

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING

18 April 2012

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Keith Burrows</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Steve Austin - Principal Engineer Alan Tilly – Transport and Aviation Manager Nadia Williams – Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Councillors Brian Crowe, Allan Kauffman, John Hensley and Bruce Baker</p>	
23.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. (Agenda Item 1)</p> <p>It was confirmed that the meeting would take place in public.</p>	
24.	<p>CORDINGLEY ROAD, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING FOOTWAY PARKING TO BE PERMITTED (Agenda Item 3)</p> <p>Councillor Brian Crowe attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners. As the petitioners were not in attendance and no message had been received to state that they would not be attending, the Ward Councillor requested that the petition be postponed to another meeting.</p> <p>Councillor Keith Burrows agreed for the petition to be postponed to the next meeting on this occasion but stated that the petition would be heard in the absence of the petitioners if they did not attend this meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>
25.	<p>NORTH ROAD/CRANMER ROAD, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING WAITING RESTRICTIONS (Agenda Item 4)</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That the double yellow lines on the junction of North Road, Tudor Road and Cranmer Road be removed, as they were causing a series of parking issues and problems in the area, which was already experiencing severe problems with parking.• Installing additional yellow lines would make the parking situation even more severe than already existed and therefore a request was made for alternative measures to the yellow lines.	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

- If yellow lines were the only feasible measure that could be installed, a request was made that consideration be given to reducing existing yellow lines from 10 metres to 5 metres.

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

- Noted that installation of the existing yellow lines had removed some parking spaces and the proposed additional yellow lines would result in even further parking problems.
- That Ward Councillors had initially requested the yellow lines as residents had initially complained to them about the parking issues in the area.
- Advised that there had also been an incident where the fire brigade had been unable to gain access into Cranmer Road to attend to a burning car.
- Stated that for the above reasons therefore and following an investigation, it was decided that installation of yellow lines was the best way forward.
- Emphasised that problems access for Emergency vehicles was one that was taken very seriously by the Council.
- Explained that a 10 metre restriction had therefore been implemented in line with the High Way Code, which stipulated that drivers should not park “within 10 metres of a junction”.
- Highlighted that no representations had been received from Ward Councillors regarding this petition.
- The Cabinet Member stated that he would ask officers to investigate the restriction but stressed that this was not an indication that the yellow lines would be removed.
- Advised that part of the investigation would include consulting with the Emergency Services. The petitioner was informed that if the Emergency Services asked for the restrictions not to be removed, the yellow lines would remain in place.
- Reiterated that the only way to prevent vehicles parking inconsiderately on junctions was to add yellow lines. Apart from adding a physical barrier (which would not be appropriate in this case), there was no other viable option but to use yellow lines.
- The Cabinet Member stated that he would ask officers to meet with petitioners on site during their investigations.
- Advised that if officers found that there was a reasonable case that 5 metres restrictions would be feasible, this would then be assessed on site.

Officers advised that:

- The current consultation on the proposed new additional yellow lines on the wider junction was separate from this petition. However, if the consultation coincided with the request for the removal of the current yellow lines, petitioners could use the opportunity to discuss their concerns.
- Petitioners must note that it was imperative for there to be reasonable access into and out of a road.

	<p>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considered the petitioners' request and discussed with them in detail their request to remove the existing waiting restrictions. 2. Subject to the outcome of 1 above asked officers to reinvestigate the reduction of 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions as shown on Appendix A. <p>Reasons for recommendation</p> <p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns. The successes of traffic measures which address speeding are largely acceptable to local residents. These can be identified with petitioners for further detailed investigation by officers within the Road Safety Programme.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>These can be discussed with petitioners.</p>	
26.	<p>MASSON AVENUE - PETITION REQUESTING TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SOUTH RUISLIP PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kauffman attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners. Councillors Shirley Harper-O'Neill and Judy Kelly sent their apologies.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The petitioner circulated photographs to show (the state of the parking condition in the road) and the location of the houses. • Had written to the Council to ask for the top of Masson Avenue to be included in the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme zone • That whilst half of King Edwards Avenue had been included in the scheme, Masson Avenue had not. • Checked with residents who had received consultation papers relating to the scheme. However, some of the residents had not completed the form, as they found it difficult to understand. • Checked the facts about the scheme and clarified the details to confused residents. • Advised that there were 51 households and not 50 as stated in the officer's report; 33 had signed the petition and had wanted parking restrictions to enable them to access their own drives. • Advised that drivers coming from the A40 as well as commuters parked in Masson Avenue. • That parents dropping and collecting their children to and from school would park across driveways and block residents. • The car wash at 315 West End Road, (which also sold vehicles 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

up to 17 April 2011) also parked vehicles for repair on Masson Avenue because they did not have sufficient parking spaces to accommodate vehicles waiting to be repaired.

- In addition, cars queuing up to use the car wash would often block West End Road which resulted in further congestion with cars queuing up along residents' driveways while waiting to access the car wash.
- A resident had been forced to telephone the operators of the car wash on a number of occasions to ask for the cars to be moved away from his driveway.
- Residents had suffered frequent abuse from vehicle owners who had been asked to move their cars from their driveways.
- Some residents had missed hospital appointments as a result of not being able to get their cars out of their drives.
- Requested some form of parking restriction that would allow residents to be able to access their own drives.
- Stated that petitioners had requested some form of parking measure in 2010 but due to the low level of support for the scheme during consultation, Masson Avenue was not included. The low response had been due to many residents being confused about the proposed scheme, as they thought that parking permits would be required at their own cost.
- That fly tipping from vans had caused problems. There were also allegations that rubbish from the car wash were being left in the road.
- Reported that they had been advised by some parents that the Headteacher had asked the GAA Sports and Social Club in West End Road whether parents could use their park in their car park.

A Ward Councillor spoke and raised the following points:

- Was very familiar with the problems that had been raised by the petitioners.
- Confirmed that the GAA Club had agreed for parents to use their car park when dropping and collecting their children to and from school.
- Stated that Masson Avenue would be the last road in the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme Zone to be included in the scheme and urged that it be implemented as soon as possible.
- Advised that the car wash was initially a family owned business. However the business had now been sold and the site was subject to enforcement proceedings.
- Suggested that there had been problems with Glebe Farm and the issue of transporters causing an obstruction to the highway when loading cars.
- Acknowledged that it had been stated in the report that Masson Avenue would be included in the review of the South Ruislip Scheme in 6 -12 months time but urged that it was of the utmost importance for it to be looked at now, as the problem would only get worse for residents.
- Suggest that once the scheme was implemented, the issues with the car wash would be precluded.

- Believed that there were extenuating circumstances for consideration to be given to including Masson Avenue to the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme sooner.

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

- Advised that the Council had anticipated residents in Masson Avenue would wish to be included in the scheme, as it was so close to the A40 and the train station.
- The Cabinet Member attached a third recommendation and requested officers to speak to colleagues in relevant Departments about 315 West End Road and investigate the business that was in operation.
- Advised that 6 months from the 6 February 2012 (6 August 2012) was the earliest that a review could be considered, as officers could not progress the review any quicker due to the sizeable work programme.
- The Cabinet Member advised that he usually agreed for reviews to take place in either 6 or 12 months time and confirmed that in this case, a review could take place within the 6 months period.

Officers advised that:

- Residents in one part of Edwards Avenue had been in support of the scheme, whilst residents living in the other part had been against the scheme.
- An informal consultation was required to be undertaken to ensure that the Council's statutory requirements were met and adhered to.
- Ward Councillors would be consulted and residents were welcomed to contact officers to clarify confusion that they may have.

Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking in Masson Avenue, Ruislip.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the discussions with petitioners, asks officers to include the request in a subsequent review of the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.**
- 3. Instructed Officers speak to colleagues in relevant Departments regarding the business at 315 West End Road.**

Reasons for recommendation

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform them that the Council intends to include Masson Avenue in the next review of the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.

	<p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>None, because the petitioners have made a request to be included within the South Ruislip Parking Management Scheme Zone SR.</p>	
27.	<p>PEPYS CLOSE - PETITION REQUESTING MEASURES TO PREVENT ALL DAY NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKING (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</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"> • Stated that 3 late responses had been sent to the Council soon after the original petition had been received which now brought the number of response to 36 and now represented 60% of the households. • Stated that there had been a low response from the flats due to limited access for security reasons. • Advised that the reason for the petition had been due to vehicle drivers and commuters parking irresponsibly and obstructing other road users which had caused safety issues to arise. • Welcomed the double yellow lines that had been installed at the junction of Milton Road but stated that this had not resolved the problem, which still persisted at the bottom of the narrow road. Highlighted that the situation would become even worse with the implementation of the parking restrictions in Milton Court. • Stated that the introducing parking restrictions in Pepys Close would ensure safe access for emergency services vehicles, refuse collection, delivery vehicles as well as residents. • Added that restrictions would also provide parking for visitors and prevent all day parking by commuters. • Suggested that the most viable scheme to assist residents and their visitors would be for single yellow lines on both sides of the road, with each side having different no-parking time slots to the other; such as 9am-11am on one side and 12pm-2pm on the other side. • Indicated that 2a (Parking Permit) of the Council's Parking Management Scheme option would be more acceptable, as 2b would still allow cars to block driveways. • Suggested that some residents were anxious about parking permit costs, even though this had been explained. Residents were particularly fearful that the cost of parking permits would be increased as soon as it had been installed, and suggested this had occurred elsewhere. <p>A Ward Councillor spoke and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the road had different types of properties with the flats having dedicated parking spaces and suggested therefore, that the issue was related more to the houses. • Stated that it made sense to extend parking restrictions in Pepys Close and excluding the flats would be practical as many were 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

rented accommodation, which explained why there had been a low response from occupiers of the flats.

- Suggested that houses in Milton Court should also be considered, as all residents had garages and driveway parking.

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

- Advised that during consultation, all residents were required to be consulted. Therefore it was a requirement that residents living in the flats were included.
- Explained that the Council took into account the actual responses received to the consultations.
- Residents would need to be in agreement as to the type of restriction they preferred.
- Stated that the options for the most appropriate parking measures would be discussed with Ward Councillors. Following discussions, the consultation document would then be sent to all residents in Pepys Close.
- The Cabinet Member confirmed that the preferred options of residents arising from the consultation would be examined and a report would be written providing a series of options.

Officers advised that:

- It was not common to have many different types of enforcement options, as this would cause a lot of confusion for residents.
- Officers would liaise with Ward Councillors and residents would be provided with the most appropriate options for them to make a decision on their preferred option.
- Confirmed that one consultation document would be sent to each household and officers would analyse the returns from properties based in Pepys Close.
- Any questions that residents may have requiring clarification would be most welcomed.

Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking in Pepys Close.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of 1 above, asks officers to add the request to the Council's programme for parking schemes for future consultation on options to address all day non-residential parking and then to report back to local Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member on the outcome.**

Reasons for recommendation

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and if appropriate add their request to the parking scheme programme.

	<p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>None at this stage.</p>	
28.	<p>LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME - PETITION TO SECURE COMPLIANCE (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Bruce Baker as a Ward Councillor attended in support of the petitioners.</p> <p>Concerns, comments and suggestions raised by the petitioners at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that that the problem was worsened a year ago with the extensive noise made by lorries travelling along Field End Road in the early hours. • That enquiries made by the petitioner had revealed that some lorries were based in Watford. • Eastcote Residents' Association had become involved about concerns arising from the volume of lorry traffic, rather than with speeding. • Urged the Council to enforce the London Night Time Lorry Ban. • Explained that the Council withdrew in 2001 from the London Lorry Control Scheme that regulated the movement of heavy Goods vehicles over 18 tonnes during the hours of 9pm and 7am on week days and at week ends from 1pm Saturday to 7am on Monday. • Highlighted that a decision had been made in 2003, following a review to remain withdrawn from the scheme. • That they had received emails from Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby, a Northwood Ward Councillor and Tony Ellis in support of their petition. • The lead petitioner stated that he had monitored the flow of heavy goods vehicles at 5am today, and 3 fully laden lorries had driven through within 25 minutes heading north bound. • Suggested that lorries heading south bound were more of a problem, as they tended to be unladen. • That several hundred households were affected by this issue in Hillingdon, particularly those in Eastcote. • Disappointed that the Council had failed to take control of the enforcement of the lorry ban. • Disappointed that the Council had taken no action against those that failed to comply with the London Lorry Control Traffic Order law. • Noted that the analysis had been conducted over only 2 days and a weekend and suggested that this should have been done over a longer period. • Disappointed that traffic counting was not included in the analysis. • Did not think that £10,268 annual fee was too much for the Council to subscribe to the London Lorry Control Scheme, which would allow the London Councils to manage and enforce the scheme on the Council's behalf. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Alan Tilly</p>

- Commented that the report did not state why the Council withdrew from the scheme.
- Advised that the petition sought for the Council at strategic level to either join the London Lorry Control Scheme or implement a viable enforcement alternative.

A Ward Councillor spoke and raised the following points:

- The Ward Councillor expressed concerns about the Council opting out of the scheme in 2003 and stated that he did not recall being consulted on the matter.
- Advised that he had personally observed heavy goods vehicles going through Field End Road and Joel Street and suggested that such vehicles were partly responsible for the poor road conditions, particularly in Joel Street and Field End Road.
- That the route of these heavy goods vehicles followed bus routes and ran through 5 wards namely; South Ruislip, Cavendish, Eastcote and East Ruislip, Northwood Hills and Northwood.
- Suggested that it would be prudent to establish exactly what the Council would receive for the £10,268 annual subscription fee.
- Raised concerns about heavy goods vehicles parking along side the Civic amenity site, leaving little room for vehicular movements.
- Asked why these lorries were exempted from parking where as other vehicles were not?
- Questioned why the Civic Amenity site opened at 5am and allowed loading at this time when the site was not opened to residents until 8am?
- Welcomed officer's recommendations but asked for recommendation 4 to be reviewed for investigations to include all day.
- Urged the Council to review the current decision and consider joining the London Lorry Control Scheme and assess this over time.
- Suggested that in the meantime, Parking Services should be instructed to enforce parking restrictions and to take enforcement action to prevent heavy goods vehicles parking at the Civic Amenity site at 5am.

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

- Re-iterated that the decision to withdraw from the London Lorry Ban scheme had been made by the Transportation Sub-Committee in November 2001 and the decision had been upheld by the Cabinet Member in 2003.
- Acknowledged that Hillingdon, Barnet, Havering and Redbridge (outer boroughs) were currently the only boroughs out of the 33 that did not take part in the scheme.
- The Cabinet Member advised that he would look at reviewing the scheme and consider whether this was the right time to join the scheme again, based on the information provided from the investigations by officers.

- Stated that the annual fee of £10268 would need to be investigated further to ascertain whether there were ongoing costs such as for policing the scheme before progressing.
- Confirmed that he had taken into account the issue of the poor road condition in Field End Road.
- Stated that he could not understand how it was that heavy goods vehicles were able to access the site at 5am when residents were not able to do so until 8am.
- The Cabinet Member stated that he would add an additional recommendation 5, to instruct officers to provide a report on the operating times of the Civic Amenity in Civic Way site in order to establish the legitimate operating times.
- Advised that he would instruct officers to liaise with Councillor Baker on this issue.
- Emphasised to petitioners that there was no commitment at this stage, as the advantages and disadvantages would need to be assessed to enable informed decision to be made.
- Advised that it may be that the issue would need to be reported to Cabinet for a decision.

Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Met and discussed with petitioners their concerns regarding early morning noise intrusion caused by lorry movements along the B472 Joel Street, between Eastcote Village and Northwood Hills;**
- 2. Noted the results of traffic surveys already carried out;**
- 3. Noted the Borough's previous experience of participation in the London Lorry Control Scheme and instructed officers to review the costs and benefits of rejoining the Scheme taking into account evidence from petitioners, and to report back to him;**
- 4. Instructed officers to carry out further investigation to establish whether the same heavy lorries were passing between 05:00 and 06:00 hours on a regular basis and their identities and to report back to the Cabinet Member.**
- 5. Instructed officers to provide a report on the operating times of the Civic amenity site to establish the operating times.**

Reasons for recommendation

The petitioners' complaints and the results of the traffic survey indicate a need for the periodic monitoring of traffic along the B472 to ensure the volume and time that heavy vehicles pass does not unreasonably detract from residential amenity in a built up area. There may be a case to review membership of the London Lorry Control Scheme taking into account both the issues raised in the petition and how membership may conceivably be of wider benefit to the Council.

	Alternative Options Considered None at this stage.	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.18 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.