

## Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning  
and Transportation  
Wednesday, 17 June 2009  
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**



**Published on: 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009  
Come into effect on: Immediately (or call-in date) 9<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

1.	<b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b>	
2.	<b>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED.</b>	
3.	<b>NORTH AVENUE AND WHEATLEY CRESCENT, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING SPEED HUMPS AND CONCERNS OVER ROAD CONDITION</b>  <i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ward Councillor, Tony Eginton, represented the Ward.</li><li>• During the 37 years some petitioners had lived in North Avenue the road maintenance had been very minimal.</li><li>• During winter the rain freezes and hazards are caused, access to drives blocked/hazards.</li><li>• Pavements in poor conditions and temporary repairs were no good.</li><li>• Mobility scooter users were forced into using roads instead which is very dangerous as pavements were in bad conditions.</li><li>• The petitioners requested speed bumps in North Avenue and Wheatley Crescent and commented that there were very narrow roads.</li><li>• In the past year three times speeding motorists had knocked people down.</li><li>• Their primary concern was safety.</li><li>• Those with physical difficulties had trouble getting around, they had trouble going on the road and path and this meant they could not go and visit others.</li><li>• According to police records no serious accidents had been reported. Petitioners were concerned on whether they were waiting for a serious accident before doing anything.</li><li>• Emergency vehicles use Central Avenue.</li></ul>	<b>Action by</b>  <b>Colin Stewart, Environment And Consumer Protection</b>

- Ward councillors supported the petition, they had been seeking the 20mph speed limit. This was only applied in Central Avenue. The adjoining roads had narrow roads, therefore was more risk.
- North Avenue and Whealtery Crescent are particularly bad roads in comparison to the rest of the borough.
- Such bad road does not encourage cyclists and therefore healthy living, also more cyclists would mean cars drive slower.
- They had requested dropped curbs and had no response so far.

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

- Police Records: KSI figures looked at over the last 3 years, these looked at those killed or seriously injured. Police database does not record minor bumps.
- On an annual basis every road throughout the borough was reviewed under the United Kingdom Pavement Management System. Based on that report neither of these 2 roads were very high on that list as far as structural damage is concerned.
- Hillingdon Council had a policy where they do not use humps. They could use 'tables'. Have had this policy for a number of years.
- The petition clearly said there is a speed issue. The Cabinet Member stated that it can be difficult to judge a speed of a car. This can be correctly measured.
- He was posing to look at the area in 2010/11 subject to funding for the 20mph zone. The Cabinet Member would expect a great number of petitions for this 20mph zone when it comes into place.
- The Cabinet Member explained that there is a programme that the Council had to follow: what UKPMS tell us to, and looked at those roads they tell us to first. Then any further funding to be used elsewhere.
- A classified traffic volume and speed survey be carried out. This can tell us the type of vehicle, speed, etc. Once this report comes back to the Cabinet Member it will be discussed with him and the officer. The Ward councillors will then be reported back and then to Mr Cox as lead petitioner.
- The Cabinet Member and officers discussed with the petitioners where strips to survey vehicles would be best placed.

There are several residents that had brick paved their front garden and so simply drive over the curb. People have put concrete down. The footpaths are not strengthened.

Possibility for funding in 2010/11 does not mean they will not do anything until then. Work is still being done.

UKPMS report had come through recently, and the Council had

approximately 410 miles of road and £2.5 million budget.

Can discuss with school if travelling with the school is an issue. As this may impact onto neighbours. There is a school travel plan.

Andy Cod, officer, is having a meeting with Minet School.

**Resolved -**

That the Cabinet Member:

1. Noted the petition and listened to the concerns of the petitioners;
2. Noted that officers had carried out a detailed assessment and that they recommended that the carriageways be resurfaced during a future programme.
3. Noted that similarly, the footways had been assessed and would be included in a future programme. Officers were asked to explore possible resources to fund this work.
4. Instructed officers to undertake a classified traffic volume and speed survey and report back to the Cabinet Member. This survey would be carried out in September when school re-starts.

*Reasons For Recommendation*

The existing carriageway surfaces had deteriorated to the extent that shallow fretting had taken place throughout the entire length of North Avenue and Wheatley Crescent. The failure was due to the natural ageing of the bitmac surface, which slowly disintegrated after an estimated life of 30 to 40 years. Past patching had filled some of the worst fretting but only as a temporary measure. The extent of patching that had been carried out had a detrimental effect to ride quality, particularly for cyclists. Resurfacing would of provided a smoother, safer riding surface, maintained the asset value of the highways and improve the visual aspect of the streets.

The footways in North Avenue in particular were in a poor state of repair but this had been exacerbated by the residents driving their vehicles over a footway which had not been strengthened to take their vehicles. The footways in Wheatley Crescent required some normal, patching type, maintenance work.

*Alternative Options Considered*

Officers considered that the carriageway surface is now beyond normal patching repair and that resurfacing was the only option available.

The footway in North Avenue needed reconstruction to eliminate the additional hazards created by residents due to their use of the footway as a vehicle access route and the change in levels caused by resident's new private paving. Patching would not eliminate these hazards.

**Relevant Ward:**

TOWNFIELD

<p>4.</p>	<p><b>MONTCALM CLOSE AND WOLFE CLOSE, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING ROAD RESURFACING</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The petitioners were happy to report that they had some very satisfied residents from Montcalm Close. Residents did consider that work had been done. No work had been done at Wolfe Close, which needed to be urgently looked at. There were contrasts in the road.</li> <li>• Wolfe Close needed work urgently, as in contrast to Montcalm which had been repaired through emergency repairs.</li> <li>• The problems in the area had an effect, so the petitioners supported any measure which would help to improve this.</li> <li>• Cllr Burrows shared the concerns with Cllr Major in a site visit last year.</li> <li>• The petitioners felt that the improvements would of had a quality of life and well-being impact if it was looked at as soon as possible.</li> <li>• They would be open to meeting with Cllr Burrows to look at where they are now in the area.</li> <li>• There is not a road in Barnhill Ward that had any resurfacing works in 3 years.</li> <li>• Petitioners were frustrated that they had not heard anything since the road safety programme.</li> </ul> <p><i>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.</i></p> <p>There are 410 miles of road in the Borough that they have funding of £2.5 million to maintain. It is the cost that drives things.</p> <p>He had driven across the Borough and a lot of areas visited. Annual Review was done by UKPMS, both of these areas were further down the list on priority.</p> <p>The reason in the delay of road maintenance was due to the severe weather in the winter.</p> <p>The Council needs to look at roads which are most dangerous before other roads. It will look at desirable after essential repairs.</p> <p>The Council was looking into Chatsworth Road but still needed to look at it in more detail. This was unrelated to this item. Everything would be taken into consideration. It would be discussed next Monday in greater detail. The Cabinet Member appreciated the frustration this may of caused amongst residents.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b> That the Cabinet Member:</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Colin Stewart, Environment And Consumer Protection</p>
-----------	---	---

	<p>1. Noted that officers had carried out a detailed assessment and that they recommend that Wolfe Close and be Montcalm Close be considered for resurfacing during a future programme.</p> <p>2. Moved the recommendation to see if there is additional funding and for officers are to explore possible resources to fund this work.</p> <p><b>Reasons For Recommendation</b></p> <p>The existing carriageway surfaces had deteriorated to the extent that shallow fretting had taken place in isolated areas of both Montcalm Close and Wolfe Close. The failure is due to the natural ageing of the bitmac surface which had slowly disintegrated after an estimated life of 30 to 40 years. Past patching had filled some of the worst fretting but only as a temporary measure. The worst area at the entrance to Montcalm Close had recently (April 2009) been partly resurfaced to eliminate any hazards in the area. The limited patching that had been carried out in the past had a detrimental effect to ride quality, particularly for cyclists. Resurfacing would of provided a smoother, safer riding surface, maintained the asset value of the highways and improved the visual aspect of the streets.</p> <p><b>Alternative Options Considered</b></p> <p>Officers considered that the carriageway surface was beyond normal patching repair and that resurfacing was the only option available.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> BARNHILL</p>	
5.	<p><b>WILLOW GROVE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING TO PROPERLY RESURFACE WILLOW GROVE</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward Councillor, Mike Cox, represented the Ward.</li> <li>• The Petitioners thanked officers that had visited the site as they could see the bad condition of the road which had raised over a few years.</li> <li>• A lot of the petitioners were elderly, therefore could not make it to the petition hearing.</li> <li>• Willow Grove also has an impact on Elsey Road.</li> <li>• An engineer found a pot hole which was below the legal limit that they had to do a patch the next day on.</li> <li>• Residents had written in over the years and this had not been dealt with.</li> <li>• Issue was because it had been left so long that this matter was now urgent.</li> <li>• Petitioners explained that because this was cul du sac a lot of the traffic had to double travel over the road. This caused double damage to the road. Also foreign drivers come down</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Caroline Haywood Environment And Consumer Protection</p>

wrongly and must turn down and go back out. Often drivers reversed into brick walls and knocked them down.

- The Ward Councillor present agreed with everything lead petitioner had said.
- That section of road should of been done 2 years ago along with the others and it had been neglected.
- The pot holes were getting bigger and bigger.
- The road was not just a quiet cul du sac, it was also used for commuter parking during the day.
- It was one of the main entrances to Shenley Park, so the road was increasingly used over the last few years.
- The officers recommendation included that the road was slowly disintegrating after an estimated 30 to 40 years.
- Petitioners explained that their children would not visit them as the road would ruin their cars. They would drive to another road and walk down an alley way.
- The road had been patched up twice in 2 years.
- They had not seen a road as bad as Willow Grove in the area.
- The road had very old residents, if they were being driven with bumps etc there was a health issue.

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

Cllr Mills wanted clarification on page 20 from officers. Did the Council need to do this now as a minimum at least: seal the joints. Some of them needed re-sealing. Others would need it with the resurfacing of the road.

UKPMS report had come through recently, approximately 410 miles of road and £2.5 million budget for the borough. £34,000 was required for this road.

The Cabinet Member explained that those urgent on survey must be carried out first and then what we funding was left over for further works to be carried out.

The quickest way was to do the patching work. It was not ideal but unfortunately the Council do not have the funding for everything.

Officers would look to see when work completion would be possible and where they could get funds.

Any severe deterioration to be highlighted to the Cabinet Member to look into.

If the road was deemed safe by UKPMS and was not high on a priority list then the Cabinet Member and officers must be guided on this.

Anything that went to the Cabinet Member in a petition would be discussed in meetings regularly.

	<p>They needed to prioritise the list and then see what funding is available. There was a great number of roads on the list. Some was considered 'cosmetic' repairs.</p> <p>At this stage they could not give an exact time of when work would be carried out. Overall funding had not been fully allocated but there was more urgent work that needs to be done.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b> That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted that officers had carried out a detailed assessment and that they recommended that the carriageway be considered for inclusion on a future resurfacing programme. Officers are to explore possible resources to fund this work.</li> </ol> <p><i>Reasons For Recommendation</i></p> <p>The existing carriageway surface had deteriorated to the extent that shallow fretting had taken place in isolated areas of the carriageway. The failure was due to the natural ageing of the bitmac surface which was slowly disintegrating after an estimated life of 30 to 40 years. Past patching had filled some of the worst fretting but only as a temporary measure. The limited patching that had been carried out in the past had a detrimental effect to ride quality, particularly for cyclists and the commonly used centre part of the road had undulations caused by the successive patching. Resurfacing would of provided a smoother, safer riding surface, maintained the asset value of the highways and improved the visual aspect of the street.</p> <p><i>Alternative Options Considered</i></p> <p>Officers considered that the carriageway surface was now beyond normal patching repair and that resurfacing was the only option available.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> MANOR</p>	
6.	<p><b>SERVICE ROAD OFF PRINCESS WAY, RUISLIP - PETITION REGARDING FLOODING IN SERVICE ROAD</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a problem regarding Service Road, had written a letter to the MP of the area and Councillor Allan Kaufmann to illustrate the problem they had when it rains.</li> <li>• It was an ongoing problem that whenever it rained heavily there would be flooding in the area.</li> <li>• There was nothing that got rid of the rain, e.g. a gully.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Colin Stewart, Environment And Consumer Protection</p>

- Felt it was a health hazard. The water would settle for a long period of time.
- Officers came and did a survey.
- The small soak-away/drain there was inadequate. The water ended up in front of houses.
- Felt the Council had a duty to help the problem that existed there.
- Planning permission had to had been given for those properties to be constructed. There should have been amenities put in place for problems such as flooding when these properties were in place.
- The petitioners were asking for the Council to have a gully constructed for them. There were all rate payers, some residents had been living there 20+ years. They believed the Council should have some responsibility.

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

Issues the Cabinet Member had was the Service Road was unadopted, therefore legally under the Highways Act the Council had no liability for it.

It had been recognised that the gully was a substandard gully.

An adopted road was part of the public highway. These were owned by and maintained by the Council. So the Council had responsibility for surrounding roads but not Service Road.

In other areas where there was this problem the residents divided the cost. In some instances house insurance covers this.

Therefore the Cabinet Member cannot legally spend Council money on a road that was not legally theirs.

Officers said petitioners may need to check with the land registry if they owned part the road. Council vehicles may go down the road for access.

Planning Acts were constantly changing. There was also a 20 year rule for these things.

Had to follow the legal route. Legally the Council did not have a responsibility.

**Resolved -**

That the Cabinet Member:

1. Noted that officers had visited the site and concluded that the council had no responsibility to adopt the service road or to carry out any drainage work.

*Reasons For Recommendation*



	<p>The service road provided access to the back gardens of houses and was mainly used for access to private garages owned by households living in Diamond Road and Victoria Road. The service road was not adopted and was unlikely to be brought up to an adoptable standard without significant expenditure. The Council therefore had no responsibility for the service road. There was a low point on the road which is drained by one sub-standard gully. The gully was also not the responsibility of the Council as it was entirely within the unadopted road and did not receive any highway water.</p> <p><i>Alternative Options Considered</i></p> <p>Adoption of the service road was not up to adoptable standard and would therefore create an unacceptable precedent for numerous other similar service roads in the Borough.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> SOUTH RUISLIP</p>	
7.	<p><b>TRISCOTT HOUSE, AVONDALE DRIVE, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward Councillor, Tony Eginton, represented the Ward.</li> <li>• Traffic problems there. There was a separate petition from the school.</li> </ul> <p><i>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.</i></p> <p>Have had many discussions over this. Had visited the site. School children come out from everywhere and there is also a parking issue.</p> <p>As there was a petition coming from the school, it may be better to do this with the school.</p> <p>Nav Johal, Democratic Services, to chase Andy Codd, on Petition from the School. Andy to email to Cllr Burrows tomorrow on when the School Petition will be ready, Avondale Drive.</p> <p>To be checked if those from Triscott House are welcome to attend the School petition.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b> That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted the petitions requests and met with petitioners to discuss in greater detail the concerns they had.</li> <li>2. Asked officers to conduct a feasibility study into suitable traffic</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Brendan Gillman, Environment And Consumer Protection</p>

	<p>calming measures and waiting restrictions in Avondale Drive, following the petition from Minet School.</p> <p><b>Reasons For Recommendation</b></p> <p>The petitioners were concerned with the volume of vehicles using Avondale Drive during school peak times. The recommendations would explore the extent of their concerns and investigate possible solutions to mitigate these concerns.</p> <p><b>Alternative Options Considered</b></p> <p>No other options had been considered, as the recommendations asked officers to gather further information before considering feasible solutions.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> TOWNFIELD</p>	
8.	<p><b>CORNWALL ROAD AND VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - PETITION OBJECTING TO PROPOSALS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b></p> <p>Petition Withdrawn</p>	Action by
9.	<p><b>THE AVENUE, NORTHWOOD - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE AND REDUCING SPEED LIMIT</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The petitioners were in favour of the implementation of both a speed reduction to 20 miles per hour and traffic calming measures along The Avenue in Northwood.</li> <li>• The roads were solely residential and connects the Rickmansworth Road to Ducks Hill Road.</li> <li>• About 30 years ago a 7 foot barrier was placed at the top of the road near to the junction with Ducks Hill Road in order to prevent heavy goods vehicles using it as a short cut and forcing them to use the Ducks Hill Road junction with the Rickmansworth Road.</li> <li>• Since then a massive increase in car ownership, which also increased on commuting by car to and from work, and aggressive driving and displacement of traffic due to the “no entry” in to Northgate from Ducks Hill Road.</li> <li>• In the last 3 years traffic had considerably decreased on the Copsewood Estate and increased in volume, speed and nature along The Avenue.</li> <li>• The location of the survey equipment right next to the junction of The Avenue and Chelwood Close meant that some cars missed the survey entirely and others entering or exiting Chelwood Close would of been seen to be travelling at very low speed and therefore the average recorded speed is dramatically reduced</li> </ul>	Action by  Brendan Gillman, Environment And Consumer Protection

along with the 85th percentile.

- Also it was placed just where cars parked on the North side of the road and within a short distance of parking on the South side of the road therefore making in effect a natural speed reduction feature which often forced cars passing in one direction at a time.
- Some cars were actually parked on the strips and petitioners questioned whether this would of stopped the accurate recording of events.
- Petitioners believed it would have been far better to site the survey equipment further East, nearer to the junction with the Rickmansworth Road.
- That Rickmansworth Road had a maximum speed limit at the junction with The Avenue of 40 miles per hour limit and as the bend was about 135 degrees, that cars accelerated through and away from the bend, on to a clear stretch of residential road ahead of them.
- Petitioners wanted this junction to be re-engineered in order to reduce the angle towards 90 degrees which would force traffic to slow down.
- The petitioners wanted fewer cars to use The Avenue as a short cut, and for those who that did use it to drive more slowly. They lived in fear of crossing the road and would not allow their children to go any where near the road unaccompanied. Numerous dead pets and wild animals had been hit and killed by traffic.
- Petitioners received so much abuse by trying to park outside or in their own homes. They did not want to park outside their house as feared their cars would get damaged.
- Petitioners requested indented bays that are marked with wooden post like the ones in Green Lane. And for them to be staggered between the sides of the road to give protection to the parked cars and act as a chicane.
- They also asked that priority be given to cars coming from Ducks Hill Road which again would of slowed the traffic coming from the Rickmansworth Road.
- Petitioners asked that the speed limit be officially reduced and signed to 20 miles per hour. It would of also helped to denote the road as being residential and combined with speed calming measures would of had good effect.
- They asked for a flashing sign that showed the speed that drivers were going and the 20 mile per hour sign.
- Petitioners also asked for the road to be re-surfaced. There were numerous deep potholes all along the road that went down in to the sub structure and patches elsewhere where other holes had been repaired. The pavement is tarmaced and was in a terrible state of repair. Recently the junctions were re-white lined and 2 of the centre strip lines at the Rickmansworth Road end actually went down along and out of the pot holes.

- Petitioners said it was a quality of life issue.

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

The Cabinet Member discussed the survey information and noted the petitioners comments that this was done in the wrong place.

He had already asked officers to carry out a new survey but the report was not available until next week.

Officers said if the location of survey strips were not in the correct place this could be discussed with petitioners. Spot checks could be carried out.

Hillingdon had the largest number of cars per household than any other London Borough.

The Cabinet Member appreciated everything the petitioners said and needed the results to come back before going any further.

The 20mph zone: there was rumours that Transport for London would fund 20mph zones. So there was possible funding that this could be used in Hillingdon. The Cabinet member would take on board petitions and any information from the Police.

Veritex Sign (flashing sign) could be put in place. They were put up temporarily in streets. Officers discussed with petitioners where this one sign would be best to put up. Outside number 25 The Avenue, facing westbound traffic was discussed.

The Cabinet Members would not grant 20mph zone until the surveys were reported back. Based on what comes back in recommendation 2 he could then see what to do for recommendation 3.

**Resolved -**

That the Cabinet Member:

1. Noted the petitions requests and met with petitioners to discuss in greater detail the concerns they have.
2. Asked officers to conduct a new 24 hour/seven day speed and volume survey in The Avenue to verify the results of the previously conducted survey.
3. Instructed officers to conduct further investigations into possible traffic calming measures under the Road Safety Programme.
4. Veritex Sign to be included in the next programme for The Avenue.
5. Instructed officers to view the pavement and road surface and report back to the Cabinet Member.

	<p><i>Reasons For Recommendation</i></p> <p>The petitioners were concerned with the volume and speed of vehicles in their road. The recommendations would explore the extent of their concerns and looked at possible solutions to mitigate these concerns.</p> <p><i>Alternative Options Considered</i></p> <p>No other options had been considered, as the recommendations asked officers to gather further information before considering feasible solutions.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> NORTHWOOD</p>	
10.	<p><b>WARREN ROAD, ICKENHAM - PETITION OBJECTING TO WAITING RESTRICTION (SINGLE YELLOW LINE)</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The finalising of yellow lines was against procedure.</li> <li>• 56% opposed the single yellow line.</li> <li>• If the Council knew the residents were confused why did they not write to the residents again.</li> <li>• 23% failed to respond to the Council survey.</li> <li>• The Council chose to ignore the residents before the petition hearing had taken place.</li> <li>• The majority were not aware of the discussions in 2008. The consultation document would of had their input.</li> <li>• Petitioners questioned why there were no other options considered.</li> <li>• That the Council should of written to all residents not just relied to lead petitioners.</li> <li>• A more detailed exercise determining the thoughts of the residents should have been carried out.</li> <li>• The school is a problem when in use. There was no problem during school holidays, weekends and evenings.</li> <li>• The middle section of the road was taken by school parking which meant that Residents had to park elsewhere.</li> <li>• Drivers speed at night.</li> <li>• Parking was causing problem for neighbours.</li> <li>• The head of the school said she would move bicycle shed to make a space for 20 parking spaces, which never happened.</li> <li>• The Council could of spent the £500 they spend on Yellow Lines to move the bicycle shed.</li> <li>• The Council showed 42% of the road supported the yellow lines, the petition showed that 56% opposed.</li> <li>• The petitioners would of liked the council to consider an alternative.</li> <li>• Cllr Hensley, Ward Councillor, asked the Head of school to</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Mina Rana, Environment And Consumer Protection</p>

speaking. The School could not build on the playing fields, as that was green belt area. The school also had funding issues.

- The Head of the School said they had a travel plan but nobody had asked for it.
- They had one field. The other school fields were over the A40.
- The Headteacher had asked 6<sup>th</sup> formers to park on one side of the road and not to park driveways. This had improved issues.
- The School office did hold many of the registration numbers voluntarily.
- The School had cancelled car boot sales since March 2009, and would not be holding anymore again in response to residents.
- The School had a weekly newsletter that reminded parents and students to be courteous.
- The Head stated that they had a travel plan that encourages pupils to cycle into school. They did have a plan to move the cycle plan to another site. Car park spaces and Cycle Shed would swap sites.

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

The Council did follow due process in the consultation process it carried out from a petition hearing in October 2008.

The original decision did come to the Cabinet Member to sign off. 76% agreed there was a parking problem on Warren Road. This was the subject of the petition hearing in October 2008. It is not the Cabinet Member's responsibility or the Council's to let every resident know of each petition. They are advertised on the website and outside the civic centre. It is up to the lead petitioners. It is a personal choice on whether they sign the consultation or not. If people are unsure they can call the Council for clarification.

This was a democratic process. That is how he based his decisions as a Cabinet Member. A consultation took place. Based on those results a Cabinet Member report was signed off and a traffic order was put up on lampposts. Some of which disappeared in the area, had since been replaced.

The majority of people in Warren Road wanted some form of restriction in Warren Road. The Cabinet Member made his judgement on what had come back in consultation. If it was close between decisions then he could ask officers to go back to re-consult.

Could of had a Cabinet Member Decision on making the decision, but as there was a petition it was put on an agenda and they waited for what the concerns were.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that Vyners School did have a School Travel Plan.

	<p>He had not heard anything in the objection that would move the Cabinet Member from anything that the officer had recommended in her report.</p> <p>He had reduced the effective timing from 18 months to 12 months.</p> <p>The consultation was quite clear cut. He had listened and made notes on what was said. The Cabinet Member was not convinced that his original decision was incorrect. And it followed all legal requirements.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b> That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged the petition.</li> <li>2. Listened to the petitioners views and concerns and noted the objection to the proposed single yellow line waiting restriction on Warren Road.</li> <li>3. Agreed to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the waiting restrictions after one year.</li> </ol> <p><i>Reasons For Recommendation</i></p> <p>The Cabinet Member would wish to listen to and understand the residents' concerns. This report provided the Cabinet Member with the background to previous consultations.</p> <p>Although it was clear that a significant minority of the local residents were not in support of the proposed waiting restrictions, it was decided to introduce the measures supported in the consultation on an <i>experimental</i> basis. This committed the council to a formal review of the measures after a period of up to 18 months before deciding on whether or not to make the measures permanent. During this period, the petition objecting to the waiting restrictions could be considered as part of the objections that would be assessed during the lifetime of the experimental order.</p> <p><i>Alternative Options Considered</i></p> <p>The Council decided not to put the restrictions in.</p> <p><b>Relevant Ward:</b> ICKENHAM</p>	
	<p><b>Meeting closed at: 10.25pm</b> <b>Next meeting: 15 July 2009</b></p>	
	<p><b>Executive Scrutiny Call-in</b></p> <p>The above decisions may only come into effect on 9 June 2009 unless called-in by the Executive Scrutiny Committee. The Committee will notify the Head of Democratic Services its wish to call-in any decisions by this date.</p>	<p>Action By: Democratic Services</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.