

## Minutes

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

22 February 2012

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



	<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows
	<b>Officers Present:</b> David Knowles, John Fern ( <i>in part</i> ) and Nav Johal  <b>Also Present</b> Councillors' Janet Duncan, David Benson, Sukhpal Brar, Jazz Dhillon, Philip Corthorne and John Riley.
10.	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 1</i> )  There were no declarations of interest to note.
11.	<b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 2</i> )  It was confirmed that the meeting would take place in public.
12.	<b>AIRDRIE CLOSE &amp; WEST QUAY DRIVE, YEADING - PETITION REQUEST TO 'STOP UP' ADOPTED PUBLIC FOOTPATH</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 4</i> )  Councillor Janet Duncan attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners.  Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mr Reeves, the lead petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioners.</li><li>• The petitioner asked if the idea was out for consultation. That from the letter the petitioner had received he could not see that any homework had been done by the Council, and that resident views had not been obtained.</li><li>• Mr Reeves asked if Council officers had considered the residents problems with the path being opened up.</li><li>• He asked if the report that requested the 'stop up' had been misplaced and asked if the officers had looked into police reports.</li><li>• The petitioners felt that they were in no different situation than the Cabinet Member Petition Hearing in October 2011 as the history of the path and reports had not been located.</li><li>• That if the path was re-opened then anti-social behaviour would recommence.</li><li>• Residents felt very strongly about this and around 8 years ago there</li></ul>

was an attempted child abduction on this path. They had the backing of the police at the time to close this path.

- It was in the public interest to close up the path.

A Ward Councillor spoke and raised the following points:

- The Ward Councillor stated that every single resident, apart from one, on Airdrie Close had signed the petition to request the Council 'stop up' the path. The one that did not sign it supported the petition but for various reasons did not sign it.
- Residents had accepted that the 'stop up' could only be carried out by a magistrate and asked that the Council supported this.
- As responsible people they should prevent any potential anti-social behaviour and crime, that this path had a history of this.
- That if the footpath was re-opened, could the Cabinet Member consider closing it at 6pm or earlier. This was similar to other paths in the Borough.
- In the past, and currently, there were problems with anti-social behaviour, drug taking and prostitution in the area. It was noted that Police patrols had increased in the area as a result.
- That during the winter the path would be extremely unsafe, particularly in the evenings.
- The Ward Councillor stressed that there was not a demand to open the path up. That money would be spent on something that people did not want.
- The Ward Councillor asked for re-consideration and for the Council to support the residents, and ask that the Council request from the magistrates that this path be 'stopped up'.

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

- Officers in a previous meeting were asked to investigate the history of the path and had found no formal request to 'stop up' this path.
- The Cabinet Member stressed the fact that no record had been found to 'stop up' the path and therefore as a public highway it could be opened up for use.
- He confirmed that the meeting in October 2011 was adjourned to enable officer to investigate the history of the path as he did not want to make a decision on the path without all the relevant information.
- He asked if the Safer Neighbourhood Teams were area of the issues the Ward Councillor had raised.
- The Cabinet Member stated that the decision to open the path could not be based on demand but the fact that it was highways land.

Officers advised that:

- It was confirmed that this was in consultation.
- Officers stated that the Council did not have the power to 'stop up' and this power was with magistrates under the Highways Act.
- The path was used in the past and there was a right for it to be used as it was public highway.
- The Council could recommend to magistrates to 'stop up' the path. To do this the Council needed to ensure that the criteria for this recommendation was met.
- Officers did not have any evidence to assure that the criteria could be

met in this instance, and did not have any evidence of anti-social behaviour in the area.

- This path came to officer's attention as someone had enquired about purchasing the land; the Council had not had an approach to open the path. Council officers then realised that as public highway this path should be opened up.

A letter dated 2 November 1998 from LB Hillingdon was distributed to the Cabinet Member. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the letter stated that the Environment Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> December 1998 looked into the closure of footpaths on community safety grounds. The Cabinet Member, therefore, decided to defer the petition in order for this to be brought back to the next petition hearing on 21 March 2012. It was noted that the Committee's decision on the 15 December 1998 was relevant to this petition.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Met and discussed with petitioners their request to 'stop up' the adopted public footpath.**
- 2. Deferred a decision on this petition and would be re-heard at the Cabinet Member Petition Hearing on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

The recommendation met the Council's legal obligation as the Highway Authority to protect the rights of the public to use the adopted public highway.

**Alternative Options Considered**

There were no alternatives to consider as there was not a more commodious alternative route and to stop up the adopted public highway would prevent the public's use and enjoyment of the highway.

13.

**HARMONDSWORTH HIGH STREET - PETITION REQUESTING 'AT ANY TIME' WAITING RESTRICTIONS** (*Agenda Item 5*)

Councillors' David Benson and Sukhpal Brar attended as Ward Councillor's in support of the petitioners.

Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:

- Mr Spink, the lead petitioner, spoke on behalf of the petitioners.
- At a Councillor Ward surgery the question of parking at the entrance to the village had been raised. As a result the present petition was organised and sent to the Council for consideration.
- Mr Spink was a Committee member for HASRA and therefore did this on behalf of the residents.
- Many drivers he spoke to were very frustrated at the parking of two large vans and cars which were frequently parked just inside the village entrance.
- This blocked the view for cars trying to enter the village. Drivers could not see if there was a vehicle approaching from the West as they got

into the village from the East.

- If drivers tried to come in around the vehicles that were parked there and there were cars coming towards them then they would have to back up to let the cars come through.
- During school traffic peak times there often was a line of cars trying to get out of the village and the traffic was very busy at this time.
- There were often occasions when drivers became abusive and offensive.
- The problems with the parking had been going on for many years; the Council had introduced some double yellow lines but these did not solve the problem fully as the lines did not reach far enough into the village. The petitioners asked if the double yellow lines could be extended further into the High Street.
- The petitioner spoke about the chicane at the end of Acacia Mews. He suggested that if this was removed it would facilitate a free flow of traffic.

Ward Councillors spoke and raised the following points:

- It was noted that a major accident by the church had left part of the church damaged.
- This area was extremely problematic for traffic and the mini-roundabout was very busy.
- As vehicles came into the High Street cars could be backed up onto Hatch Lane due to the congestion.
- People were parking along the road with large vans and this caused problems with the congestion on the road.
- The Ward Councillors asked the Cabinet Member to agree measure which would clear the bottleneck and help traffic flow.
- Ward Councillors had carried out site visits and could confirm what residents were saying was 100% correct.

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

- The Cabinet Member was familiar with the area and the problems on the road.
- He advised that to include the 'at any time' waiting restrictions this had to be advertised, under the relevant legislation. A notice would be placed in the local press and notices would be put on lampposts in the area.
- If any objections were received these would be passed to the Cabinet Member for consideration. If no objections were received then the necessary work could be carried out.

Officers advised that:

- Officers would put on hold the 'Manchester pattern' bollard that had been ordered to replace the damage that done, whilst a review of the area was carried out.

**Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

**1. Met and discussed with petitioners their request for the installation of 'at any time' waiting restrictions.**

**2. Asked officers to include the request as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.**

**3. Instructed Officers to inspect the bollard that was broken and report to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation & Recycling.**

**Reasons for recommendation**

Discussions with the petitioners allowed the Cabinet Member to fully understand the concerns and if it was considered appropriate add the request to the Council's Road Safety Programme.

**Alternative Options Considered**

These were identified from the discussions with the petitioners.

**14. SKIPTON DRIVE, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES (Agenda Item 6)**

Councillor Jazz Dhillon attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners.

Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:

- Councillor Jazz Dhillon spoke on behalf of the petition submitted.
- A request was put forward for a second speed survey on Skipton Drive from residents of Skipton Drive.
- 65% of households had signed the petition regarding speeding vehicles along the road.
- The Cabinet Member and officers were asked for advice on a way forward to resolve this issue.
- A possibility of a 30mph zone was discussed.
- The Ward Councillor stated that he received regular feedback from residents regarding this issue.
- He was informed by residents that speeding occurred more often at weekends.
- It was noted that the speed survey that was done previously had highlighted no issues; this was carried out 24/7 for a period of time.

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

- The Cabinet Member stated that the perception of the speed of vehicles was always different.
- That when speed guns were visible that vehicles would slow down on approach.

**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. A second traffic volume and speed survey be commissioned in**

Skipton Drive, Hayes and the results be reported back to the Cabinet Member.

3. Subject to the outcome of recommendation 2, asked officers to include the request and possible options in the Road Safety Programme

4. Asked Officers to liaise with the Pinkwell Safer Neighbourhood Team as part of further investigations and to identify any appropriate enforcement actions.

#### Reasons for recommendation

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns.

#### Alternative Options Considered

These were identified from the discussions with the petitioners.

15. **HILL LANE & HILL RISE - PETITION REQUESTING WAITING RESTRICTIONS** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The Cabinet Member heard item 7, Hill Lane, and item 8, Hill Rise, together. The correction on page 32 of the agenda was noted, 'Rise' should read 'Lane'.

Councillors' Philip Corthorne and John Riley attended as Ward Councillors in support of the petitioners.

Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:

- Mr Lee and Mr Burnside spoke on behalf of the petitioners.
- It was stated that the problems residents encountered related directly to commuter parking.
- Drivers left their cars parked in Hill Lane and Hill Rise and used the path to walk through to nearby West Ruislip rail station and went to work.
- This had changed the nature of the area from a pleasant residential street into a car park.
- Often cars were left for days at a time whilst the drivers went on holiday and got a train from the nearby station.
- The cars were parked there without reference to the convenience of the residents of Hill Lane and Hill Rise. There were times when it was difficult for residents to leave their drives due to the inconsiderate parking close to and directly opposite their crossovers.
- Residents had, on occasion, been prevented from going to work due to this and have had to leave their cars a considerable distance from their homes, and have had to walk considerable distances.
- Cars were parked on both sides of the road and tightly adjacent to driveways, which made it often impossible to exit and leave safely.
- Several incidents had occurred over the last year. This included an ambulance which had been unable to get to a house and had to park in the middle of the road. A fire engine could not get around the

corner. Refuse lorries were reported to struggle every week on the road.

- Commuters would park their cars on top of rubbish sacks that residents had left on the road for collection. This would mean that rubbish would be left uncollected.
- There were a number of disabled residents and carers who found it difficult to get the 'Dial-A-Ride' and other vehicles to their homes.
- There were many blind spots as a result of commuter vehicles parking inconsiderately.
- Delivery vehicles often had trouble turning and had problems making deliveries.
- Residents requested a parking restriction of one hour per day, from perhaps 11am – Noon, to deter the commuter parking. It was noted that this arrangement was working well in other surrounding local streets in the area.
- Petitioners also asked the Cabinet Member to consider double yellow lines in the corners of the roads and pictures were distributed to the Cabinet Member to show the extent of the problem.
- Petitioners also explained that a rotary road sweeper had not swept the road in around 2 years.
- Petitioners noted that the situation had got worse since the last consultation exercise.
- There were also issues with commuters using resident drives to turn their cars around. Damage was sometimes caused to resident cars and property.

Ward Councillors spoke and raised the following points:

- Ward Councillors spoke about the consultation exercise that was carried out for residents on Hill Lane a year ago. The result of this was that a consensus could not be reached and therefore parking restrictions were not implemented.
- The majority of residents in the area did want a restriction on parking to stop commuter parking.
- A fair amount of work had already taken place with Hill Lane and Hill Rise residents and various options had been considered. Part time waiting restrictions were considered to be the best option to help resolve the issues.
- Ward Councillors stressed that the parking issues were a major concern to those with caring responsibilities and carers. It was also a continuing problem for emergency vehicles.
- Residents had problems entering and exiting their own properties.
- Those parking were not considering those that lived on the streets.
- Ward Councillor's had visited the area and saw first hand the issues around parking.
- It was noted that the parking charges at the train station car park had increased considerably and it was notably more expensive than other station car parks.
- There was a woeful disregard to residents by commuter parking.
- That a pleasant series of roads had becomes a very difficult place to get to.
- The area was never designed for 2.5 cars per household.
- A reduction in the number of cars parked would make it safer and improve the access.

- The Ward Councillors supported the petitioners and the points they had raised.

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

- The Cabinet Member advised that LB Hillingdon was the largest Borough for car ownership per household.
- He advised residents that the restrictions to parking would apply to the residents of the road as well as commuter parking and thus that the restrictions would apply equally to all who used the road.
- He reiterated that the earlier consultation that the Ward Councillors had mentioned had not given the Cabinet Member a mandate to go proceed, and that he required a clear mandate to move this forward.
- The Cabinet Member went on to say that in the last consultation only one person had said yes to 11am – 12pm being a suitable time for waiting restrictions.
- He clarified with petitioners that their petition specified for waiting restrictions and not a permit scheme.
- The Cabinet Member stressed to the petitioners that he would base his decision on the results that were returned. He asked that they encouraged all neighbours to complete the consultation forms when they receive them.
- When the results of the consultation exercise have been received these would be shared with the Ward Councillors.
- He advised that to include the waiting restrictions to a road this had to be advertised, under the relevant legislation. A notice would be placed in the Gazette and notices would be put on lampposts in the area.
- If any objections were received these would be passed to the Cabinet Member for consideration. If no objections were received then the necessary work could be carried out.

Officers advised that:

- The timing of the consultation exercise would be around March/ April.
- Ward Councillors would have the opportunity to view the consultation before it is sent out.

#### **Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Discussed with petitioners and listened to their concerns regarding all day commuter parking in their road and the request for limited time waiting restrictions.**
- 2. Requested that residents be further consulted on proposals for limited time waiting restrictions on a section of Hill Lane and Hill Rise.**

#### **Reasons for recommendation**

Residents had specifically asked for a one hour waiting restrictions to be installed along a section of Hill Lane and Hill Rise.

#### **Alternative Options Considered**



	These were discussed with petitioners.
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.40 pm.

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