

## Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,  
Transportation and Recycling  
Wednesday, 13 February 2019  
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge**



	<p><b>Cabinet Member Present:</b> Councillor Keith Burrows (Chairman)</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> David Knowles – Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects Neil Fraser – Democratic Services Officer</p>
1.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That all items of business be considered in public.</b></p>
2.	<p><b>HIGHLAND ROAD, NORTHWOOD HILLS - THE PROPOSED NORTHWOOD HILLS PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The petitioner addressed the Cabinet Member, and highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The petition was submitted to ensure that the Council listened to the residents of Highland Road.</li><li>• An informal consultation was carried out in Autumn 2017. Of the 94 homes on Highland Road, 49 homes (52%) replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ 12 in favour of a parking management scheme</li><li>○ 9 in favour of waiting restrictions</li><li>○ 27 in favour of no change</li><li>○ 1 void</li></ul></li><li>• Therefore, 55% of responders did not want any change to the current parking arrangements.</li><li>• However, residents were not aware, or did not understand, that the Council would instigate a scheme on a road-by-road basis. As such, the 4 closest roads to Highland Road had been included in the scheme, namely Colchester Road, Lichfield Road, York Road, and Winchester Road.</li><li>• These 4 roads were formally consulted on a scheme in October 2018. Highland Road was not. Any scheme on these roads would result in an increase in commuter parking into Highland Road, as the cars would be unable to park on the aforementioned 4 roads.</li><li>• The Council has not provided sufficient information on what the scheme will</li></ul>

constitute.

- It is understood that in order to mark up a parking bay, 4.5m minimum is required. If this is not available then a yellow line will be drawn, which will operate at the same time as the parking permit scheme. This meant that no one would be able to park on the yellow line during the scheme hour, not even resident permit holders. In addition, yellow lines would be painted across driveways and would include up to 1m clearance from the edge of the dropped curb before a bay is marked. This would result in less available parking for residents.
- Brighton & Hove Council paint white road markings to deter parking across driveways. Could this be considered for Hillingdon?
- If a parking management scheme was instigated, what options were there to remove or amend the scheme, if it was subsequently determined that the scheme was not working?
- In conclusion, it was requested that:
  - Hillingdon should re-consult with the residents of Highland Road, with full information on the scheme, and the precise details of any parking bays;
  - Part of the road should be included in the scheme, commencing from where it joins York Road, up to the entrance to the park, situated close to home no. 44 (approximately half the road);
  - Hillingdon consider using white lines across driveways and not the yellow line as the scheme currently proposed.

Councillor Burrows read a statement from Ward Councillors, who were unable to attend in person. Points highlighted included:

- Parking in Northwood Hills had been a hot topic for a considerable amount of time, with strong views on all sides on this issue. Ward Councillors had therefore encouraged the Council to pursue an evidence-based, balanced approach, which put the needs of residents first while ensuring that action was only taken if it had the support of a majority of residents.
- It was likely that creep from commuter or resident cars parking in Highland Road will be a consequence of introducing a parking scheme into a road where parking was previously possible.
- Ward Councillors support the petitioner in their aims to be included in a scheme, as long as two fundamental criteria are met, namely;
  - A majority of the residents in the street must be in favour of the proposals; and
  - The implementation of the main scheme must not be delayed.

The Cabinet Member listed to the petitioners, and addressed their points as follows:

- Hillingdon does use the white lines referenced, and these could be considered within Highland Road;
- The Council has the ability to review, change, and remove parking management schemes, if evidence shows that this is required.
- The petitioner's ideas could be considered as part of a detailed plan for Highland Road. This would require further consultation with residents of the road. The suggestion to implement a scheme for half of Highland Road was possible, though not normally policy, and would require further consideration.

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

**1. listened to their request for the inclusion of Highland Road in the proposed Northwood Hills Parking Management Scheme; and**

**2. asked officers to add the request for a Parking Management Scheme for Highland Road to the Council's future parking scheme programme for an informal consultation, when resources permitted.**

**Reasons for recommendations**

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and, if appropriate, add their request to the parking schemes programme.

**Alternative options considered / risk management**

These were discussed with petitioners.

**3. HARLYN DRIVE, PINNER - PETITIONS REQUESTING INCLUSION IN THE PROPOSED NORTHWOOD HILLS PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME (Agenda Item 5)**

The petitioner addressed the Cabinet Member, and highlighted the following points:

- The reasons for the petition were set out in the covering letter to the petition, and had been reproduced in the subsequent officer report.
- There were concerns that the parking stress survey carried out in Harlyn Drive had been carried out during a period when parking was light (i.e. during school holidays).
- Tolcarne Drive, like Harlyn Drive, bordered Harlyn School. When consulted, 46% of the residents of Tolcarne Drive responded. Of those respondents, 60% were in favour of some kind of scheme. This equated to just over 1 in 4 residents of the road being in favour of a scheme, however the Council had concluded that Tolcarne Drive should be included, and Harlyn Drive should not.

- Harlyn Drive will be adversely affected by vehicle creep, should the proposed scheme be introduced, particularly those residents at the northern end of Harlyn Drive.
- While the majority of residents in Harlyn Drive would likely prefer no scheme, in the event of one being introduced for the roads shown on the Council plans, then Harlyn Drive should also be included.

Councillor Burrows read a statement from Ward Councillors, who were unable to attend in person. Points highlighted included:

- Parking in Northwood Hills has been a hot topic for a considerable amount of time, with strong views on all sides on this issue. Ward Councillors had therefore encouraged the Council to pursue an evidence-based, balanced approach, which put the needs of residents first while ensuring that action was only taken if it had the support of a majority of residents.
- It is likely that creep from commuter or resident cars parking in Highland Road will be a consequence of introducing a parking scheme into a road where parking was previously possible.
- Ward Councillors support the petitioner in their aims to be included in a scheme, as long as two fundamental criteria are met, namely;
  - A majority of the residents in the street must be in favour of the proposals; and
  - The implementation of the main scheme must not be delayed.

The Cabinet Member listened to the petitioner, and addressed their points as follows:

- The parking surveys were always carried out at peak times to ensure results would explicitly show any problems.
- The decision to implement a parking scheme excluding Harlyn Drive was based on resident demand following the informal consultation carried out, and was supported by Ward Councillors at the time.
- Having listened to the petitioner, it was agreed that residents of Harlyn Drive should be re-consulted and provided with details of any proposed scheme, before implementation.

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

**1. listened to their request for the inclusion of Harlyn Drive in the proposed Northwood Hills Parking Management Scheme; and**

**2. asked officers to add the request for Harlyn Drive to be included within the proposed Northwood Hills Parking Management Scheme to the Council's future parking scheme programme for an informal consultation, when resources permitted.**

	<p><b>Reasons for recommendations</b></p> <p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and, if appropriate, add their request to the parking schemes programme.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered / risk management</b></p> <p>These were discussed with petitioners.</p>
4.	<p><b>PARKWAY, HILLINGDON - PETITION OPPOSING THE INTRODUCTION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>The item was deferred to a future meeting.</p>
5.	<p><b>PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF LIGHTING IN STONEFIELD PARK, SOUTH RUISLIP</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>The petitioner addressed the Cabinet Member, and highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety was the main concern and reason for submitting the petition.</li> <li>• Children and adults attending the nearby school were required to cross through the park. The park was unlit, and particularly during winter months, was very dark.</li> <li>• A number of offenses had been seen to take place within the park, including drugs and other antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• The park was used for a number of activities, including after school clubs, gym, and for travelling to events at the school.</li> <li>• In addition, parents attending the school in cars and parking in Cedar Avenue were restricting access to the park.</li> <li>• Lighting was required, though it was suggested that this could be at certain times of the day, rather than 24/7.</li> <li>• Making the park better lit and more welcoming would promote greater use among the community.</li> </ul> <p>Councillor Burrows read a statement from Ward Councillors, who were unable to attend in person. Points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Ward Councillors knew Stonefield Park extremely well, and had been very involved with the police in the Stonefield Park area, taking part in several knife sweeps and noting the clear evidence of potential drug dealing in the area. The Ward Councillors were regular visitors to the school for concerts and Christmas productions.</li> <li>• The local members of South Ruislip Residents Association monitored the park closely, and had been active in working in conjunction with Green Spaces to develop the children’s play area, the adventure equipment for older children, and the outdoor gym.</li> <li>• The ASB team were not always available when they had been contacted by the residents, therefore there had been no clear collection of evidence about safety issues concerning children going to and from school.</li> </ul>

- Ward Councillors felt that the Council should take into consideration the views of other stakeholders and the general principles used by the Council in similar parks in the Borough, to avoid setting a precedent.
- This park was unique as it had 5 open access/exits and Cedar Avenue was the only access to the school by road. Because of width and congestion, the road was not suitable for children to be dropped off and collected by parents and guardians.
- From examining the petition, alongside the supporting information of the report, it was clear that although the petitioners had a strong case for safety considerations, there were other elements to consider, for example:
  - The impact of street lighting on wildlife in the area;
  - The impact of leaking light pollution into the surrounding neighbourhood;
  - Dog walker's views, who made regular use of the park;
  - Any RAF issues that could arise leading to lighting disturbing the landing of aircraft;
  - Further feedback from the SNT;
  - Financial implications.
- In addition, it appeared that the school had only very recently taken up the offer of using the School Travel Team to investigate parents/guardians potential concerns about safety travelling to and from school.
- It was unclear whether lighting would be a positive addition to the safety and well-being of all stakeholders.
- Considering all points raised, it was clear that there was more work to be done to reach an amicable solution that involves all who used Stonefield Park.

The Cabinet Member listened to the petition, and addressed their points as follows:

- Regarding instances of crime recorded by the ASB, serious crimes such as drugs and violence would be recorded and dealt with by the Metropolitan Police.
- It was agreed that further work was required to ensure that all stakeholders were being consulted on how best to address the issues raised. This included RAF Northolt, who were holding a public meeting in the near future.

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

- 1. Listened to their concerns regarding Stonefield Park;**
- 2. Noted that the Council, in common with many other local authorities, generally does not retrospectively introduce artificial lighting within its established parks and open spaces;**
- 3. Noted that the allegations of drug dealing have been referred to the Police, as set out in the body of the report;**
- 4. Whilst welcoming the early engagement with Bourne Primary School referenced in the body of the report, asked Ward Members to further encourage the school to work with the Council's Road Safety and School Travel Team;**
- 5. Encouraged the petitioners themselves to offer to engage with the**

**school as part of this further dialogue.**

**Reasons for recommendations**

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss with petitioners their concerns and, if appropriate, add their request to the parking schemes programme.

**Alternative options considered / risk management**

These were discussed with petitioners.

---

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