

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING

20 February 2013

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: David Knowles, Transport and Projects Senior Manager Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Peter Curling Councillr Janet Gardner Councillor Phoday Jarjussey</p>	
35.	<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>	
36.	<p>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED. (Agenda Item 2)</p>	
37.	<p>RESIDENTS' REQUESTING RENEWED SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL SUPPORT FOR MINET INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOL IN COLDHARBOUR LANE, HAYES (Agenda Item 3)</p> <p>Councillor Peter Curling attended as a Ward Councillor in support of the petitioners.</p> <p>The lead petitioner did not attend the meeting. As they were unable to be present they had written a letter to Democratic Services. This letter was summarised by Councillor Burrows at the meeting and explained that the lead petitioner agreed with the recommendations set out in the officer report.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns about the recent lack of school crossing control support in Coldharbour Lane, Hayes.2. Informs petitioners of the fact that the incumbent school crossing patrol officer is presently unavailable to provide the service.	<p>Action by</p> <p>Mhairi Stephens</p>

	<p>3. Agrees that during the recruitment process currently being conducted, the first officer appointed be allotted to the Coldharbour Lane site, at least on a temporary basis until such time as the long term position with regard to staff absence is better understood.</p> <p>4. Invites Minet Junior School to engage with the Council’s School Travel Plan team to pursue further initiatives of potential benefit to the school and wider community.</p> <p>Reasons for recommendation</p> <p>This recommendation meant there was no immediate financial implication to the Council and was the lowest risk option to help ensure residents safety.</p> <p>Alternative options considered / risk management</p> <p>The Council could recruit a casual employee to cover high risk sites when staff absence required this. However this suggestion would have financial implications, as there is currently no budget to cover this in the allocated cost code</p>	
38.	<p>ARCON DRIVE, BALLINGER WAY AND WAXLOW WAY, NORTHOLT - PETITION OBJECTING TO THE AMENDED PROPOSALS FOR AT ANY TIME WAITING RESTRICTIONS <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local residents had never requested any time waiting restrictions to be introduced. Further restrictions would exacerbate the parking problem locally. • Local residents felt that an unfair and biased survey had been conducted by officers. The accompanying letter suggested that local residents were in favour of the scheme which they were not. • There was insufficient parking for local residents at present and parking on the footway assisted local residents. • Being unable to park locally had created problems for disabled residents as well as making it more difficult to collect children. • The introduction of any time waiting restrictions would have an adverse effect on property prices locally and would devalue properties due to the lack of parking provision. • If this action were approved, it would create a greater parking problem than currently existed. • The easiest way forward would be to permit local residents to park on the footway. • Local residents acknowledged that the estate had become a ‘rat run’ for local traffic and amending the waiting restrictions would mean that roads would become busier and more dangerous to children living locally. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

- Most residents had more than two cars and so any amendments would have a significant impact on local residents.
- A number of properties incorporated garages but these were too narrow for modern cars to use.
- Local main roads did not have any waiting restrictions.
- Local apartment developments were equipped with underground car parking facilities which were under utilised but local residents were unable to use these.
- Only a third of the development lay within Hillingdon, with the remainder being located in the London Borough of Ealing and so it was unfair to penalise Hillingdon residents.
- The Management Company which managed the estate was not sympathetic to the concerns raised by Hillingdon residents.
- The petitioner felt that Hillingdon residents did not have a voice at the Residents Association.
- No residents from either Ballinger Way or Waxlow Way were aware of the three week consultation which had taken place.
- There was parking provision for 40 cars outside Cost Cutters, but local residents were unable to use this.

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

Councillor Burrows explained that the Council was unable to influence local private Residents' Associations as these were independent bodies. However he suggested that the petitioner contact their local ward Councillors to see how they might be able to assist them further.

In response to the concerns raised about the consultation process and the fact that a large proportion of the estate lies in the London Borough of Ealing, officers explained that aspects of the consultation had been complex. However, residents had been fully aware of the location of their properties at the time they decided to purchase their properties and it would be reasonable to suppose that either the property purchasers or their agents would have satisfied themselves with regard to prevailing or reasonably foreseeable parking conditions. Officers agreed that Ealing also suffered from parking issues and the dilemma for officers from both Boroughs was to try and find the best compromise possible.

In relation to the point about garage size, Cllr Burrows explained that it was not unusual for developers to create properties with garages which were unable to accommodate family vehicles, but in many cases, the owner of the property used their garage for storage space only.

Councillor Burrows moved both recommendations in the officer report. He also requested that officers encourage the ward Councillors for Yeading to submit their views as part of the consultation process and similarly that the petitioners approach their ward Councillors to seek their potential support. The Cabinet Member also instructed officers to liaise further with colleagues from the London Borough of Ealing.

	<p>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discusses with petitioners and listens to their concerns regarding the amended proposals for “at any time” waiting restrictions in their roads. 2. Asks officers to include the petition request and the outcome of discussions with petitioners in the forthcoming report incorporating all representations received from the statutory consultation on amended proposals for “at any time” waiting restrictions in Arcon Drive, Ballinger Way and Waxlow Way. <p style="text-align: center;">Reasons for recommendation</p> <p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns with proposed “at any time” waiting restrictions that were amended following a previous consultation and petition from residents.</p> <p>Alternative options considered / risk management</p> <p>These were discussed with petitioners.</p>	
39.	<p>PETITION REQUESTING RESTRICTED PARKING IN ICKENHAM CLOSE, RUISLIP (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Burrows explained that he had spoken to Councillors Brian Crowe and John Riley both of whom supported the petition. Councillor Philip Corthorne was unable to attend the meeting but had sent an email expressing his support for the petition. Councillor Burrows read out the email at the meeting.</p> <p>Councillors Burrows also referred to three letters in support of the petition from the residents at 16, 40 and 58 Ickenham Close which were unable to attend the meeting. These letters were also read out at the meeting.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that in September 2011, the Council had informally consulted the residents of Ickenham Close to see if residents would like to consider being included in a possible extension to the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme. • At that time, the majority of residents that responded to the consultation had indicated they would prefer no change to the existing parking arrangements and therefore no further action was taken to introduce parking restrictions in Ickenham Close. • Since 2011 however, there had been a significant amount of displaced parking which had prompted the residents of Ickenham Close to propose that parking restrictions were applied to all areas of Ickenham Close between 9 am to 5 pm due to the continued use by commuter and off-peak travellers who used the Close as a free car park for West Ruislip Station. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Kevin Urquhart</p>

- Displaced parking in Ickenham Close had inhibited residents and their visitors / deliveries.
- Displaced parking had also increased local congestion and inhibited access to waste disposal vehicles.
- Displaced parking could inhibit access for emergency vehicles.
- As there are no restrictions in place, it was noted that a constant stream of traffic drove around the Close searching for free parking with no consideration for the residents and in some cases, discarding litter

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

Councillor Burrows explained how residents' parking schemes worked and why they had become popular with residents within the Ickenham area and across the Borough. Councillor Burrows informed petitioners that the Council had a rolling programme of works which meant that the earliest possible time at which the informal consultation could take place would be over the summer months.

Councillor Burrows explained that the informal consultation would last for 7 days which would provide residents with a series of options to assess. After which, officers would design the schemes and then there was a legal duty for the Council to consult residents during the statutory consultation phase on these proposals.

Councillor Burrows concluded his remarks by encouraging the petitioner to ensure as many residents as possible participated in the consultation process. He also explained that if residents misplaced their feedback forms, they could contact the Council and letters could be reissued or officers would explain the various options over the telephone.

Councillor Burrows moved both recommendations in the officer report.

He also added a third recommendation in relation to vehicular access to refuse lorries to determine whether or not they were experiencing access issues on a regular basis.

Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns with parking in Ickenham Close, Ruislip.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the discussions with petitioners, asks officers to include the request in a subsequent review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.**
- 3. Instructs Officers to speak to Waste Services and the problems they may have encountered in this area.**

Reasons for recommendation

	<p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform them that the Council intends to include Ickenham Close in the next review of the West Ruislip Parking Management Scheme.</p> <p>Alternative options considered / risk management</p> <p>These were discussed with petitioners.</p>	
40.	<p>PETITION REQUESTING FOOTWAY PARKING TO BE PERMITTED IN CORWELL LANE, HILLINGDON (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Janet Gardner and Phoday Jarjussey attended as Ward Councillors in support of the petitioner.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corwell Lane was so narrow that if vehicles were parked badly or cars were double parked, it was impossible for larger vehicles to use the road. • If a white line were painted onto the road it would have demarked both sides of the road and there would not be an issue. • Emergency vehicles including fire engines had become stuck in the past and thereby had been unable to respond effectively to emergency calls. • There had been many occasions when parked vehicles had been hit by oncoming traffic and either the sides of vehicles and or wing mirrors had been damaged. • The petition had been signed by 40 residents from predominantly the southern section of Corwell Lane and requested that footway parking be permitted to improve access locally. <p>Both ward Councillors spoke and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members were aware that there had been damage caused to cars parked on Corwell Lane in the past. • Members were aware that ambulances had experienced difficulties both dropping off and collecting patients. • The petitioner had made a strong case for footway parking to be permitted in the future. <p>The Cabinet Member listened to petitioners concerns and responded to the points raised.</p> <p>Councillor Burrows was in agreement with petitioners that there appeared to be an access issue with the road. Councillor Burrows confirmed that the request would be added to the work programme and suggested that this summer would probably be the earliest opportunity for the consultation process to begin.</p> <p>Councillor Burrows urged petitioners and local residents to respond to the consultation documentation when this was received and also</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Kevin Urquhart</p>

encouraged them to contact The Roads and Projects Team if any aspects of the proposals were unclear. Officers confirmed that ward Councillors would be notified when the consultation process was due to commence.

In relation to access for emergency vehicles, Councillor Burrows confirmed that the Council undertook regular Transport Liaison meetings to establish whether there were any long standing issues. He also explained that the Emergency Services were also in regular contact with the Council and a log existed which recorded incidents when they arose.

Officers confirmed that they would contact the Emergency Services to enquire whether a 'dummy run' could be conducted after 6pm to test access on Corwell Road. In addition, Officers also confirmed that they would check with Refuse Services to establish whether they had encountered problems in the past. The Cabinet Member agreed both recommendations in the officer report.

Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Considers the petitioners' request for footway parking in Corwell Lane, Hillingdon**
- 2. Asks officers to add Corwell Lane between the junction of Lansdown Road and Harlington Road to the programme for Footway Parking Exemption Schemes so that subsequently, design and consultation with residents can be carried out when resources permit.**

Reasons for recommendation

From initial investigation the layout of a section of Corwell Lane between the junction of Lansdown Road and Harlington Road will allow footway parking to take place in accordance with the Council's criteria. However, subject to the Cabinet Member's approval of the recommendations to this report, detailed investigation would be required before a scheme could be designed.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None were considered as the petitioners had made a specific request to park on the footway.

The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm closed at 8:35 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.