

Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,
Transportation and Recycling
Wednesday, 10 October 2018
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge**



	<p>Cabinet Member Present: Councillor Keith Burrows (Chairman)</p> <p>Ward Councillors Present: Councillor Jonathan Bianco (agenda item 4), Duncan Flynn (agenda item 4), Alan Deville (agenda item 5), Stuart Mathers (agenda item 5), Jan Sweeting (agenda item 5), Janet Duncan (agenda item 5), and Scott Farley (agenda item 6)</p> <p>Officers Present: Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Steven Austin (Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager), Ian Thynne (Principal Sustainability Officer), Mark Butler (Conservation Officer) and Tom Campbell (Assistant Planning Policy Officer)</p>
1.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>None.</p>
2.	<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>
3.	<p>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED. <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p>
4.	<p>RAISINS HILL AREA OF SPECIAL LOCAL CHARACTER- PETITION REQUESTING AN ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>The Cabinet Member considered a petition from residents requesting an article 4 direction in the Raisins Hill area of special local character. The petitioners spoke of their concerns and suggestions including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>The petition organiser had been a resident for 32 years and the petition had been signed by 100 residents which was approximately 69/135 dwellings. Five dwellings declined to sign the petition.</i>• <i>Hillingdon Council designated Raisins Hill as an area of special local character in 2012 after consultation with residents.</i>• <i>The area had a well-defined character.</i>• <i>Residents were unhappy with the degradation of the area of special local character which was caused by permitted development rules. These rights</i>

allowed home owner to make significant changes to their roofs without the need to apply for planning permission.

- *There had been an increase in these types of roofs and it was argued that this did not preserve the local character.*
- *Roofs were one of the primary characteristics of the area of special local character affecting more than just one aspect of the designation.*
- *Petitioners requested protection as it was damaging the coherence of the architectural designs. The townscape significance as the character and hierarchy of spaces and interesting vistas along the streets and views between buildings were being spoilt.*
- *The petitioner referred the Cabinet Member and officers to some photographs demonstrating the changes to the roof scapes.*
- *Petitioners requested an article 4 direction to be obtained to restrict permitted development changes to roofs in Raisins Hill area of special local character so that planning applications would have to be made if there were going to be changes to roofs. Petitioners requested this only in relation to the permitted development of roofs.*
- *Petitioners acknowledged that there were a number of steps involved and it would not be easy to obtain the article 4 direction, however petitioners were also willing to accept other suitable solutions.*
- *Overall residents were unhappy with the roofs and wanted to protect the area.*

Councillor Duncan Flynn attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition. He noted the issues and concerns raised by residents. He explained that Raisins Hill was a rare road in terms of its structure and layout, houses had similar materials and there was good quality housing in the area. The road had seen a number of different applications and substantial changes. He appreciated that national planning policy limited what could be done. He also accepted that an article 4 direction was not an easy process but did not consider it to be an unreasonable expectation. He sympathised with residents and hoped that this petition would be the start of some meaningful dialogue with a positive outcome.

Councillor Jonathan Bianco attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition. He shared the views of Councillor Flynn and sympathised with residents. He saw both sides and was pleased to see this petition was not completely anti-development. He asserted that within reason owners should be able to develop to some degree. He asked officers to consider the article 4 direction, and questioned if this was not possible, was there any other suitable option.

In response to the submissions heard, officers confirmed that there was no authority to remove permitted development rights as they were rights put in by the law of the land. The request could only be made to the department of the Secretary of State. In response to Councillor Bianco's question on whether or not it was reasonable, officers explained that there was a criteria to meet and this would determine the strength of the application. Matters such as a greater need for housing could be factors however the likelihood of engagement in this case would be small given the size of the area involved. It was for the department of the Secretary of State to make a judgement and this would be made on the factors mentioned earlier, in addition to resource and the gravity of the application. Councillor Burrows was unsure whether this could be sufficient to meet the criteria and questioned whether there were any HMOs in the area. Officers did not have this information to hand but Councillor

Flynn indicated that he did not think so.

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Councillor Burrows had regard to the photographs put before him by petitioners, but in his view, the photographs did not show significant changes to roofs due to the materials used. This was confirmed by officers and it was also mentioned that if there were significant changes, the Council's enforcement team would have been involved as this would not have fallen under permitted development rights.

Councillor Burrows explained that there was an article 4 direction in the Brunel and Uxbridge South area due to the number of family homes being turned in to HMOs. The only way to protect these properties was by an article 4 direction. Although it was a long process, the Secretary of State was engaged as it was a large area.

Councillor Burrows noted Councillor Bianco's assertion as to whether this could be a conservation area. This was looked at in 2017 but did not meet the requirements. It was questioned what exact areas were being looked at as it could involve a larger area than Raisins Hill beyond.

Overall, Councillor Burrows considered that permitted development rights could not be withdrawn as they were governed by central planning policies however he was keen to explore whether this area could be upgraded to a conservation area.

In considering the matters, Councillors Burrows made the following decisions.

RESOLVED –

Meeting with the Petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Listened to the concerns outlined and reasons put forward by residents for an Article 4 Direction.**
- 2. Noted that Council's Conservation Officers have considered in detail what makes Raisins Hill an Area of Special Local Character, as explained in the body of this report.**
- 3. Noted that the Council needs to consider very carefully whether there are any circumstances particularly relevant to Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character which justify withdrawing permitted development rights for roof conversions and agreeing an Article 4 Direction.**
- 4. Considered the wider implications of imposing an Article 4 Direction on Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character.**
- 5. Decided that the request for an Article 4 Direction should be not agreed and therefore will not be added to the Council's Cabinet Forward Plan.**
- 6. Requested Officers to look at the possibility of upgrading Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character to a conservation area, taking into account the submissions made by the petition and ward councillors and report these back to the Cabinet Member.**

	<p>Reason for decision</p> <p>The petition hearing provided a valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners of their concerns and suggestions.</p> <p>Alternative options considered / risk management</p> <p>None at this stage.</p>
5.	<p>CHURCH ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING A ZEBRA CROSSING (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>The Cabinet Member considered a petition from residents requesting a zebra crossing. In support of the petition, the petitioners spoke of their concerns and suggestions including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A petition with 311 signatures had been submitted to the Council requesting a zebra crossing.</i> • <i>It was explained that children from two primary schools, Laurel Lane School and St Martins School crossed the roads on a weekly basis to attend church, and on average there was at least 192 children crossing the road. It was difficult to manage this especially with some children that have special needs which created a greater element of risk.</i> • <i>There was also a park near the road, with no gated entrance that was used by children regularly.</i> • <i>With the layout of the road, drivers did not have clear forward visibility of the road.</i> • <i>St Martins School was a specialist resource for children with ADHT and AST, and there were more challenges involved when crossing roads.</i> • <i>Hillingdon's Road Safety and School Travel Team have worked with children to encourage them to cross roads safely.</i> • <i>Church Road was also used as a rat run, and visibility was limited. It was a dangerous road with bends and parked cars blocking the view. It was often used to skip the main part of town as a short cut.</i> • <i>Even during weekends and evenings it was busy as other group activities took place nearby. The road was generally busy at all times and used by the general public for a number of reasons.</i> • <i>There was a significant concern for the elderly and children crossing the road.</i> • <i>Petitioners requested preventative measures to be put in place and urged the Cabinet Member and officers to keep the crossing safe.</i> <p>Councillor Stuart Mathers attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor in support of the petition. He agreed with all the submissions made and explained that the primary purpose for the zebra crossing was to protect children and provide a safe area for them to cross. During off peak times, the road was more dangerous and the introduction of a parking management scheme would mean that there would be fewer cars on the roads and it would be clearer. It was important that parking bays did not block vision on the road. The road was used for speeding and rat runs, and it was only going to get worse. The road was used for community events and the recent success of the cycle event was well received by the local community. Councillor</p>

Mathers asked the Cabinet Member and officers if the road could be made safer.

Councillor Jan Sweeting submitted the following, which were supported by Councillor Janet Duncan:

I support the petition because:

- 1. Church Road is a dangerous road with numerous reports of 'near misses' by residents living in Church Road.*
- 2. Many instances of 'road rage' again reported by residents as it is a busy 'rat run' for cars as well as for heavy lorries and vans.*
- 3. Not only the speed of motorists which is the problem but the geography of the road which is undulating, narrows and widens so creating many blind spots for pedestrians.*
- 4. It is a route to school for pupils at St Martins and Laurel Lane Schools and so the road is crossed by many primary aged children on a daily basis, with 'near misses' again being reported.*
- 5. It is also the road where St Martins Church is situated which holds regular services and accommodates various groups both during the week and at weekends and where pedestrians have much difficulty crossing the road due to frustrated motorists taking risks and the very busy nature of the road.*
- 6. It is recognised that the undulating nature of the road may make it difficult for a crossing to be placed at the location indicated on the map, but I ask that investigations look into all options as the present situation is a dangerous one for pedestrians both young and old needing to cross Church Road.*
- 7. Being situated adjacent to the neighbouring Closes Park means that the crossing would enable the users of this park to cross the road in safety as at present this is a very difficult operation for many residents.*

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Councillor Burrows knew the area well and accepted that it was a busy road. He explained that crossing could be created but it would depend on a number of factors such as design requirements and layouts. He admired the teachers taking the children to the church given the road conditions. . Councillor Burrows explained that an independent traffic survey would be commissioned through a specialist company in the normal manner. He explained that that the request would be added to the Council's Road Safety Programme and agreed a location with the benefit of the petitioners and the Ward Councillors.

In considering the matters, Councillors Burrows made the following decisions.

RESOLVED –

Meeting with the Petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Considered their request for a Zebra Crossing on Church Road, West**

Drayton close to St Martin's Church.

- 2. Asked officers to add the petitioners' request to the Council's Road Safety Programme for further detailed investigation.**
- 3. Asked officers to commission independent speed and traffic surveys at locations agreed by the petitioners and local ward councillors and then to report back to the Cabinet Member.**

Reasons for decision

The petition hearing provided a valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners of their concerns and suggestions.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None at this stage.

6. PETITION REQUESTING DOUBLE YELLOW LINES AND A RESIDENTS' PERMIT PARKING SCHEME IN GOULDS GREEN, UXBRIDGE *(Agenda Item 6)*

The Cabinet Member considered a petition from residents requesting a double yellow lines and a residents permit parking scheme in Goulds Green. In support of the petition, the petitioners spoke of their concerns and suggestions including the following:

- *Goulds Green was a small road with only 20 houses. The petition had been signed by almost every household on the street with the exception of one.*
- *Goulds Green used to be a quiet road, however recently up to 30 untaxed vehicles were being parked on the street which was impacting residential parking.*
- *A household was using the property for commercial purposes and the Council had been informed and already commenced enforcement proceedings, serving notices. The impact of the commercial premises meant that parking was limited for residents as uninsured and untaxed cars were taking up available parking spaces.*
- *Clarity was sought on whether vehicles could be parked on the pavement or half up on the pavements. The last penalty noticed issued in relation to this was in 2005, however there were no signs to confirm what was allowed.*
- *Requested that Goulds Green be made safer for all its residents by creating double yellow lines at both junctions of Goulds Green and by introducing a parking management scheme.*

Councillor Scott Farley attended the meeting as Ward Councillor and supported the petition and comments made by the petitioner. He expressed sympathy for the residents and agreed that introducing double yellow lines would enhance safety. Councillor Farley asked Councillor Burrows and officers to also bear in mind the potential impacts of introducing a parking permit on neighbouring roads. He questioned whether there would be a knock on effect and asked for this to be considered when making a decision.

Councillor Janet Gardner submitted the following comments for the meeting:

I presume this is a result of complaints from residents (one who came to our ward surgery in July) who live in Goulds Green , one of the main complaints was regarding inconsiderate parking of a great many vehicles,(some untaxed) by another of the residents, who apparently operates a car mechanics premises from his premises, which I am sure isn't permitted in a residential street

So.

If it makes life more bearable for the residents of the road to enter and exit their premises, and deters the running of a business from the local streets, then I don't see why anyone would have any objections to double yellows in the Goulds Green area.

I am hoping that if this is permitted then there will be monitoring of the surrounding area by our enforcement teams on a regular basis, just to check that the untaxed and cars for sale are not moved from Goulds Green and parked up on the other side of Harlington Rd, which is in Botwell Ward

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised. Councillor Burrows noted that concerns raised in relation to the commercial use of a property and had regard to the enforcement notice sent by the Council. After discussing with the issue of the petitioner, Councillor Burrows took the view that a parking management scheme may not be necessary if the enforcement notice was complied with. He emphasised however that all options remained open for petitioners and residents.

Councillor Burrows was happy to add Goulds Green to the programme and discuss suitable locations for the parking management schemes with Ward Councillors, without it having a knock on effect with neighbouring roads. In relation to the petitioners question about whether on pavement was considered, Councillor Burrows explained that the fact that no penalty notices had not been issued since 2005, Goulds Green was deemed to be an exception as the area seemed to be self-governed.

In considering the matters, Councillors Burrows made the following decisions.

RESOLVED -

Meeting with the Petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Listened to their request for the introduction of double yellow lines and a residents' permit parking scheme in Goulds Green, Uxbridge.**
- 2. Decided that the request for parking controls for Goulds Green, Uxbridge and possibly roads in the surrounding area should be added to the Council's future parking scheme programme for further investigation and more detailed consultation when resources permit.**

Reasons for decision

The petition hearing provided a valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners of their concerns and suggestions.

	Alternative options considered / risk management
--	---

	These were discussed with the petitioners.
--	--

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