

Minutes

Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation
Wednesday, 16 September 2009
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



Published on: 28 September 2009
Come into effect on: 5pm on 5 October 2009

<p>1.</p>	<p>BEECH AVENUE, EASTCOTE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING RESURFACING</p> <p>Councillors Edward Lavery and Michael White attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors and supported the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>There were no petitioners present at the meeting but the Cabinet Member noted that an area of Beech Avenue road surface had deteriorated to the extent that shallow fretting had taken place in parts of the carriageway. In some areas the bitmac surface had completely worn away exposing small areas of the original bitmac surface.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Notes that officers have carried out a detailed assessment and approval be given to the carriageway surface receiving treatment during a future programme. <p>Reasons For Recommendation</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 and the surface dressing that had been applied over the original bitmac layer. Past patching had filled some of the worst fretting but only as a temporary measure. The road profile was “bumpy” in places but not excessively so. In some small areas the bitmac surface had completely worn away exposing small areas of the original bitmac surface. This was not dangerous but does give the road a “patchwork” appearance. Resurfacing would provide a smoother, improved riding surface, maintain the asset value of the highways and improve the visual aspect of the street.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>Officers considered that the carriageway surface was now beyond normal patching repair and that resurfacing was the only option available to restore a smooth surface.</p>	<p>Action by Gurmeet Matharu Environment & Consumer Protection</p>
-----------	--	--

	<p>Relevant Ward: Cavendish</p>	
2.	<p>BERKELEY CLOSE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING A RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING SCHEME</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the introduction of the stop and shop parking in Ruislip Gardens and the elimination of additional parking by the new crossing in West End Road Berkeley Close had been increasingly used as a free parking place for commuters going into London Borough Of Hillingdon • Car parking at Ruislip Gardens Underground Station was only for four hours and users were charged which meant that commuters into London parked their cars on Berkeley Close • Some residents had 2 or 3 cars which made parking more difficult • One resident had allegedly used the Close as a car park for a number of vehicles he had been selling • There were a number of elderly people who lived on Berkeley Close who had to park their vehicles a distance from their homes. <p>Councillor Michael Cox attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor. Issues he raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He supported the comments raised by the petitioners • Berkeley Close had a number of residents who temporarily lived there • A residents only parking scheme would ensure the permanent residents could park their vehicles close to their homes <p>The Cabinet Member informed the residents that a parking survey of the area would indicate the types of vehicles which were parking on the road. There were other means of limiting parking in the area such as limited waiting restrictions which would stop commuter parking. Officers would ensure the survey covered different times during the day and evening.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and discussed with the petitioners their concerns regarding parking in Berkeley Close 2. Instructs officers to carry out a parking survey in Berkeley Close and to report back to Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member. <p>Reasons For Recommendation The request from residents of Berkeley Close was acknowledged and a survey would establish the level of non-residential parking.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p>	<p>Jack Webster, Environment & Consumer Protection</p>

	<p>These could be considered following analysis of the survey results.</p> <p>Relevant Ward: Manor</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>REQUEST THAT CONSULTATION BE UNDERTAKEN WITH LOCAL RESIDENTS MOST AFFECTED BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BOARDING ACCOMMODATION AT THE HAREFIELD ACADEMY</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions made at the meeting by the petitioners included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the consultation process for the planning application for the development of the boarding accommodation at the Harefield Academy had been flawed as residents had not been aware that the application was to be considered at North Planning Committee on 23 June 2009 • A number of residents of Northwood Road had not received the consultation letter regarding the planning application • The Academy had failed to deliver correspondence to residents regarding their public consultation event prior to submission of the planning application, including a public exhibition. The letters had been delivered by children from the Academy and the reliability of this arrangement was questioned • An investigation should be carried out into the delivery of the Council's consultation letters to residents in Northwood Road • Residents had not seen the site notice for the planning application as it had been posted at the entrance to the site and not in an area where residents could easily see it • The planning application had been advertised in a free newspaper and not in the more widely read local newspaper • Without a formal consultation exercise the Council had failed in its duties under the Human Rights Act • The residents affected by the planning application should be given the opportunity to discuss the application <p>The Cabinet Member listened to the issues and concerns raised by the petitioners and responded to the points raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lead Petitioner had received the consultation letter dated 22 April 2009 • The site notice and the public notice in the local newspaper had been published in accordance with statutory requirements • The letters which had been sent out to the consulted residents had not been returned back to the Council as unopened <p>A representative from the Bell Cornwell, the planning agents for the planning application attended the meeting and clarified the following points and issues raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Academy had held a public consultation exhibition. Over 300 	<p>James Rodger, Planning and Community Services</p>

letters had been hand delivered to local residents and posted/emailed to a wide number of interested parties. An advert for the event had been placed in a local paper. This would have made residents aware of the forthcoming application

- Following submission of the application at the end of March, the Council had fully followed, and had exceeded, the statutory requirements with regard to consultation
- On 21 May 2009, the Principal of the Academy, along with other members of staff, attended the Harefield Residents' Association meeting and had presented the scheme to them
- A number of written representations had been received by the Council in response to the application
- A direct response had been given to the issues raised by Mr and Mrs Levy in their letter to the case officer dated 8 June 2009
- During the course of the application process, the Principal of the Academy had had direct contact with the Levys of Roundwood House and their agent, including meeting them to discuss a number of issues they had raised in their objection letter
- The matter had been discussed in detail at a Harefield Residents' Association meeting on 18 June 2009
- A number of local residents had attended the North Planning Committee on 23 June 2009 and had been represented by a public speaker
- The Committee Members had fully debated the scheme and the issues involved and had resolved to grant planning consent
- The Academy agreed with the officers of the Council that the Council had carried out its statutory duties with regard to consultation on this application

Resolved-

That the Cabinet Member:

1. Noted and discussed with petitioners their concerns regarding the consultation process.
2. Does not agree to the request that further consultations be carried out on the planning application.
3. Confirms the decision made by the North Planning Committee at its meeting of the 23 June 2009 in respect of the application for the erection of a three storey building to provide accommodation for 50 boarders and 4 staff with ancillary amenity space, landscaping, car parking and biomass boiler enclosure at Harefield Academy, Northwood Way, Harefield (Ref: 17709/APP/2009/624).

Reasons For Recommendation

It was considered that adequate public consultations had been carried out over and above statutory requirements in connection with this application. Local residents had been given an opportunity, and had taken the opportunity; to express their views regarding this proposal and their interests had not been prejudiced. The North Planning Committee had considered the views of residents in determining the application.

	<p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>The chief petitioner had requested that the Council undertook a further formal consultation process. In practice this would serve no useful purpose, as extensive consultations had already been carried out and the views of local residents had been received by way of 5 letters of objection and a petition with 62 signatures. The North Planning Committee had considered the views of residents, by way of the report to the Committee, the addendum report and the presentation of the petitioner, in determining the application.</p> <p>Relevant Ward: Harefield</p>	
4.	<p>FAIRWAY AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING RESURFACING</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions made at the meeting by the petitioners included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairway Avenue’s road surface had a number of potholes which had damaged motor cars and made cycling dangerous • Resurfacing the road with a “new thin surface” was poor financial planning and it would make more economic sense to completely resurface the road • It was only part of the road which needed resurfacing • The pavements on Fairway Avenue were in need of repair <p>Councillor Michael Bull attended the meeting as a Ward Councillor and supported the petitioners in their views.</p> <p>Officers informed the meeting that the proposed “thin surfacing” would last 15-20 years.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member listened to the issues and concerns raised by the petitioners and supported the comments made. Officers were asked to investigate the recycling of road surface material which was a practice which was taking place in other countries.</p> <p>That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and discussed with petitioners their concerns regarding the road surface on Fairway Avenue. 2. Noted that officers had carried out a detailed assessment of the road surface and approval be given to treatment of the carriageway surface during a future programme. 3. Asked that officers inspect the condition of the pavements in Fairway Avenue and submit a report to the Cabinet Member. <p>Reasons For Recommendation</p> <p>Officers considered that substantial parts of the carriageway surface were in reasonably good repair at this time but would deteriorate unless action was taken. The existing carriageway surface had deteriorated with shallow fretting in isolated areas of the carriageway. The failure was</p>	<p>Gurmet Matharu, Environment & Consumer Protection</p>

	<p>due to the natural ageing of the bitmac surface, which was now slowly disintegrating after an estimated life of 25 to 30 years. Past patching had filled some of the worst fretting and had left the road in a reasonable condition. Officers therefore considered that limited patching work should be carried out and the road resurfaced with a thin surfacing or possibly a surface dressing.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>Resurfacing would also provide a smoother riding surface, maintain the asset value of the highway and improve the visual aspect of the street. However extensive areas of the road were still in comparatively good repair and alternative methods of maintenance, apart from normal resurfacing to a depth of around 40mm, should be considered.</p> <p>Relevant Ward: West Drayton</p>	
5.	<p>THE GROVE, ICKENHAM - PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions made at the meeting by the petitioners included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A request for single yellow line restriction on both sides of the road, between nos. 21-46. • For those restrictions to be in line with neighbouring roads the petitioners would accept restrictions to be Monday-Friday, 8.30am-10.30am and 3.30pm-4.30pm • There were concerns that all day parking in The Grove would prevent emergency vehicles gaining access • The introduction of waiting restrictions in nearby roads, had transferred commuter parking to The Grove • Waiting restrictions were needed because commuters using Hillingdon underground station, were parking in The Grove from early in the morning till late at night • The situation had deteriorated with vehicles parking on grass verges for weeks on time. People were leaving their cars whilst they were away on holiday • 23 out of the 24 properties had requested that restrictions be introduced • The website for Wembley Stadium informed the public that on-street car parking was available on The Grove • There was a plot of land near to the station which could be used for car parking • That any yellow line restrictions do not cover dropped kerbs <p>The Cabinet Member listened to the issues and concerns raised by the petitioners and supported the comments made by the petitioners and the recommendations made by officers in the report. Officers were asked to ensure that yellow line restrictions did not cover dropped kerbs.</p>	Minaxshree Rana, Environment & Consumer Protection

	<p>Resolved- That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and discussed with petitioners their concerns regarding parking in The Grove. 2. Approval be given to the commencement of statutory order making procedures for the introduction of waiting restrictions in The Grove, Ickenham on both sides of the road to operate between the hours of 8.30am to 10.30am and 3.30pm to 4.30pm <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. From a point 10 metres southwest of the southwestern kerbline of Swakeleys Drive and a point 10 metres northeast of the northeastern kerbline of The Chase and Grove Close. b. From a point 10 metres southwest of the southwestern kerbline of The Chase and Grove Close to the southwestern extremity of The Grove. 3. Approval be given to the commencement of statutory order making procedures for the introduction of 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions at the junction of The Grove, Grove Close and The Chase to extend 10 metres from respective kerb lines as shown in the appendix to the report. <p>Reasons For Recommendation</p> <p>The proposed waiting restrictions had been requested by the residents of The Grove, which prohibited all day commuter parking. The proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions would improve motorists and pedestrian visibility, improve safer access for emergency services and reduce congestion, making it easier for vehicles to enter / exit The Grove.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>These were discussed with the petitioners.</p> <p>Relevant Ward: Ickenham</p>	
	<p>Meeting closed at: 8.40pm Next meeting: 14 October 2009</p>	
	<p>Executive Scrutiny Call-in</p> <p>The above decisions may only come into effect on 5 October 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 Khalid Ahmed on 01895 250833. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.