

## Minutes

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

16 November 2011

Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillor Keith Burrows</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Steve Austin, Roy Clark and Nikki O'Halloran</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillors Jonathan Bianco (5), Michael Bull (6), Allan Kauffman (4), Andrew Retter (5) and Scott Seaman-Digby (3)</p> <p><i>* Numbers in brackets are the agenda item numbers that these Councillors were present for</i></p>	
1.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. (Agenda Item 1)</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That all items be considered in public.</p>	Action by
2.	<p><b>PETITION AGAINST THE INCREASE IN PARKING CHARGES FOR NON-HILLINGDONFIRST CARD HOLDERS IN NORTHWOOD (Agenda Item 3)</b></p> <p>Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised by petitioners included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>• Three Rivers District Council residents in Hertfordshire often used the shops in Northwood town centre as it was closer to them and more convenient than towns in their own county. For example, Rickmansworth was 3 or 4 miles further away;</i></li><li><i>• It was noted that half of Northwood was actually situated in Hertfordshire. As such, a significant amount of the trade in Northwood town centre was from non-Borough residents;</i></li><li><i>• Although the Council was supporting its residents, shop owners felt that they were not being supported by the authority;</i></li><li><i>• The petitioners acknowledged that all vehicles could park for up to 30 minutes for free but stated that individuals wanting to visit the hairdresser, doctor or dentist would often take longer than 30 minutes which would incur parking charges;</i></li><li><i>• Two businesses had closed in Northwood town centre over the last few months, with many more struggling. Petitioners believed that the increase in parking charges was pricing Three Rivers residents out of Northwood and that this would have a detrimental impact on the businesses there;</i></li><li><i>• One of the businesses in Northwood had stopped offering</i></li></ul>	Action by  Roy Clark

*HillingdonFirst discounts as it was thought to be unfair to half of its customers which were not residents in the Borough;*

- *It was suggested that drivers be given one hour of free parking in Northwood, rather than 30 minutes; and*
- *Although it had been suggested that drivers park in Waitrose car park for free, residents were reluctant to do that. Furthermore, it was believed that Waitrose was contemplating the installation of barriers so that only its customers could use the facility.*

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of petitioners and responded to the points raised. It was noted that although two businesses had closed in the last few months, there had been others that had opened. Furthermore, the parking fees were thought to be well priced, particularly for London.

The London Borough of Hillingdon was surrounded by other council areas. As such, it was thought that Northwood was not unique. However, the Cabinet Member requested that officers provide him with a breakdown of the usage figures so that a comparison could be made between the number of HillingdonFirst cardholders and non-residents that were using the machines. It was suggested that, if there was a drop in the number of non-HillingdonFirst cardholders using the parking machines in Northwood, consideration could be given to whether this was as a result of the increased parking charges for non-cardholders and whether this was also happening elsewhere in the Borough.

The Cabinet Member advised that, once he had received the usage breakdown, consideration could be given to the possibility of revisiting the issue of differential parking rates.

**RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. met with the petitioners to discuss in greater detail their concerns regarding the recent increase in parking charges for non-HillingdonFirst card holders in Northwood;**
- 2. reaffirmed that the current differential parking rates should remain unchanged; and**
- 3. instructed officers to provide the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors with a breakdown of the statistics provided in the report for further discussion.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

Representatives of the Northwood Residents' Association have requested that their petition be considered.

**Alternative options considered**

None.

<p>3.</p>	<p><b>PETITION AGAINST THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE SOUTH RUISLIP PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME OUTSIDE DEANE PARK HALL, LONG DRIVE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kauffman attended the meeting as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised by petitioners included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Approximately 1,500 members of all ages used the South Ruislip Community Centre each week and that the Centre was fully booked from 9.30am to 10.30pm virtually every day;</i></li> <li>• <i>When the Centre’s car park was full, there was an overspill onto Long Drive. Petitioners were concerned that the proposed restrictions would prevent users of the Community Centre from parking outside. The proposals could push drivers towards parking outside neighbours houses and could jeopardise the good relationship that the Centre had with residents in the area;</i></li> <li>• <i>It was noted that the South Ruislip Community Association (SRCA) was a voluntary organisation that needed to remain affordable. Concern was expressed that the proposed parking restrictions could result in the loss of members, and therefore income;</i></li> <li>• <i>It was suggested that the SRCA be considered in the same way as other residents in the area;</i></li> <li>• <i>It was noted that the only residents that had not supported and signed the petition were those that had not been at home;</i></li> <li>• <i>Although a potential long-term aim, it was suggested by the Ward Councillor that the scrubland at the edge of the car park be used to extend the Centre’s car park; and</i></li> <li>• <i>A further suggestion was to implement restrictions which prohibited parking between 8am and 9am. It was thought that this would prevent commuters from parking outside the Centre all day whilst those members that arrived early would still be able to park in the car park.</i></li> </ul> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of petitioners and responded to the points raised. He noted that the suggestion for parking restrictions had been implied within the report and that the feasibility of its introduction would need further consideration.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. noted the petition submitted by the South Ruislip Community Association.</b></li> <li><b>2. agreed to defer the proposed extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme in the area directly outside Deane Park Hall.</b></li> <li><b>3. instructed officers to look at the feasibility of a one hour restriction as proposed by the local Ward Councillor and report back to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>
-----------	---	---

	<p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>The petition is opposing a specific part of the proposed extension to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme, in the area directly outside Deane Park Hall.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>None as petitioners have made a specific request.</p>	
4.	<p><b>PETITION REQUESTING A CHANGE TO THE PARKING ARRANGEMENTS IN JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD HILLS</b> <i>(Agenda Item 5)</i></p> <p>Councillors Jonathan Bianco and Andrew Retter attended the meeting as Ward Councillors.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised by petitioners included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Petitioners had no problem with the implementation of the Stop and Shop scheme or the procedure that was followed for the implementation. However, concern was expressed that the angle of the chevron parking bays was dangerous;</i></li> <li>• <i>For more than 40 years prior to the commencement of the Stop and Shop scheme, the bays had been angled in the opposite direction so that drivers were easily able to drive into them and back out;</i></li> <li>• <i>Petitioners had found the revised parking layout to be dangerous as vehicles travelling along Joel Street were given little indication that a car was driving out of a bay – the previous layout meant that oncoming vehicles would see the reversing lights when vehicles reversed out of the bays;</i></li> <li>• <i>Concern was expressed that the petitioners had no knowledge of a formal risk assessment being undertaken when the layout of the bays was changed to force drivers to back in and drive out of bays;</i></li> <li>• <i>Photographs of the difficulties experienced when driving out of the bays were shown to the Cabinet Member and petitioners advised that it was not always safer to drive out of the bays. The new layout also meant that drivers' vision was obscured when parked next to a high sided vehicle;</i></li> <li>• <i>It was acknowledged that it was not possible to avoid accidents completely;</i></li> <li>• <i>Petitioners believed that individuals within the Metropolitan Police Service and the Fire Brigade might be sympathetic to their concerns but that the organisations as a whole would not agree to reverse the bays; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Petitioners requested that the bays be reversed back to the way they were before the installation of the Stop and Shop scheme for a trial period and then reviewed.</i></li> </ul> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of petitioners and responded to the points raised. He noted that the risk assessment for the changes that were implemented in Joel Street would have been</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

	<p>undertaken by the Department of Transport in conjunction with road safety practitioners.</p> <p>Ward Councillors advised that, although the Stop and Shop scheme had been working well since it was implemented, there were concerns about the angle and width of the bays (they were thought to be too narrow) and the need for additional/clearer signage. Officers advised that the width of the bays was 10cms narrower than the maximum permitted but that they would visit Joel Street to ensure that bays there were marked up correctly.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member advised that, when asked for their opinions in the past, the Police and Fire Brigade had not been afraid to express their independent views. Consideration would also need to be given to the Council's aim of reducing the amount of unnecessary street furniture.</p> <p>Officers were asked to provide the Cabinet Member with the accident statistics for before and after the Stop and Shop scheme had been implemented in Joel Street.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. met and discussed with the petitioners their concerns with the current parking arrangements in Joel Street.</b></li> <li><b>2. asked officers to seek the formal views of the Metropolitan Police and Fire Brigade on petitioners' concerns and report back findings to Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member.</b></li> <li><b>3. instructed officers to check the current signage and report back to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>To give the Cabinet Member an opportunity to discuss the petitioners' concerns. The addition of the third resolution would enable the Cabinet Member and local Ward Councillors to review the situation.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>These will be discussed with petitioners.</p>	
5.	<p><b>RUTTERS CLOSE, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING 'AT ANY TIME' WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Michael Bull attended the meeting as a Ward Councillor in support of the petition.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised by petitioners included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Three new houses had been built in Kebony Close but there had been no 'give way' markings at the end of the Close at the junction with Rutters Close – this had almost caused a number of accidents. A request was made that 'give way' markings be installed at the junctions of each of the three spurs of Rutters</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

	<p><i>Close and at Kebony Close. A further request was made for double yellow lines to be implemented in Rutters Close between the junction with Mulberry Crescent and the junction with Kebony Close;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Shrubs, bushes and other vegetation along the side of the road made visibility quite difficult for drivers;</i></li> <li>• <i>Refuse and emergency vehicles had experienced difficulties accessing the road; and</i></li> <li>• <i>A significant number of residents living in Mulberry Crescent parked their vehicles in Rutters Close. If they were displaced, residents believed it was likely that they would park in Jasmine Terrace.</i></li> </ul> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of petitioners and responded to the points raised. Consideration was given to the displacement of parking if the 'At any time' waiting restrictions were implemented and how this would impact on the rest of Rutters Close. The Cabinet Member instructed officers to visit the site and report back to him.</p> <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 'At any time' waiting restrictions.</b></li> <li><b>2. asked officers to include the request as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.</b></li> <li><b>3. asked officers to undertake a site visit to establish if further measures were required and to report back to the Cabinet Member.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>It is clear that petitioners have given considerable thought to the introduction of parking controls that would help access and egress to Rutters Close. The suggestion put forward can be investigated in detail and reported back to the Cabinet Member on the feasibility.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>None as residents have made a specific request for 'At any time' waiting restrictions.</p>	
6.	<p><b>BALLINGER WAY AND WAXLOW WAY, NORTHOLT - PETITION OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED 'AT ANY TIME' WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b> <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised by petitioners included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The majority of the properties in Ballinger Way contained four (or more) bedrooms and housed at least 2-3 adults and 2-4 children. The area was family-orientated and the neighbours were friendly with each other;</i></li> <li>• <i>For many of the families living in the area, one car was</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

*impractical. Many households had two parents that both worked full time and some worked irregular hours, for example, shift work at the hospital;*

- *Although some houses had garages, these were not always large enough to hold family sized vehicles;*
- *It was noted that, if the ability to park outside their properties was withdrawn, it would make it difficult for the families that lived there to park as well as their visitors. The introduction of 'At any time' waiting restrictions would technically mean that the Police would not be able to park there, and Royal Mail and supermarkets would not be able to make deliveries;*
- *It was suggested that the 'At any time' restrictions were being proposed to generate a revenue stream for Trinity Estates;*
- *Those residents present were unaware of the survey that Trinity Estates had undertaken so were sceptical of its results;*
- *If the proposals were implemented, the nearest unrestricted road in which residents would be able to park was Broadmead Road. An increase in the number of vehicles parking in Broadmead Road would prevent buses from being able to pass each other; and*
- *Residents were unsure what alternative options were available but suggested that they be permitted to park on the footway.*

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of petitioners and responded to the points raised. Petitioners were assured that the proposal to introduce 'At any time' waiting restrictions was not a means of creating a revenue stream.

It was noted that the Greater London Council made it an offence to park on the footway in 1974. Residents were advised in June 2011 that the Council would take enforcement action against vehicles parking on the pavement. The Cabinet Member had seen a series of photographs of vehicles parked on the footways in the area, some with all four wheels on the pavement, and right up to the junctions. He advised that the Council had a duty to ensure that the highways and pavements were safe for all users.

The Council was aware that refuse and emergency services vehicles had experienced difficulties accessing some of the roads in the area, although not Ballinger Way. Consideration needed to be given to the area as a whole to ensure that parking was not displaced to the adjoining roads.

The Cabinet Member advised that officers would be producing a report for him regarding the proposals for the area and that the comments received at the Petition Hearing would be considered when the report was put together. It was noted that officers at the London Borough of Ealing were running a separate, related consultation on parking restrictions in the area and that Hillingdon officers would need to liaise with them. This would ensure that consideration was given to the impact of any decision made by Ealing on Hillingdon residents – and vice versa. It was anticipated that a decision would not be made until after Christmas.

	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. discussed with petitioners and listened to their concerns regarding the proposed “at any time” parking restrictions in their road.</b></li> <li><b>2. asked officers to include the petition request and the outcome of discussions with petitioners in the forthcoming report incorporating all representations received from statutory consultation on the proposed “at any time” waiting restrictions in Ballinger Way and Waxlow Way.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reasons for recommendation</b></p> <p>Following statutory consultation on parking proposals, all comments received must be considered by the Council before a final decision is made. A report will subsequently be drafted detailing these comments which can include this petition together with the outcome of discussions with the Cabinet Member at the petition evening.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>These were discussed with petitioners.</p>	
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.47 pm.</p>		

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