

## Minutes

### PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

9 February 2023



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows (Chairman) Alan Chapman (Vice Chairman) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Adam Bennett Elizabeth Garelick Kamal Preet Kaur Peter Money (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers and Witnesses Present:</b> David Knowles, Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p>
43.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TO REPORT THE PRESENCE OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence; however it was noted that Councillor Kaur was absent. Councillor Kaur arrived at the beginning on item five.</p>
44.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
45.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 January 2023 be approved as a correct record.</p>
46.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED AS PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked Part 1 and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
47.	<p><b>PARKING ZONE INFORMATION REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Kaur arrived at the beginning of this item.</p> <p>David Knowles, Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects, was present for this item and introduced the report by noting the Committee's request to further understand if there had been an increase in, or if there was to be an anticipated increase in, parking</p>

pressures experienced on residential streets in the vicinity of the two Elizabeth Line stations in the Borough, West Drayton and Hayes & Harlington stations. It was highlighted that the Elizabeth Line had opened fairly recently and was overwhelmingly welcomed as its ability to allow fast access to central London would bring opportunity and prosperity to the areas around those stations. With the prospects brought in by the Elizabeth Line, it was expected that there would be an impact on the residents around the train stations, particularly in the form of parking pressures.

It was highlighted that parking restrictions in the area of the Borough covered by the Elizabeth Line stations had been in growing and developing for over two decades, and that there had been some recent interest in expanding these measures, for example in Coldharbour Lane and North Hyde Road, both within the vicinity of Hayes & Harlington station. In response to questions from the Committee, it was highlighted that although there was a heightened public interest in West Drayton and Hayes as a result of the Elizabeth Line, the immediate parking pressures brought on were not substantive due to the extensive existing parking management schemes and restrictions in those areas; it was noted that petitions from residents were a primary driver in determining what local appetite there was for parking restrictions and recent feedback from residents had only indicated a desire for modifications or extensions to existing restrictions such as an extension to the operating hours of certain schemes, as seen in Warwick Road, West Drayton. Members noted how changing commuter habits could start to change how parking restrictions were implemented as traditionally, one or two hours of restrictions during weekday day time would be enough to deter commuters from putting pressure on residential parking; however, this could change to more of an issue of overnight commuter parking.

The Committee noted how, in addition to potential parking pressures brought on by the introduction of the Elizabeth Line, there were also those who would leave their vehicle for an extended period of time in an area with few parking restrictions in order to catch a bus to Heathrow Airport, known as fly-parking. Officers noted that demand for parking restrictions was very much resident driven and it was not uncommon for prospective schemes to fall through as the resident demand, which had originally presented the issue, was no longer there upon consultation. For clarity, the Committee were informed of the usual process for implementing a new parking management scheme (PMS) and it was highlighted that this process could take a substantial amount of time. Officers explained that the first step towards a PMS was usually a petition being received from residents, the petition would then be heard by the relevant Cabinet Member at a petition hearing; the testimony from residents at a petition hearing would inform the direction of officers' consultation. It was noted that petitions usually took around three months to be heard, this was down from around nine months a number of years ago. The next step would most likely be an informal consultation with residents, feedback from the consultation would then go to the Cabinet Member through the democratic process and a publicly available report. Once the network of roads or area for a PMS is known, officers would draw up detailed designs for the PMS; following this, officers are prescribed by law to advertise in the local press and conduct a formal 21-day consultation. There would then be a formal Cabinet Member decision on the implementation of a PMS. If the Council did not follow this due process, a parking adjudicator could find that a PMS was not justified and should be dissolved. The Committee aired their frustration in the length of time required for the implementation of a PMS but understood the importance in due diligence when designing and implementing these kinds of parking restrictions legally.

The Committee heard how it was not unheard of for the Council to receive two petitions

that directly oppose each other with regard to local appetite for parking restrictions; and it was unfortunately common for the demand that existed when the petition was put together, to have dissipated when residents become aware of what such a scheme would entail. The Committee thanked officers for their work in implementing and upholding the most appropriate restrictions within a work area that could uncover opposing views and conflicts amongst residents.

**RESOLVED: That the Property, Highways & Transport Select Committee noted the contents of the report and provided comments to officers as necessary.**

48. **TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES INFORMATION REPORT** (*Agenda Item 6*)

David Knowles, Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects, was present for this item and introduced the report by noting that the link between this item and the previous one was that resident demand, often through the Council's petition process, was the primary driver behind the introduction of measures. It was initially highlighted for the benefit of residents' knowledge that the police were the only authority that could enforce speeding violations, and that safety cameras, often referred to as speeding cameras, could not be installed by local authorities, therefore requests for such cameras could not be followed up by the Council. There were a number of tools available to the Council in terms of mitigating the impact of speeding vehicles in the Borough as outlined in the report; one of these measures was the installation of vehicle activated signs (VAS), of which the Council had recently agreed the purchase of a new set of VAS and Members were encouraged to give their feedback as Ward Councillors as to suggestions for appropriate locations around the Borough for the new signs. It was noted that there was no legal process required to install a VAS which meant they were a relatively fast method of introducing traffic calming measures.

Speed tables were also discussed as another relatively common traffic calming measure in the Borough and an important tool at the Council's disposal to slow traffic. It was noted that these were often requested by residents by way of petition which was a useful technique for displaying resident support for such measures; however, a recent example was given as to a petition which requested the removal of speed tables that had been installed as a result of a request brought about by a previous petition, this was due to the noise created by HGVs, primarily lorries carrying skips, when they hit the speed tables. Members noted that the noise created by larger vehicles and HGVs when encountering speed tables was a burden for those residents living within the immediate vicinity of speed tables; Members were encouraged to galvanize residents into submitting a petition in those instances whereby they can directly suggest actions that they would like to see the Council take. Members discussed the parameters of speed tables and the viability of colouring them with yellows or reds to ensure their visibility and that drivers would associate them with a hazard. Officers noted that the parameters of speed tables were defined in legislation and as a duty of care, the Council must ensure that what is installed is fit for purpose; it was also added that the Council could consider installing coloured speed tables and had installed a number of coloured tables previously where there was either a red anti-skid coating on the top of the speed table or an entire zebra crossing installed upon the speed table, however it was noted that with coloured tarmac would come increased maintenance costs.

The Committee discussed concerns regarding motorists who ignored traffic restrictions with regard to banned movements/turns, speed limits and road markings. Officers noted the issue informing Members of local authorities' ability to enforce moving traffic contraventions which can use cameras to enforce issues such as parking on zig-zag

	<p>lines outside of schools and driving in bus lanes. Officers highlighted that local authorities were no longer allowed to undertake parking enforcement by camera, it was noted that this did add to the challenge of nuisance parking.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the typical timeframe between the receipt of a resident petition to the implementation of traffic calming measures, should the scenario warrant measures. Officers highlighted that traffic calming measures were often funded through Transport for London (TfL), whose revenue streams were badly impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, an impact that was still ongoing. As a result, a number of the traffic calming schemes devised over the years since the pandemic had to be redesigned or put on hold primarily due to finding a funding source for the measures. Officers informed the Committee that assurances had been given from TfL that a steady stream of funding could be expected over the coming years, possibly signalling a return to normality in terms of funding for traffic calming measures.</p> <p>By way of clarification, officers confirmed that Hillingdon was part of the London Lorry Control Scheme, a scheme that seeks viable routes for the movement of HGVs over a certain weight. It operates at night and at weekends on specific roads throughout London to minimise noise pollution. It was noted that historically, boroughs paid a fee to be part of the scheme and there was a perception amongst outer London boroughs that the focus of the scheme was entirely within the central boroughs, therefore Hillingdon chose to withdraw from the scheme. This changed when London Councils, the operators of the scheme, approached all of the London boroughs stating that they had increased their resources and that there would no longer be a fee for subscribing to the scheme, Hillingdon then chose to re-join the scheme. The Committee were encouraged that Hillingdon was part of the scheme and urged officers to do what they could in their communications with London Councils to ensure that HGVs avoided the quieter residential streets in the Borough.</p> <p>The Committee thanked officers for the detailed report and the breadth of work that they undertake in ensuring the Borough's roads are safe for both pedestrians and motorists.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Property, Highways &amp; Transport Select Committee noted the contents of the report and provided comments to officers as necessary.</b></p>
49.	<p><b>CABINET FORWARD PLAN</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Property, Highways and Transport Select Committee noted the Cabinet Forward Plan.</b></p>
50.	<p><b>WORK PROGRAMME</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>The Committee noted the work programme, and it was confirmed that officers were working on organising a site visit for the Committee to attend and observe the Council's Rhino Patch resurfacing machines as part of the Committee's major review into highways resurfacing. Members noted that they would like to see the site visit take place as soon as possible to ensure the review is completed in a timely manner.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Property, Highways and Transport Select Committee noted the Committee's work programme.</b></p>

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.19 pm.
---

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.