

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING

14 October 2015



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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Keith Burrows (Chairman)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer) and David Knowles (Transport and Projects Senior Manager).</p>
8.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
9.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC. <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>RESOLVED: That all items be considered in public.</p>
10.	<p>REQUEST TO REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT IN HARVIL ROAD FROM 50MPH TO 40MPH <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>Councillors Jane Palmer and John Hensley attended the meeting and each spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There had been an increase in large commercial vehicles using Harvill Road. This presented a particular risk as there were three blind crests on the road.• Works vehicles had been observed to pull out from premises located along the road in front of oncoming traffic.• Rubbish and mud falling from moving vehicles was a problem. This caused both safety and environmental issues for local residents and other road users. Rubbish could build up on verges after falling from vehicles and due to fly tipping.• An incident had taken place where a cement bag had fallen off a lorry and landed on the windscreen of a car. This highlighted the need for lorries to secure their loads and the need for enforcement activity in the area.• The number of goods operator licenses issued had increased. This should be scrutinised.• It was unsafe for large vehicles to be travelling at 50mph along such a narrow road, especially given the blind crests and bends in the road.• The speed limit signage was contradictory along parts of the road and was sometimes in the wrong location or was obscured. Better signage should be provided, including the use of flashing signs.

- Although there were no bus stops on the road, buses stopped unofficially. This posed a safety risk given the 50mph speed limit on the road.
- Drivers often ignored solid white lines and performed illegal overtaking manoeuvres.
- Traffic increases of 275% north bound and 400% south bound were forecast, post construction, in the event the event that the HS2 rail link was built.
- The petitioners were seeking a reduction in the speed limit on Harvil Road from 50mph to 40mph, better signage and more stringent enforcement of highway related regulations.
- The petitioners had collected 200 signatures rather than the 75 signatures stated in the officer report. The lead petitioner had attempted to contact Council officers to advise of the additional signatures, but had received 'out of office' responses.

Ward Councillors spoke in support of the petitioners' request and raised the following issues:

- The Ward Councillors commended the petitioners for their petition and the information provided.
- Cllr. Palmer had requested, in the week before the meeting, that Harvil Road be cleaned, due to the build up of mud. The mud presented a danger to motorists, who were at risk of skidding.
- It was difficult for any cleaning schedule to cope with the approximate 800 lorries using the road in a 24 hour period.
- There was a problem with vehicles speeding in the road, particularly at night, which could cause a serious accident.
- The Dogs Trust was an asset to the community, but the current road conditions made it unsafe for buses to stop in the vicinity.
- Harvil Road and nearby Moorfield Road were under siege from lorries.
- There was a wider issue with speeding motorbikes in the Harefield area. The Ward Member said that many of these travelled at speeds greater than 60mph and some travelled in excess of 80mph.
- Cllr. Hensley felt that some aspects of the officer report were unhelpful in relation to consideration of the petition. Accidents were not necessarily caused by the issues highlighted by the petitioners, particularly accidents caused by drink drivers, which could happen anywhere. In addition, the report did not address safety issues.
- Solid white lines could cause problems as this made it illegal to overtake any vehicle, other than those moving very slowly.
- Harvil Road represented one of the most significant issues than Cllr. Hensley had encountered in his fourteen years as a ward Councillor. It was considered to be one of the dirtiest roads in Hillingdon.
- There needed to be enforcement of the current speed limit on Harvil Road.
- Drainage of the road was also an issue, which could cause vehicles to aquaplane. In one case, a vehicle had aquaplanned into a hedge.
- The lack of a footway or street lighting on a narrow bridge made it dangerous for pedestrians, particularly at night.
- There was a 50mph speed limit sign close to rumble strips. This should be replaced by a 30mph sign if the rumble strips were to be retained.
- The entrance to the golf course was a safety risk as there was a lack of visibility for exiting cars.
- The Council had no authority over licensed vehicles that were based outside the Borough.

- It was possible that a fuel depot for the HS2 high speed line would be built close to Harvil Road. This would cause a significant increase in traffic for a seven year period.
- The edges of the road had deteriorated, presenting an additional safety risk. It was noted that the road had been resurfaced 18 months ago but that the volume of heavy goods traffic had caused subsequent deterioration.
- The installation of cat's eyes should be considered for the length of Harvil Road.

The Cabinet Member, Councillor Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns raised, noting (in response to Cllr. Hensley's comments) that the officer's report had been written to address the specific issue raised by the petitioners. It was confirmed that the possibility of installing cat's eyes would be further investigated.

Officers advised that the narrow bridge in Harvil Road was not owned by the Council and that the Council was not able to force the owner to make changes.

The Cabinet Member added two additional recommendations. The first was to instruct officers to investigate the installation of Varitex flashing signs and the second was to instruct officers to investigate highways enforcement action, particularly in relation to the depot.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Met with petitioners to discuss their request for reducing the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph in Harvil Road, between Harefield and Ickenham.**
- 2. Noted the results of 24/7 traffic surveys undertaken by the Council to measure the speed, volume and composition of the traffic in Harvil Road in 2012 and 2014 and the accident data provided by TfL.**
- 3. Instructed officers to undertake a detailed study and consultation on reducing the speed limit of Harvil Road to 40mph and report the results back to him.**
- 4. Instructed officers to do a detailed study of HGV movements along Harvil Road and investigate ways to mitigate the impacts on residents and report the results back to him.**
- 5. Instructed officers to feed in the evidence from petitioners and the outcome of any study to HS2 Limited, as part of the ongoing dialogue with them, with a view to achieving suitable traffic mitigation as part of the HS2 project.**
- 6. Instructed officers to investigate the possible installation of Varitex flashing speed signs, subject to 3 and 4 above.**
- 7. Instructed officers to investigate possible enforcement action, particularly in relation to the depot in Skip Lane and the material deposited on the Public Highway.**

Councillors Jem Duducu and Alan Kauffman attended the meeting and each spoke as a Ward Councillor.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners included the following:

- Ruislip Gardens Primary School was trying to encourage children to walk to school, but the speed of traffic in the area was a concern that threatened this aim.
- The petitioners were requesting that a 20mph speed limit be introduced on the Ruislip Gardens Estate. The School's Travel Plan also supported this aim. The roads of most concern were Stafford Road, Bedford Road and Clyfford Road.
- Cars frequently parked on both sides of roads in the area. This reduced visibility.
- A serious collision had occurred on the estate in July 2014. A child had been knocked down by a van and had needed to be transported to hospital by air ambulance.

Ward Councillors spoke in support of the petitioners' request and raised the following issues:

- Any changes to the speed limit should be made to the whole estate, although it was noted that vehicles were only likely to be able to pick up speed on Stafford Road, Bedford Road and Clyfford Road.
- There was only one road in an out of the estate, so by definition, it would not be used as a thoroughfare. Traffic on the estate would either be travelling to or from a residence or to or from the school.
- A 20mph speed limit should be considered, while bearing in mind the need to keep costs down.
- Installation of speed bumps should be considered in Clyfford Road and Bedford Road and possibly, also in Stafford Road.
- Signage could be considered to remind motorists that the estate is a residential area, but signage in relation to this and the speed limit was not likely to be effective without other measures also being taken.
- The provision of dropped curbs on a road did not preclude the use of speed bumps.
- There were approximately 600 houses on the Ruislip Gardens Estate.

The Cabinet Member, Councillor Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns raised and agreed that signage alone was not likely to significantly reduce vehicle speeds within the Ruislip Gardens Estate. The Cabinet Member advised that accident data provided to the Council by Police had not included the serious accident in July 2014 that had been referenced by the petitioner. Officers were asked to investigate this further.

Cllr Burrows advised that, in order for the Council to consider reducing the speed limit or installing speed bumps within the Ruislip Gardens Estate, it first needed to obtain evidence that there was evidence of excessive speed in the area. The most effective and nationally recognised method for obtaining such evidence was through the undertaking of a speed and vehicle survey on the Estate.

The petitioners and Ward Councillors present were asked to help identify locations on the estate for the survey to be carried out at. Following discussion, four locations were agreed. It was confirmed that the survey would provide data on vehicle speeds, time of day and vehicle size. In the event that specific concerns were identified e.g. motorists

regularly exceeding the existing speed limit at a certain time of day, this information would be passed to the Police for them to consider enforcement action.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Met with the petitioners to discuss their request for a 20mph speed limit.**
- 2. Asked officers to arrange a speed and vehicle survey at locations suggested by the petitioners, for the results to be reported back to the Cabinet Member and local Ward Councillors.**
- 3. Subject to 1 and 2, asked officers to undertake further investigations under the Road Safety Programme and report back to him.**

12. REQUEST FOR A PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN WHITETHORN AVENUE, YIEWSLEY (Agenda Item 6)

The Cabinet Member deferred the hearing of the petition to a future meeting as the lead petitioner was unable to attend.

RESOLVED: That:

- 1. The hearing of the petition in relation to a request for a parking management scheme in Whitethorn Avenue, Yiewlsey be deferred to a future petition hearing with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling.**

13. REQUEST FOR A PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN ASHWOOD AVENUE, HILLINGDON (Agenda Item 7)

Following agreement from the lead petitioners, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the petition would be heard jointly with the petition for nearby Beechwood Avenue.

Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners, in relation to the Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue petitions, included the following:

- Residents first started finding it difficult to park in Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue around five years ago. The problem had got worse over time, which the petitioner felt was partly due to word of mouth.
- The roads were close to Hillingdon Hospital, which resulted in hospital staff and visitors using them to park. There were also other none residents parking in the streets on a daily basis.
- The hospital already advised staff and visitors not to park on local residential streets or, alternatively, to use public transport. However, this was not making a difference to the residents' parking difficulties.
- Expansion to the Hillingdon Hospital Parking Management Scheme (PMS) into neighbouring streets had exacerbated the parking difficulties in Ashwood and Beechwood Avenue as hospital visitors that had previously parked elsewhere were now parking there. In particular, the extension of PMS into Moorcroft Lane had had a significant impact.
- The petitioner had been having regular dialogue with the Council's Transport

and Projects Team since 2010. This had generally been positive, but the parking difficulties had escalated and action, in the form of a Parking Management Scheme, was now needed.

- The residents had previously taken steps to try to discourage non residents from parking in their streets. This had included the use of brightly coloured posters and the offering of a park and ride scheme. These measures had not been effective in reducing the number of non residents parking in the area.
- The petitioners were facing opposition to parking restrictions from residents living at the other end of Beechwood Avenue. This was due to the houses at this end of the street having drop kerbs and driveways. By comparison, the part of the street in which the petitioners lived contained 14 houses, with just two drop kerbs. The petitioners were, therefore, requesting that consideration be given to introducing a PMS only at one end of Beechwood Avenue.

The Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioners and raised the following issues:

- The Councillor had been visiting the area for a year and had been unable to park in the street.
- He had witnessed non residents parking in the street and noted that some of them parked there on a regular basis.
- Consideration should be given to extending the PMS to other neighbouring roads. This would ensure that parking difficulties were not displaced to other streets in the event that a PMS was introduced in Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue.
- There had been incidents where inconsiderate parking had made it impossible for emergency services to gain access to the streets.
- The Ward Councillor strongly supported the petitioners' request for the introduction of a PMS.

The Cabinet Member, Councillor Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns raised and noted that difficulties could also be caused by traffic waiting to get into the hospital car park. There was not currently enough parking at the hospital site and this was something that the hospital was trying to resolve. The provision of a multi-storey car park had been considered but the current status of this was not known. It was acknowledged that expansion of the hospital's PMS appeared to have contributed to parking difficulties in other areas. It was also acknowledged that some motorists chose to park on residential streets away from their own dwelling while they went on holiday.

It was noted that the impact of any expansion of the PMS on neighbouring streets would need to be carefully considered, in particular the impact on Evelyns Close and Pinewood Avenue. The petitioners advised that signatures were currently being collected to request a PMS in Pinewood Avenue. The Cabinet Member advised that, once the Council received a petition, it could consider including Pinewood Avenue in a consultation exercise without the need to go to a formal petition hearing.

The lead petitioner for Ashwood Avenue advised that she had not encountered any objections to her petition when asking residents to sign it, although two people had declined to sign as they neither supported nor opposed the petition. A Member of the audience was concerned that, although he had a blue badge, he did not qualify for the provision of a disabled parking bay and could not afford to have a drop curve installed. This made parking difficult, given the current limited availability.

The Cabinet Member advised that the proposed consultation in relation to the introduction of a PMS would need to be undertaken with all the residents of Ashwood

Avenue and Beechwood Avenue. However, it would be possible to introduce a PMS to cover only part of a street. This could overcome any objections raised by residents living at the other end of Beechwood Avenue compared to the petitioners.

The petitioners were asked to encourage their neighbours to respond to the consultation in relation to the installation of a PMS, once it had been issued by the Council. This was important as the Council would need evidence of support for a PMS in order to be able to proceed with installation.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member

- 1. Met with the petitioners to listen to their request for a Parking Management Scheme to be introduced in Ashwood Avenue, Hillingdon.**
- 2. Instructed officers to add the request for a Parking Management Scheme in Ashwood Avenue and the surrounding area to be added to the Council's future parking scheme programme for further investigation and more detailed consultation, when resources permit.**

14. REQUEST FOR A PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN BEECHWOOD AVENUE, UXBRIDGE (Agenda Item 8)

Following agreement from the lead petitioners, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the petition would be heard jointly with the petition for nearby Ashwood Avenue.

Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana attended the Meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor.

Concerns and suggestions from petitioners, in relation to the Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue petitions, included the following:

- Residents first started finding it difficult to park in Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue around five years ago. The problem had got worse over time, which the petitioner felt was partly due to word of mouth.
- The roads were close to Hillingdon Hospital, which resulted in hospital staff and visitors using them to park. There were also other none residents parking in the streets on a daily basis.
- The hospital already advised staff and visitors not to park on local residential streets or, alternatively, to use public transport. However, this was not making a difference to the residents' parking difficulties.
- Expansion to the Hillingdon Hospital Parking Management Scheme (PMS) into neighbouring streets had exacerbated the parking difficulties in Ashwood and Beechwood Avenue as hospital visitors that had previously parked elsewhere were now parking there. In particular, the extension of PMS into Moorcroft Lane had had a significant impact.
- The petitioner had been having regular dialogue with the Council's Transport and Projects Team since 2010. This had generally been positive, but the parking difficulties had escalated and action, in the form of a Parking Management Scheme, was now needed.
- The residents had previously taken steps to try to discourage non residents from parking in their streets. This had included the use of brightly coloured posters and the offering of a park and ride scheme. These measures had not been effective in reducing the number of none residents parking in the area.
- The petitioners were facing opposition to parking restrictions from residents

living at the other end of Beechwood Avenue. This was due to the houses at this end of the street having drop kerbs and driveways. By comparison, the part of the street in which the petitioners lived contained 14 houses, with just two drop kerbs. The petitioners were, therefore, requesting that consideration be given to introducing a PMS only at one end of Beechwood Avenue.

The Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioners and raised the following issues:

- The Councillor had been visiting the area for a year and had been unable to park in the street.
- He had witnessed none residents parking in the street and noted that some of them parked there on a regular basis.
- Consideration should be given to extending the PMS to other neighbouring roads. This would ensure that parking difficulties were not displaced to other streets in the event that a PMS was introduced in Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue.
- There had been incidents where inconsiderate parking had made it impossible for emergency services to gain access to the streets.
- The Ward Councillor strongly supported the petitioners' request for the introduction of a PMS.

The Cabinet Member, Councillor Keith Burrows, listened to the concerns raised and noted that difficulties could also be caused by traffic waiting to get into the hospital car park. There was not currently enough parking at the hospital site and this was something that the hospital was trying to resolve. The provision of a multi-storey car park had been considered but the current status of this was not known. It was acknowledged that expansion of the hospital's PMS appeared to have contributed to parking difficulties in other areas. It was also acknowledged that some motorists chose to park on residential streets away from their own dwelling while they went on holiday.

It was noted that the impact of any expansion of the PMS on neighbouring streets would need to be carefully considered, in particular the impact on Evelyns Close and Pinewood Avenue. The petitioners advised that signatures were currently being collected to request a PMS in Pinewood Avenue. The Cabinet Member advised that, once the Council received a petition, it could consider including Pinewood Avenue in a consultation exercise without the need to go to a formal petition hearing.

The lead petitioner for Ashwood Avenue advised that she had not encountered any objections to her petition when asking residents to sign it, although two people had declined to sign as they neither supported nor opposed the petition. A Member of the audience was concerned that, although he had a blue badge, he did not qualify for the provision of a disabled parking bay and could not afford to have a drop curve installed. This made parking difficult, given the current limited availability.

The Cabinet Member advised that the proposed consultation in relation to the introduction of a PMS would need to be undertaken with all the residents of Ashwood Avenue and Beechwood Avenue. However, it would be possible to introduce a PMS to cover only part of a street. This could overcome any objections raised by residents living at the other end of Beechwood Avenue compared to the petitioners.

The petitioners were asked to encourage their neighbours to respond to the consultation in relation to the installation of a PMS, once it had been issued by the Council. This was important as the Council would need evidence of support for a PMS in order to be able to proceed with installation.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member

- 1. Met with the petitioners to listen to their request for a Parking Management Scheme to be introduced in Beechwood Avenue, Hillingdon.**
- 2. Instructed officers to add the request for a Parking Management Scheme in Beechwood Avenue and the surrounding area to be added to the Council's future parking scheme programme for further investigation and more detailed consultation, when resources permit.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.25 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.