p>	
25.	<p><b>EDINBURGH CLOSE, ICKENHAM - PETITION RELATING TO THE PROPOSED PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Two petitions were considered at this meeting with the Cabinet Member, one petition objected to the proposed Parking Management Scheme, and the other supported the scheme.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestion raised by the petitioner objecting to the scheme at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>That the petition originally was not in objection of the Parking Management Scheme, but just the severity of the 9am to 5pm restriction.</i></li><li>• <i>Suggested that a 10am to 12noon restriction placed at the top of Edinburgh Drive would deter commuters and teachers from parking.</i></li><li>• <i>Felt that proposed 9am to 5pm restriction would be too onerous, particularly for the elderly who required help during the day and visits from maintenance contractors.</i></li><li>• <i>That the original proposal opted for less restricted times.</i></li><li>• <i>Suggested that since parking restrictions had been imposed in other roads, Edinburgh Close had become more targeted by commuters.</i></li><li>• <i>Objected to yellow lines being installed outside numbers 13, 14 and 15 where there was a turning cycle and would also mean that it would not be possible for residents to park outside their properties.</i></li><li>• <i>Suggested that residents parking bays outside these properties</i></li></ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

*would enable cars to turn more easily and create a bigger turning circle.*

- *Wished to be able to park either in their drive or directly outside their property, particularly as he had two young children.*

Concerns and suggestion raised by the petitioner in support of the scheme at the meeting included the following:

- *Advised that commuters parked over their drives/outside their houses from 7.30am.*
- *That the small close was a constant thorough fair where it was only possible to park on one side of the road.*
- *Pointed out that residents had endured repeated offences and abuses from vehicle owners.*
- *Suggested that vehicles were often parked in the road for up to two weeks at a time by holiday makers.*
- *That it was impossible for visitors to park, particularly when visiting elderly residents.*
- *Explained that it was very difficult for delivery lorries to enter the close and vehicles regularly had to reverse out of the close.*
- *Suggested that vehicles could only go one-way into the close, and vehicular movements of residents were restricted, as they could hardly turn into the close.*
- *Advised that parking restrictions would be welcomed but accepted that it would cause some difficulty for the residents in Edinburgh Drive and the Paddock.*

Councillor John Hensley attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor:

- *Suggested that the only solution to the parking problems in Edinburgh Close was to give back the road to the residents by introducing a residents' parking scheme.*
- *Considered that it would be prudent to also include Edinburgh Close in the proposed Parking Management Scheme and indicated that it would not solve the parking problems.*
- *Suggested that the only problem with the proposed Parking Management Scheme was the lack of consensus in Edinburgh Close, where some residents were in favour of yellow lines and others would prefer parking bays to yellow lines.*
- *Highlighted that in order to have parking bays, yellows would be required.*
- *Re-iterated that some residents would welcome parking restrictions from 9am to 11am and; 7am to 9pm restrictions would restrict anyone from parking during those times.*
- *Urged that it would be futile to not have some sort of Parking Management Scheme in Edinburgh Close.*

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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The petitioners were advised that there had been a 71% response rate from residents in Edinburgh Close when consulted. Out of the 12 responses, 11 had indicated that they would prefer to be included in a possible scheme, with 1 preferring no change.</li> <li>• Officers were instructed to investigate whether a scheme would be feasible and report back – the proposed scheme then subsequently resulted in the submission of this 2 petitions currently being considered.</li> <li>• Suggested that in proceeding, it would be prudent for officers to present options, discuss them with the Ward Councillors who would then put these options to residents for discussion.</li> <li>• Strongly advised against opting for restrictions of 1 hour as other drivers would park immediately after the one hour was up until the next day. This scheme had been operated in other areas in the past and had resulted in residents asking for it to be reversed.</li> <li>• Advised that officers would try to develop an acceptable scheme for Edinburgh Close.</li> <li>• It was noted that the consultation response from residents of Edinburgh Close was one of the highest that had been received by the Council.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved – That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Noted that two separate petitions had been received, one objected to the proposals for parking restrictions and one broadly in support of them.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Discussed with petitioners and listened to their concerns regarding the proposed parking scheme in their road.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Subject to the outcome of 2 above, instructed officers to investigate options for Edinburgh Close and report back to the Cabinet Member and local Ward Councillors.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>It is not clear from the petition whether the residents are asking for changes to the proposed parking scheme or if they wish it to be deferred indefinitely. This will be established with petitioners at the Petition Hearing and, if necessary, through further detailed investigation by officers.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>These will be discussed with petitioners.</p>	
26.	<p><b>JUNCTION OF EASTCOTE ROAD AND FORE STREET, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Concerns and suggestion raised by the petitioners at the meeting included the following:</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

- *Although the new zebra crossing installed had helped, it had not calmed the traffic on the junction of Eastcote Road and Fore Street approaches to the zebra crossing.*
- *There had been many accidents which had not been reported to the Police and these had led to this petition being organised.*
- *Expressed grave concerns about the dangers for children from Coteford Junior School walking home by themselves being involved in an accident, as motorists were unaware of the zebras crossing being there.*
- *Suggested that there was a danger of the situation potentially resulting in a 'pile up'.*
- *Advised that the main concern of the petitioners was to prevent drivers from speeding around the corner.*
- *Suggested that installing a round about would help to slow down motorists.*
- *Advised that as the roads were very narrow with uneven surfaces and tilting pavements, motorists driving with excessive speed around the bend posed a significant danger to pedestrians.*
- *Explained that speeding motorist had resulted in driving into electrical junction box (the green cabinet) on the corner of Fore Street and into residents' garden walls.*

Councillor Bruce Baker attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor and made the following Points:

- Advised that this issue had been discussed in the past and there had been a considerable amount of objection about installing a roundabout (as part of the proposal for a new access road to the former Minister of Defence site(MOD)); which was considered would solve the problem.
- That it was concluded that the 'knock on' effect of installing a roundabout would be horrendous.
- Explained that it had been proposed to install two sets of traffic lights, one controlling the traffic to the new RAF Eastcote estate and the other at the junction of Fore Street.
- Transport for London (TfL) arranged for this new junction to be built (a pelican crossing was also planned, but TfL decided not to go ahead with this).
- Suggested that accident statistics for this area was no higher than other busy junctions in the area.
- Suggested that main problem occurred during peak times and would use Wentworth Drive and Fore Street as a 'rat run', which in turn would result in the increase of traffic flow and become a danger to children.
- That drivers being able to easily turn into Fore Street resulted in causing a tail back on Joel Street.
- Requested that a wider consultation be conducted in the whole area to establish what measures would be acceptable to all affected residents.
- Suggested officers and Ward Councillors should consider available options and report suitable options back to residents.
- Suggested that following consultation, if it was established that

the new zebra crossing was not working, TfL had indicated that they would install pelican crossing lights instead.

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

- It was noted that as a result of the proposal in 1991 to put a roundabout for a new access road to the former MOD site, vehicular movements in High Road Eastcote had been affected.
- Appreciated that there had been a number of accidents in the area, and stated that the Council was obliged to look at the road statistics reported by the Police.
- Advised that two lights had been proposed for the zebra crossing.
- That the developer of the former MOD site had agreed to install two Vehicle Activated signs (VAS) (which flashed up if motorist went over the speed limit) in the area, which would remain in place permanently.
- Did not consider that a roundabout would be suitable for this area, as the aim was to try and avoid any proposal that would result in increasing traffic in the area.
- Suggested that options for some form of traffic calming measures would be devised for the area.
- Advised that an additional recommendation would be added to instruct officers to look at the current signage in the area and, if additional signage was required, to report back for inclusion in the Council's Road Traffic Programme.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet member:**

- 1. Met with the petitioners to discuss in greater detail their concerns with road safety at the junction of High Road Eastcote and Fore Street.**
- 2. Subject to (1), asked officers to place this request on the Council's Road Safety Programme for subsequent investigation and the development of possible options.**
- 3. Subject to (1), instructed officers to liaise with the Police and local Safer Neighbourhoods teams to investigate and, if appropriate, undertake some local enforcement.**
- 4. Instructed officers to look at the current signage in the area and, if additional signage was required, to report back for inclusion in the Council's Road Traffic Programme.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

The Petition Hearing will provide an extremely valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners of their concerns and suggestions.

**Alternative options considered/risk management**

These can be discussed in greater detail with petitioners.

27.	<p><b>MORGANS LANE, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING REDUCTION OF SPEED</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Concerns and suggestion raised by the petitioners at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Considered that the Police report on recorded accidents had little meaning as many accidents did not get reported.</i></li> <li>• <i>Suggested that the Police report history of two accidents in 3 years meant nothing.</i></li> <li>• <i>Concerned that vehicles exiting Morgans Lane were also at risk of being involved in an accident.</i></li> <li>• <i>Explained that Traffic Volume speed surveys had been conducted in the past, but had not been conducted on a 24 hours, 7 days a week basis.</i></li> <li>• <i>Highlighted that motorist driving through Wood End Green Road and Kings Way often became frustrated after having been forced to slow down by the speed bumps and often drove at excess speed when they got to the roundabout leading to Morgans Lane.</i></li> <li>• <i>Stated that the roundabout was at a 'blind bend' and speeding vehicles sometimes hit parked vehicles in Morgans Lane with the potential to also collide with pedestrians resulting in a fatality.</i></li> <li>• <i>Residents, Police, and shoppers' vehicle parked close to the roundabout leading to Morgans Lane, including people's properties (and lives) were all at risk.</i></li> <li>• <i>Stated that there were no clear signs to indicate that Morgans Lane was a one way road.</i></li> <li>• <i>Questioned whether a fatality would need to occur before something was done to address the issue.</i></li> </ul> <p>Councillor Mo Khursheed attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor in support of the petition. Although Councillors Janet Gardner and Phoday Jarjussey who were also Ward Councillors for Botwell sent their apologies, it was noted that they also were in support of the petition.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Suggested that someone had been involved in an accident in this area.</i></li> <li>• <i>Advised that no action had been taken as a result of the last petition hearing meeting in March 2006.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reiterated that motorist usually sped up as they came to the round- about leading to Morgans Lane, which was a one way road.</i></li> <li>• <i>Commented that Police vehicles were also parked on Morgans Lane and would often approach Morgans Lane at speed when answering emergency calls.</i></li> <li>• <i>Suggested that the report omitted to provide details about the severity of the personal injuries sustained at the junction of</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>
-----	--	---

*Uxbridge Road and Morgans Lane.*

- *Suggested that he was personally aware that one car had gone over the railings in Uxbridge Road.*
- *Had observed how young drivers often drove round the bend at excess speed.*
- *Requested that the matter be looked at seriously and urged that the introduction of traffic calming measure be considered to reduce speeding in Morgans Lane.*

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

- It was noted that the aim of the Road Safety programme was to prevent fatalities although this was not always possible.
- Appreciated the frustration of residents and suggested that the Council's focus should be on improving matters in the future.
- Suggested that the main aim was to now look at making Morgans Lane safer by including it in the Road Safety Programme.
- Assured petitioners that a comprehensive survey would be undertaken but this would require petitioners to liaise with Councillor Khursheed, to establish the most suitable places in Morgans Lane to place the speed monitors. Councillor Khursheed would then provide the feedback to officers.
- Added an additional recommendation requiring officers to review the signage in Morgans Lane and report back; if it was found that further signage was required, it would be included in the Road Safety programme.
- Advised that the results of the completed speed survey would shape up the road safety measures that would be proposed.

**Resolved – That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Met and discussed with petitioners their concerns with speeding traffic in detail and the possible options to address issues that would be acceptable to residents.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the discussions with petitioners, asked officers to include the request and possible options in the Road Safety Programme.**
- 3. Instructed officers to undertake a classified traffic volume and speed survey in Morgans Lane, Hayes.**
- 4. Asked officers to liaise with the Botwell Safer Neighbourhood Team as part of further investigations and to identify any appropriate enforcement actions.**
- 5. Asked officers to look at signage in Morgans Lane and report back if further signage was required and include in the Council's Road Safety programme.**

	<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 can be identified from the discussions with the petitioners.</p>	
28.	<p><b>WHEELERS DRIVE, RUISLIP - PETITION IN SUPPORT OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that a petition objecting to propose Waiting Restrictions in Leahome Waye, Wallington Close and Wheelers Drive had been considered at a meeting with Councillor Burrows on 13 October 2010.</p> <p>A subsequent petition was then submitted in support of Waiting Restriction in Wheelers Drive.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised the petitioner at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Suggested that residents had not been aware of Appendix B (an amended 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Wheelers Drive) at the time of signing the petition objecting to Waiting Restrictions.</i></li> <li>• <i>Advised that many householders who had been made aware of Appendix B now had no objection to proposed 'No waiting' restrictions in Wheelers Drive.</i></li> <li>• <i>Stated that in March 2011, a mediation meeting held in Ruislip was attended by Police Support Community Officers (PCSOs) to ascertain consensus between residents. This meeting had subsequently resulted in a great deal of hostility.</i></li> <li>• <i>Explained that during the period of the consultation meeting, a verbal agreement was reached by those in attendance.</i></li> <li>• <i>Expressed concern that if residents who opted not to currently use their garages started using them, it would exacerbate current problems.</i></li> <li>• <i>Suggested that 68 of the signatories to the petition against Appendix A had been signed by people who were not local residents.</i></li> <li>• <i>Stated that all those who had signed the petition in support of proposed Waiting Restrictions either lived in or lived close to Wheelers Drive.</i></li> </ul> <p>Councillor Brian Crowe attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor about the issue.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Advised that there had been two petitions relating to this issue, the first in objection to parking restrictions and the second in</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>



*support of parking restrictions.*

- *Explained that he had visited Wheelers Drive (a narrow road) and noticed that numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 had parking areas in either end of drop kerbs.*
- *Pointed out that areas in front of some of the houses did not have drop kerbs.*
- *Suggested that it was possible for people to park on the road on either end of the fence*
- *Did not believe that parking restriction could be implemented in Wheelers Drive, given the lack of consensus between residents and the tension which had been referred to in the officer's report.*
- *Advised that having attended the first petition hearing meeting in October 2010, there appeared to be a general consensus objecting to parking restrictions in the area.*
- *Noted that the previous petition objecting to parking restrictions had not requested a scheme – it simply objected to the proposed parking restrictions.*
- *Considered that at present, it was not necessary and inappropriate for any action to be taken.*
- *Did not consider that parking restrictions were what residents wanted.*
- *Did not consider that a great deal could be done unless the road was widened or the 'green area' was used.*
- *Did not see any reason why the previous position objecting to parking restrictions should be altered.*

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and noted that the PCSO who had been present at a meeting with residents (during the statutory consultation period) was in attendance at the meeting. The PCSO stated that he had attended a meeting with residents to mediate and to find the best solution for residents. That at the conclusion of the meeting those present seemed happy with the proposals shown in the map and were happy for waiting restrictions to be implemented.

The Cabinet Member listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised:

- He advised that a large number of petitioners had attended the petition hearing meeting in October 2010 objecting to Waiting Restrictions.
- It was noted that the meeting had been moved to the Council Chamber to accommodate the number of people that had attended and had strongly stated their views against the proposal.
- Mentioned that Ward Councillors had attended meetings with residents to try and mediate and identify possible solutions.
- Believed that a solution had been achieved but had subsequently received this petition.
- Advised that the proposal to install yellow lines would be ineffective, as people would simply park around the bend.
- Considered that the main issue now was to establish a proposal

that would be acceptable to all, particularly as feelings between residents were running high over the proposal as shown in Appendix A and B.

- Suggested that it would be very difficult to come up with a solution that would be acceptable to all, especially now that a further Appendix C was now being proposed.
- Commented that the situation would merit further discussion, as well as mediation in order to diffuse the tension between neighbours.
- Advised that due to the level of tension and many different opinions voiced, there was currently no solution because of the lack of consensus of agreement between residents of Wheelers Drive and nothing would be done without this consensus.
- Strongly advised that no further action would be taken until an agreement had been reached with residents.

**Resolved – That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Met and discussed with petitioners in detail their concerns they were experiencing with parking in their road.**
- 2. That subject to 1 above, asked officers to identify suitable options to address these, which would be acceptable to residents.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

It is understood from the petition that some residents have indicated that they would not object to possible “at any time” waiting restrictions on one side of the Wheelers Drive and Leaholme Way junction. However, the Cabinet Member will be mindful that previous proposals have met with strong local opposition.

**Alternative options considered**

These can be identified from the discussions with the petitioners.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.45 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 250472. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.