## **Minutes**

Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling Wednesday, 23 May 2012 Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



Committee Members Present: Councillor Keith Burrows		
LBH Officers Present: Steve Austin – Principal Engineer Khalid Ahmed – Democratic Services Manager		
Also Present: Cllr Michael Bull, Cllr Paul Buttivant, Cllr Brian Crowe, Cllr Shirley Harper-O'Neill, Cllr Allan Kauffman and Cllr Anita MacDonald.		
TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. (Agenda Item 1)	Action by	
It was confirmed that all items on the agenda were Part I and would therefore be considered in public.		
CORDINGLEY ROAD, RUISLIP – PETITION REQUESTING FOOTWAY PARKING TO BE PERMITTED. (Agenda Item 3)	Action by:	
The lead petitioner for this petition did not attend the meeting, however, the local Ward Councillor, Brian Crowe did attend the meeting and informed the Cabinet Member that he had spoken to the lead petitioner.		
Concerns raised on behalf of the petitioner were as follows:		
<ul> <li>Residents had concerns regarding the width available for vehicles to pass down Cordingley Road and were requesting footway parking</li> </ul>		
to other vehicles wanting to pass down the road  • Cordingley Road had an approximate carriageway width of		
the road, This left only 3.2 metres of free space for vehicles to pass through		
Residents did not want to lose any of the parking bays on the road		
Councillor Keith Burrows noted the comments made by the Ward Councillor and responded as follows:		
	Councillor Keith Burrows  LBH Officers Present: Steve Austin – Principal Engineer Khalid Ahmed – Democratic Services Manager  Also Present: Cllr Michael Bull, Cllr Paul Buttivant, Cllr Brian Crowe, Cllr Shirley Hard Cllr Allan Kauffman and Cllr Anita MacDonald.  TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. (Agenda Item 1)  It was confirmed that all items on the agenda were Part I and would therefore be considered in public.  CORDINGLEY ROAD, RUISLIP – PETITION REQUESTING FOOTWAY PARKING TO BE PERMITTED. (Agenda Item 3)  The lead petitioner for this petition did not attend the meeting, however, the local Ward Councillor, Brian Crowe did attend the meeting and informed the Cabinet Member that he had spoken to the lead petitioner.  Concerns raised on behalf of the petitioner were as follows:  • Residents had concerns regarding the width available for vehicles to pass down Cordingley Road and were requesting footway parking  • Residents were having to move their vehicles to allow access to other vehicles wanting to pass down the road  • Cordingley Road had an approximate carriageway width of 6.8 metres with 1.8 metres wide parking bays on both sides of the road, This left only 3.2 metres of free space for vehicles to pass through  • Residents did not want to lose any of the parking bays on the road  Councillor Keith Burrows noted the comments made by the Ward	

- There was an option of removing some of the parking bays | Action By: along the road to improve the access
- For the Council to consider footway parking, there needed to be at least 1.5 metres of unobstructed footpath, to enable pedestrians to pass
- The widths of the footpaths on Cordingley Road varied between 1.4 metres and 1.7 metres.

#### **RESOLVED:**

#### That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Noted the petitioner's concerns with regard to the parking in Cordingley Road.
- 2. Asked that the petitioners be informed that the road does not meet the Council's criteria for footway parking schemes as the footways are too narrow
- 2. Asked officers to explore options to provide clearer access for HGVs and develop further proposals in liaison with local Ward Councillors and the emergency services.

#### Reasons for recommendation

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and, if considered appropriate asks officers to seek the views of the emergency services and local Ward Councillors for the possible removal of some of the parking bays in Cordingley Road to ensure that there is clear access through the road.

#### Alternative options considered / Risk Management

None, as the road does not meet the Council's criteria for footway parking schemes.

#### 3. STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING THAT PARKING SPACES ON STATION ROAD BE **RETAINED**(Agenda Item 4)

Councillors Michael Bull, Paul Buttivant and Anita MacDonald attended the meeting as Ward Councillors in support of the petitioners.

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

- The retailers on Station Road had not been made aware of the consultation exercise which had taken place regarding the proposed improvements for Station Road
- A copy of a petition signed by local traders was passed to the Cabinet Member which informed him that they had not received the consultation feedback leaflets on the proposed

Kevin Urquhart -Planning, Environment . Education and Community Services

Action by

improvements for Station Road

- Reference was made to the Portas review which looked into the decline of the viability of high streets and this identified that a lack of suitable parking was cited as one of the causes for the decline
- The proposal to reduce the parking spaces on Station Road would impact on local businesses
- The proposed off street parking was situated at least 300 yards from the major shopping area in Station Road. In inclement weather this would be too far for shoppers to use
- The Council's "stop and shop" would become meaningless if the convenient parking was removed
- There had only been one accident recorded on the junction of Warwick Road and Station Road which should not warrant the re-profiling of the pavements
- The shops needed delivery vehicles to park outside to enable restocking to take place
- The removal of parking bays would mean that delivery vehicles would have to park some 50 yards up the road which would mean that restocking would have to take place by trolley, and would involve the re-crossing of Warwick Road
- Reference was made to the pavements on either side of the entrance to the bus terminal and the railway station which were of comparable width to those on Station Road

All three Ward Councillors spoke in support of the petitioners

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points. He acknowledged that there had only been 1 accident in three years and he informed the petitioners of the background to the West Drayton Town Centre Improvement Scheme, which included the proposals for Station Road.

The petitioners were informed that the original consultation began in April 2009 and this involved the circulation of leaflets, which did not give specifics on the scheme, such as proposals relating to parking bays.

Reference was made to the petitioner's point about the comparisons with the pavements close to the bus station and the railway station. The meeting was informed that these pavements were not owned by the Council.

#### **RESOLVED:**

#### That the Cabinet Member:

1. Met with the petitioners and discussed with them, their concerns regarding the proposal to remove the three parking bays from outside shops No. 19 to 23, Station Road.

**Action By:** 

- 2. Asked officers to take into account the views of the petitioners and to look at other options in relation to parking arrangements
- 3. Will look at the options which officers bring back to him, in consultation with the three Ward Councillors.

### Reasons for recommendation

The petitioners are concerned with the loss of parking spaces in their road. The recommendations will explore the extent of their concerns and look at possible solutions to mitigate these concerns.

Alternative options considered / risk management No other options have been considered.

# 4. MAHLON – AVENUE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF THE GATE AND A PETITION REQUESTING THE RETENTION OF THE GATE. (Agenda Items 5 and 6)

Councillors Shirley Harper-O'Neill and Allan Kauffman attended the meeting as Ward Councillors.

As there were two petitions relating to this item, Councillor Burrows agreed to take the petitions together under one item.

Concerns, comments and suggestions raised by the lead petitioner in support of the **removal of the gate** at the meeting included the following:

- The gate did not stop "rat running" vehicles, it merely displaced the "rat running"
- Mahlon Avenue's road surface was in bad condition, which made the road a potential risk to accidents
- Traffic was displaced to Central Avenue with vehicles often speeding
- The gate caused the closure of two avenues which has led to congestion at the lower end of Mahlon Avenue, close to its junction with Station Approach and Edwards Avenue
- The gate had been damaged twice as a result of accidents
- A wall of a house had been damaged from an accident

Concerns, comments and suggestions raised by the lead petitioner in support of the **retention of the gate** at the meeting included the following:

- Since the installation of the gate in 1991, the number of accidents had reduced
- It was acknowledged that there was still "rat running" in the area, however, this was not as bad as before the gate was installed
- The gate had reduced "rat running" to the extent that it now only occurred for an hour in the morning
- Before the gate was installed, there were traffic jams as vehicles attempted to enter and exit West End Road which

Aram
Cheraghi –
Planning,
Environment
Education
and
Community
Services

**Action by** 

	resulted in large build ups in Masson, Edwards and Mahlon Avenues	Action By:
	<ul> <li>Since the installation of the gate, children now had a safe place to cross when walking to school</li> </ul>	
	The two Ward Councillors spoke in support of the retention of the gate.	
	Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points. An officer confirmed that the emergency services had not raised any objection or concerns with regard to the gate. The purpose of the gate was to reduce "rat running" and this had been a good solution.	
	RESOLVED:	
	That the Cabinet Member:	
	1. Met with both the petitioners and considered both requests relating to the gate located on the junction of Edwards Avenue and Mahlon Avenue, Ruislip.	
	2. Agreed that the gate be retained for the reasons it was initially installed.	
	3. Asked officers to investigate other possible solutions through the Road Safety Programme to the traffic problems around Mahlon Avenue, Ruislip.	
	4. Asked officers to contact local Ward Councillors once the Cabinet Member has agreed the appropriate solution through the Road Safety Programme.	
	Reasons for recommendation The discussion with petitioners will help identify suitable options to address petitioners concerns.	Education and Community Services
	Alternative options considered / risk management These can be identified from the discussions with petitioners.	
5.	WOODRIDGE WAY, NORTHWOOD – PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ALONG SANDY LODGE WAY (Agenda Item 7)	Action by
	Concerns, comments and suggestions raised by petitioners at the meeting included the following:	
	<ul> <li>There were concerns regarding driver safety when driving out of Woodridge Way as the visibility of the oncoming traffic from the right was very poor and limited</li> <li>There have been a number of near miss accidents</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>The visibility had been made worse by the two blocks of flats which were built in 2002</li> </ul>	

 The signage in the area was not clearly visible and needed to be bigger and clearer

- Sandy Lodge Lane should be made a 20mph zone which would also help the school traffic coming out from Moor Park Road at the junction of Sandy Lodge Way
- Speed breakers could be introduced on Sandy Lodge Way which would slow down traffic
- Another option could be the installation of a large mirror, opposite Woodridge Way exit, which would enable motorists to see traffic coming from the right
- Reference was made to the extension of the pavements which had added to the problem

Reference was made to a message sent from Councillor Carol Melvin, local ward Councillor who supported the petitioners' views. Councillor Keith Burrows informed the petitioners that he had also received three letters from local residents who expressed their support for the introduction of road safety measures at the junction.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to some of the points made. In relation to the installation of a mirror opposite the junction of Woodridge Way and Sandy Lodge Way to improve visibility for vehicles, the petitioners were informed that the use of convex mirrors on the public highway was seldom permitted under current signage legislation.

It was acknowledged that visibility at this junction was tight and Councillor Keith Burrows informed petitioners that he would instruct officers to commission a 24/7 traffic volume and speed survey to establish the extent of the problem with the speeding. Included in this would be looking at the current signage and investigating the reason of why the pavement had been extended. The outcome of the survey would then be discussed with local Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member.

#### **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 which would be acceptable to residents.
- 2. Asked officers to include the request and possible options in the Road Safety Programme and commission a traffic volume and speed survey on Sandy Lodge Way, close to the junction of Woodridge Way.
- 3. Asks officers, as part of resolution 2 above, to look at the current signage in the area, together with the reason for the kerb / pavement build up which took place in 2002.

Kevin
Urquhart –
Planning,
Environment,
Education
and
Community
Services

**Action By:** 

Reasons for recommendation To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns.	
Alternative options considered / Risk Management These can be identified from the discussions with the petitioners.	
The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.40pm.	

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