

## Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,  
Transportation and Recycling  
Wednesday, 12 October 2016  
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**



	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows (Chairman)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Phoday Jarjussey, Councillor Carol Melvin</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Helena Webster, Community Engagement &amp; Town Centres Team Leader Steve Austin, Principal Engineer Chris Mansfield, Deputy Director Planning, Transport &amp; Community Projects, Residents Services Kate Boulter, Democratic Services</p>
1.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
2.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b></p> <p>All items would be considered in public.</p>
3.	<p><b>HAREFIELD HOUSE CAR PARK - PETITION OBJECTING TO THE INTRODUCTION OF PAY &amp; DISPLAY PARKING</b></p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>The petitioners believed the proposal to introduce parking charges in Harefield Village showed a lack of understanding of local issues. The village had no bank or Post Office on the High Street and was not a shopping destination. The High Street was often congested with deliveries and parallel parking, which the free car park had gone some way to address. Shopkeepers had a tendency to park outside their shops, which prevented shoppers from parking there.</i></li><li><i>Businesses were feeling the impact of HS2 and Brexit. Costs were going up and shoppers were being put off spending. If parking charges was introduced, shoppers would go elsewhere and businesses could close.</i></li><li><i>The car park was ill-equipped. There were no lights, which caused safety issues after dark, and Hillingdon First cards were not working on one of the pay machines in the car park which meant residents could not get their discount.</i></li></ul> <p>Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the</p>

points raised. Officers advised that Harefield had been the beneficiary of improvements as part of a wider scheme to raise the attractiveness of the village, and would be monitored to see if any further improvements could be made. £180,000 had already been invested. Business had been asked to evaluate the improvements and 75% had rated the future of the village as 'promising' or 'very promising'.

Councillor Burrows advised that the Council was obliged to bring the car park into use and to charge for parking in line with other car parks in the Borough. The implementation of parking charges had been successful in other areas. The Harefield car park would provide parking for shoppers, workers and people visiting the hospital which would not be available if the land was not used as a car park. In line with all new parking schemes, the Harefield car park would be reviewed after twelve months.

**RESOLVED: Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling:**

- 1. discussed with petitioners their concerns with the introduction of parking controls at Harefield House car park.**
- 2. acknowledged the conditions of the Section 106 agreement for the Harefield House/Cedar House redevelopment. This included a clause that if the public car park was not provided within two years of the lease being agreed in November 2014 then it would be assigned back with no obligation to provide a public car park.**
- 3. recalled that, following statutory consultation, a formal decision was taken by the Cabinet Member in March 2016 to proceed with the introduction of Pay & Display parking in Harefield House car park. The proposals were in line with the majority of car parks in the Borough, and as such a local Ward Councillor supported the proposals.**
- 4. Considered the information provided and circulated locally regarding parking charges within the 'HELP SAVE FREE PARKING IN HAREFIELD!!' flyer, causing unfortunate and unnecessary confusion for residents, many of whom wrongly assumed that the matter related to wider proposals beyond those for the car park alone.**
- 5. noted that, following investigations, correspondence was provided to the lead petitioner on 28 April 2016 by the Deputy Director of Planning, Transportation and Community Projects who was fully satisfied that the proper process had been followed throughout.**
- 6. reassured the petitioners that, in common with all new parking management arrangements, the scheme would be reviewed, usually after 12 months, to determine that the objectives of the scheme were being met.**

**4. PETITION AGAINST THE PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN COPTHALL ROAD EAST, ICKENHAM**

*Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:*

- *It was stated by the Petitioner that most residents of Copthall Road East did not support the extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme that had recently been introduced.*
- *The response to the consultation on the extension had shown a split decision and the petitioners did not understand why the Council had decided to implement the extension.*
- *The petitioners were not aware that another petition supporting the extension had been submitted to the Council during the consultation. The petitioners asked if they could view a copy of the petition in support.*
- *The impact of the new restriction meant that visitors and workers were unable to park.*
- *Residents felt it was unfair that they were required to pay for permits to park outside their houses.*
- *Residents stated that they would like a one hour waiting restriction and for residents to be allowed to park on the road during this time.*

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Officers advised that it would not be legal to exclude residents from any waiting restriction as Highways Law did not allow anyone to park on a yellow line.

Councillor Burrows advised that, where a consultation resulted in a split opinion, Ward Councillor were consulted on their views, and any resulting decision was subject to the Council's call-in procedures which enabled any Councillor to call-in a decision for review. In this instance, the decision to implement the extension to the parking scheme had not been called in.

**RESOLVED: Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling:**

- 1. discussed the request that the extension to the Ickenham Parking Management Scheme in Copthall Road East be reviewed;**
- 2. deferred the matter to the next Petition Hearing so that (i) the Cabinet Member could consult further with Ward Councillors before making a decision, and (ii) the lead petitioner had an opportunity to view the petition in support of the extension to the scheme.**

**5. SANDOW CRESCENT, HAYES - PETITION ASKING FOR ALLOCATED PARKING FOR RESIDENTS**

*Councillor Phoday Jarjussey attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition. Councillors Janet Gardner and Mo Khursheed were unable to attend the meeting and had asked that their support of the petition be noted.*

*Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:*

- *Commuters were parking in Sandow Crescent which was preventing residents from parking outside their homes.*
- *Sometimes cars were parked for days or weeks at a time. One car, which did not belong to a resident, had not moved for three months. Residents suspected people went on holiday from Heathrow and left cars parked in the*

*Crescent.*

- *There was tension between residents and people parking in the Crescent. Arguments had developed when residents approached car drivers and asked them to park more considerately. On occasions, residents' cars had been blocked in by other cars parked too closely. There was concern that emergency services would not be able to get into the cul-de-sac.*
- *Residents were having to park great distances from their homes. Some residents had been given parking tickets for parking temporarily outside their homes to unload or drop off children. Residents were reluctant to go out in case they lost their parking space.*
- *Sandow Crescent was close to Hayes & Harlington Station and commuters used the road for parking. It was anticipated the problem would get worse as Crossrail and the town centre redevelopment progressed.*

Councillor Burrows advised that resident of Sandow Crescent had been consulted about parking twice and not many responses had been received on those occasions. Circumstances changed and, as Hayes became more attractive with Crossrail and Heathrow Express providing quick rails links into London, the problem of commuter and holiday parking would become more of a problem. Councillor Burrows thanked the petitioners for raising the issue as the Council would not have known. It was noted that petitions had been received from two other roads nearby which indicated a widespread parking problem in the area.

**RESOLVED: Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling:**

- 1. discussed with petitioners their concerns with parking in Sandow Crescent, Hayes.**
- 2. advised petitioners that the parking legislation did not allow the Council to provide an allocated bay on the highway ascribed to an individual resident.**
- 3. noted the results of previous consultations in the area.**
- 4, decided that Sandow Crescent should be included in a future consultation on options to manage the parking in an area to be agreed with local Ward Councillor.**

**6. REGINALD ROAD, NORTHWOOD - PETITION ASKING FOR A CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS TO MANAGE THE PARKING IN THEIR ROAD**

*Councillor Carol Melvin attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition.*

*Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:*

- *Residents were having difficulty parking in Reginald Road due to non-residents parking in the road. These were mainly trade vehicles and cars belonging to people who worked on the High Street. On occasions residents had been forced to use the public car park.*
- *A planning application had been submitted for two more houses on the road*

*which, if approved, would add to the parking problem.*

- *Petitioners would like to have a one hour waiting restriction which would prevent commuters parking all day.*

Councillor Burrows advised that, in a previous consultation, residents of Reginald Road had rejected parking restrictions. He acknowledged that circumstances changed and new parking schemes implemented in other areas could have displaced vehicles to Reginald Road. Councillor Burrows would consult with Ward Councillors to hear their views on parking in the area.

**RESOLVED: Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling:**

1. **discussed with petitioners their concerns with parking in Reginald Road, Northwood.**
2. **asked officers to add the request to the Council's extensive parking programme for further consultation in a possible area agreed with local Ward Councillors.**

**7. MYRTLESIDE CLOSE, NORTHWOOD - PETITION ASKING FOR A PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME**

*Councillor Carol Melvin attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition.*

*Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:*

- *A high volume of commuter and shopper parking was causing parking problems for the residents of Myrtleside Close. Nearby roads had introduced parking restrictions which had displaced parking to Myrtleside.*
- *Elderly residents were unable to park outside their homes, and carers and ambulances struggled to park when attending visits to residents. Refuse lorries had difficulty manoeuvring.*
- *The petitioners requested that a scheme similar to those in force nearby be introduced in Myrtleside Close.*

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. He advised that any parking scheme would need to be for the entire length of the Close and that any restrictions would also apply to residents.

**RESOLVED: Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling:**

1. **discussed with petitioners their concerns with parking in Myrtleside Close, Northwood.**
2. **asked officers to add the request to the Council's extensive parking programme for further consultation.**