

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING

15 October 2014

Meeting held at Committee Room 4 -
Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Keith Burrows (Chairman)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Wayne Bridges Councillor Alan Chapman Councillor Pat Jackson Councillor John Morse Councillor Richard Mills</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: David Knowles, Transports and Projects, Senior Manager Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer</p>
12.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>Cllr Keith Burrows declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 8, as his daughter attended Bishopshalt School.</p>
13.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>All items were considered in public.</p>
14.	<p>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED. <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p>As set out in the agenda.</p>
15.	<p>PETITION REQUESTING RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING IN BURNHAM AVENUE, GLEBE AVENUE, MILVERTON DRIVE AND SUSSEX ROAD, ICKENHAM <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The petition requested action to be taken to address the parking issues on the Glebe Estate in Ickenham (Burnham Avenue, Milverton Drive and Glebe Avenue).

- The petitioner's view was that Glebe Primary School, in Sussex Road was responsible for traffic congestion and parking problems locally.
- As there was no parking at the school, local roads were badly affected, especially at drop off and picking up times.
- The Council did not enforce parking restrictions around the locality of the school.
- In addition, school plans to make their grounds and sports hall available to hire would exacerbate these problems.
- A residents' only parking scheme was being forced on the area by the Council, despite the area being subject to a Council consultation about possible parking options for the future.
- Residents had raised a number of concerns at the consultation held at the school but no feedback had been provided and these had gone unheeded.
- Local residents should not be forced to pay £40 per annum for a parking scheme to control the congestion caused by Glebe Primary School.
- The petitioner suggested that in this case, an exception should be made and the school should pay for the implementation and upkeep of the scheme.
- A related petition had also been submitted to the Council, concerning a request for parking restrictions/resident only parking to prevent non residents from leaving their cars in Burnham Avenue, Ickenham all day. However, despite contacting the Council, there had been no further developments

No Ward Councillors attended the meeting.

The Cabinet Member, Cllr Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns and responded to the points raised.

Cllr Burrows explained that he understood the crux of the petition was the petitioners desire to have a residents' parking scheme implemented but with unlimited parking permits for residents and for this to be funded by Glebe School.

Cllr Burrows confirmed that the current ongoing consultation about possible parking options for the future had been sent out with the full involvement of Ickenham Ward Councillors. He confirmed that no scheme would be forced upon residents and any decision taken would be dependent on the majority view of local people.

Referring to the current situation, he stated that the Council had adopted a Borough-wide policy for Parking Management Schemes which had been in operation for a number of years. The current policy provided residents with a permit for the first vehicle for free, but that permits for each additional vehicle were charged at £40 per year. In addition, he clarified that residents also received 10 visitor vouchers free of charge annually and further additional vouchers can be purchased at the price of £5 for a book of 10.

Councillor Burrows stated that he would not waive the charge in this case and advised the petitioner that if they had any concerns about the consultation currently underway or indeed any other issues to which they alluded, these should be set out in writing and would be addressed through the Council's formal complaints procedure in due course.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

1. Discussed with petitioners and listened to their request for a residents' only parking in Burnham Avenue, Glebe Avenue, Milverton Drive and Sussex Road, Ickenham.

2. Informed the petitioners that all roads mentioned in the petition had already been included in a planned area wide consultation for options to address non-residential parking. The outcome of this consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member to consider in due course.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform residents of the planned consultation that will be taking place.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED / RISK MANAGEMENT

These were discussed with petitioners.

16. **SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM, PETITION REQUESTING A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING** (*Agenda Item 5*)

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:

- The petition requested a pedestrian crossing on Swakeleys Road.
- The petitioners highlighted that due to the traffic levels and speed of the traffic a crossing was required.
- Referring to the letter attached to the petition, the petitioner stated that residents had received a letter a year ago which indicated there would be a crossing installed.
- There was a significant amount of local support for a crossing.
- It was explained that at present, residents were forced to use the nearest crossings situated either at Swakeleys Roundabout or near to Thornhill Road. This was especially inconvenient for the disabled, elderly or those residents with mobility problems.

Although Cllr John Hensley was unable to attend the meeting he submitted an email which was summarised at the meeting. This stated that he supported the principle of a pedestrian crossing but felt that strong evidence would be required before any decision could be taken.

The Cabinet Member, Cllr Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns and responded to the points raised.

It was noted that a 24/7 speed and traffic survey had previously been conducted in 2010. This had raised a number of concerns including high average speeds and high traffic flows. However, Cllr Burrows explained that while there had been support in principle for a crossing, the traffic calming measures necessary for the scheme to work were not supported due to the impact on directly affected residents as well as the detrimental impact on the emergency services.

Despite these earlier findings, it was noted that there was still local support for the concept of a pedestrian crossing and so on this basis, Cllr Burrows requested that the request for a pedestrian crossing would be added to the Council's road safety programme and for subsequent work to include measuring pedestrian flows at the point

at which the crossing had been requested.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Discussed with petitioners their request for a pedestrian crossing on Swakeleys Road, Ickenham.**
- 2. Noted the outcome of previous investigations, which concluded that a non signal controlled crossing was not appropriate.**
- 3. Agreed that the request would be added to the Council's extensive road safety programme for subsequent further investigation which must include pedestrian flows at the point at which the pedestrian crossing had been requested.**

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

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

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED / RISK MANAGEMENT

These were discussed with petitioners.

17. PETITION REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF GRANITE BLOCK SAFETY HAZARDS IN RYEFIELD AVENUE (*Agenda Item 6*)

Councillors Wayne Bridges, Alan Chapman and Pat Jackson attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:

- The petition requested the removal of the granite block safety hazards and was very similar to one which had been submitted several years earlier.
- The amount of street furniture along Ryefield Avenue was distracting, and as result posed a danger to motorists.
- When the 8 granite setts were covered by snow they posed a danger to two wheeled vehicles such as motor cycles and cyclists.
- The blocks caused drivers to play "chicken" with oncoming vehicles, when vehicles were parked opposite the 8 granite setts.
- The blocks were expensive as they required ongoing maintenance and repairs.
- The blocks caused drainage problems.
- The rumble strips were not moderate as stated in the officer report and were not easy to drive over.

Councillors Bridges, Chapman and Jackson all spoke in turn and agreed with the points the petitioner had raised. The Councillors noted that the granite blocks had been reported on a number of occasions and that it had been established the cost of tarmacing these over would be approximately £3000. Ward Councillors highlighted the ongoing maintenance costs and requested that they were removed.

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

Councillor Burrows summarised the rationale behind the design of the chicanes and highlighted the accident data provided in the report including the findings from the Metropolitan Police illustrated that the design had been effective.

Discussion took place on the merits of removing the granite blocks and a variety of other options, including maintaining the current scheme.

Moving forward, Cllr Burrows explained that Officers would take into account the list of possible solutions provided by the lead petitioner. Officers were requested to inspect the granite blocks and conduct repairs as soon as possible and then for Officers to explore all possible alternatives to the granite blocks and report back to the Cabinet Member. Cllr Burrows assured the petitioner that when the options had been explored, these would be discussed with Ward Councillors, Residents Associations and other interested parties so that the proposed solution worked.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Considered the petitioner's request and discussed in detail their concerns in regards to the traffic calming measures.**
- 2. Noted the receipt and consideration of a largely identical petition, which was heard by him, together with the various actions which followed that hearing; the level of support for the proposals at the time of the original public consultation prior to the scheme being built and of the level of support for the more recent measures in Windsor Avenue near Oak Farm School.**
- 3. Noted the reduction of accident levels and traffic speeds since the scheme was introduced.**
- 4. Subject to the concerns raised by the petitioners, asks officers to conduct a review of the street furniture in Ryefield Avenue under the Road Safety Programme.**
- 5. Instructed Officers to instigate a detailed inspection of all the granite blocks and rectify all problems immediately where necessary and to report the outcomes to him as Cabinet Member.**
- 6. Instructed Officers to look at a possible alternative run over to the granite blocks and to report back to him as Cabinet Member.**

18. PETITION REQUESTING RESIDENT'S ONLY PARKING IN WOODHOUSE CLOSE, HAYES (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor John Morse attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:

- The petition requested the installation of a residents' only parking scheme in Woodhouse Close.
- The Close only consisted of 12 homes and yet the situation was so bad, residents were unable to park by their homes late at night.
- There had been instances of anti-social behaviour, including the use of

threatening behaviour in the local area, which made it of paramount importance that residents could park outside their own homes.

- Some vehicles were parked in the Close and were marked for sale. This meant that the spaces were not available to residents for long periods of time.
- There had been a number of occasions when abandoned cars had been parked in front gardens or on the footway which meant that the residents of Woodhouse Close were often forced to park several streets away.
- Commuters used the Close and left their cars there all day which meant that residents were unable to park locally.
- Inconsiderate parking also meant that access and egress routes for emergency and service vehicles was often hampered.
- A number of the residents were employed as shift workers at the Airport and they had difficulty parking locally when they returned from work.
- There had been instances of youth's congregating in and around the Close and this meant residents had to walk long distances to and from parked cars, which was often intimidating.

Councillor Morse stated that he supported residents' request for a residents' only parking scheme. He agreed that the current parking conditions meant that access for emergency vehicles was difficult and this needed to be improved.

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

Councillor Burrows stated that on the basis of the problems the petitioners had outlined, Woodhouse Close would be added to the Council's future parking programme for further investigation. In addition to agreeing the three Officers recommendations in the report, 2 additional recommendations were agreed. These included instructing Officers to investigate the cases of abandoned vehicles the petitioner had highlighted as well as asking the Council's Waste and Recycling Services and Emergency Services to conduct dry runs to test access and egress to the Close.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Discussed with petitioners and listened to their request for a residents' only parking controls in Woodhouse Close, Hayes.**
- 2. Agreed that the request for parking restrictions in Woodhouse Close, Hayes should be added to the Council's future parking scheme programme for further investigation and more detailed consultation with residents.**
- 3. That subject to 2 above seeks the advice of the Ward Councillors on the most appropriate extent for any such consultation.**
- 4. Instructed Officers to contact Mr Murton regarding abandoned vehicles and asked Officers to take all necessary action to have them removed.**
- 5. Instructed Officers to speak to Refuse and Emergency Services about access to the road.**

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform

residents of the planned consultation that will be taking place.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED / RISK MANAGEMENT

These were discussed with petitioners.

19. ROYAL LANE, HILLINGDON - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES (Agenda Item 8)

Councillor Richard Mills attended the meeting and spoke as a Ward Councillor.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:

- The petition requested the installation of traffic calming measures in Royal Lane, Hillingdon between Hillingdon Hill and Pied Heath Road.
- The petitioners explained that concerns had arisen due to the continuous speed, volume and noise of traffic along this stretch of road.
- There had been a number of accidents on Royal Lane, caused by excess speeding.
- To moderate speeds, the petitioners suggested that the Council might consider the introduction of width restrictions which would assist in reducing speeds.
- Other petitioner suggestions to control speeds included: the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit, speed ramps, speed cameras, one way working and also a pedestrian crossing outside Bishopshalt School.
- It was noted that the incinerator plant, near Hillingdon Hospital was a source of much local congestion and noise given the incessant vehicle movements. As a result, a further suggestion included the relocation or change to the current access route to the incinerator plant.

Councillor Mills stated that he agreed with the petitioners' concerns and noted that in his experience, motorists were likely to accelerate hard as the character of the road changed from an urban to a rural environment. He also highlighted that there were a number of concealed side roads which fed into Royal Lane which were very dangerous.

Cllr Brian Stead had also highlighted in conversations with Councillor Mills that the prevalence of anti-social behaviour along Royal Lane had increased and at present, there was a fad for motorbike racing.

Councillor Mills noted that a speed survey had been conducted in the past but the findings from this differed from the experiences of local people. On this basis, he stated that re-carrying out a speed survey was a good idea as given the current technology, knowing what vehicle types as well as the speeds being achieved would be very valuable. Commenting on the location of the issue, he explained that the close proximity to the hospital might well negate some of the options the petitioners had suggested simply because of their impact on emergency response vehicles.

Further suggestions also included the impact of improving lighting and the effect this had been shown to have on vehicle speeds elsewhere.

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

Commenting on the proposed pedestrian crossing outside Bishopshalt School, Councillor Burrows stated that this would have to go through a strict safety audit but the Head Teacher had been working closely with the Council and endorsed the concept of a crossing which had been integrated in the School's Travel Plan.

Commenting on the idea of safety cameras, Councillor Burrows explained that the installation of these was outside the control of the Council and usually were only installed if there had been 3 or more fatalities on a stretch of road. Thankfully this had not been the case, so it was unlikely this option would be pursued in the immediate future. Concluding his remarks, Councillor Burrows explained he could understand the merits of conducting a further speed survey to inform the Council's future actions. The four recommendations in the Officer report were agreed. In addition, the Cabinet Member added a fifth recommendation, which asked Officers to prune the trees where necessary along the stretch of road to improve road safety by making the concealed roads more visible.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform residents of the planned consultation that will be taking place.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Met with petitioners and considered their request for traffic calming measures in Royal Land Hillingdon.**
- 2. Subject to the above, asked Officers to undertake a 24 hour / 24 / 7 day vehicle speed and volume survey at locations on Royal Lane to be agreed with the petitioners and to report the results back to the Cabinet Members and local Ward Councillors.**
- 3. Subject to the above, considers adding Royal Lane to a future phase of the Council's Vehicle Activated Signs Programme.**
- 4. Instructs Officers to look at other possible road calming measures as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme and report back to the Cabinet Member.**
- 5. Instructs Officers to ensure trees etc are investigated and cut back where necessary.**

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and inform residents of the planned consultation that will be taking place.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED / RISK MANAGEMENT

These were discussed with petitioners.

	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.00 pm.

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