

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

7pm, 7 December 2022

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
Uxbridge, UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Cabinet Member Present: Councillors Jonathan Bianco</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Jones, Democratic Services Apprentice Steve Austin, Transportation David Knowles, Transportation</p>	
1.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
2.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were in Part I and would 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>PETITION REQUESTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS FOR NON-RESIDENTS ON THE GREENWAY [ICKENHAM] TO REDUCE TRAFFIC. (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman considered a petition from residents requesting parking restrictions to reduce non-residential parking on the Greenway, [Ickenham] to reduce traffic and improve road safety.</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner was in attendance and raised a number of points, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Greenway was a residential road but also contained a few shops that backed up onto the Greenway.• There was a petition back in 2000 on the Greenway which requested the installation of yellow line restrictions.• Safety was ultimately the biggest concern for the Lead Petitioner and fellow residents and noted the presence of families in the locality.• Recent increases in traffic had potentially resulted from the Greenway's close proximity to West Ruislip station but also HS2 construction workers placed nearby, as referenced in	

paragraphs 3-6 of the officer report. The overspill of HS2 workers' parking had been particularly prevalent at the section of the Greenway which contained free parking, except between the hours of 10-11am.

- These factors noted by the Lead Petitioner had resulted in shop entrances being blocked but also resident driveways and private access points. This had the knock-on effect of reducing the forward visibility for residents when exiting their driveways that had resulted in near misses and damage only accidents.
- Further to this, the Lead Petitioner communicated that there had been incidents of altercations between the residents and individuals blocking their driveways. It was mentioned that, in connection with this, examples of potential anti-social behaviour had occurred. As a result, residents had been forced to install CCTV cameras at their own expense in order to deter and potentially document such behaviour.
- The Lead Petitioner also referenced the 2007 development of Buckland Court, whose residents had also experienced issues with parking. It was said that 415 flats were built here with 468 parking spaces also. However, the Lead Petitioner reported that a number of people living at these premises had more than one car but only one car parking space and therefore took advantage of the free parking on the Greenway outside of the current times of operation.
- It was concluded by the Lead Petitioner in his statement to the Chairman that, in order to combat the issues mentioned effectively and make the road safer for residents, petitioners had requested that parking restrictions ought to be increased to 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the afternoon. It was also inferred that another potential remedy could be to introduce a resident's permit scheme for the section of the Greenway which currently offers non-discriminatory free parking.

Councillor Eddie Lavery, Ward Councillor for Ickenham & South Harefield, affirmed his support for the petitioners stating that:

- The Greenway's close proximity to West Ruislip station, combined with the development at Buckland Court and ongoing HS2 works had all contributed to significant problems for residents.
- In additional regard to HS2 difficulties, Councillor Lavery noted that these problems were due to worsen as peak construction would occur next year. Moreover, the Council lacked any enforcement powers in terms of instructing HS2 workers on suitable on-site parking facilities.
- Councillor Lavery argued that two potential resolutions were available to petitioners. Firstly, a residents parking scheme (which he acknowledged had several challenges associated with and costs etc). Secondly, a different set of hours for parking restrictions, as proposed by the Lead Petitioner, could help to solve the issues at hand.
- An experimental traffic order was also highlighted as a possible solution, which would coincide with HS2 peak construction in the short term and looked at again once HS2 works had slowed as a

potential long-term fix.

- It was also noted that new parking at West Ruislip Golf Course could have helped with the problems identified within the petition.

The Chairman accepted the remarks made by the Lead Petitioner and Councillor Lavery, and responded to these with the following points:

- A resident's parking zone usually required a large area in order to function correctly.
- In reference to Councillor Lavery's temporary but also potentially permanent proposal for an experimental traffic order, pledged further investigation into this as well as the other suggestions made by the Lead Petitioner.
- The Chairman asked officers if stress surveys were necessary and whether a resident's parking zone was located nearby to the area in question which could incorporate areas of the Greenway.

Officers acknowledged the points made by the Lead Petitioner and Councillor Lavery and accepted these as valuable suggestions, particularly the extension of parking restriction hours for residents, which would require further investigation. Officers also informed the Chairman that there was no residents parking scheme nearby.

The Chairman, in reference to Councillor Lavery's proposal to address the issues associated with HS2 works, reiterated its temporary nature but also prospect as a permanent solution and agreed that further investigation into this was required.

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1. met with petitioners and listened to their request to either extend the operational times of the existing waiting restrictions or to implement a possible Parking Management Scheme; and,**
- 2. subject to the above, asked officers to add this request to the Council's extensive Parking Scheme Programme for further investigation and possible informal consultation.**

Reasons for decision

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

Alternative options considered and rejected

None at this stage.

5.

PETITION REQUESTING ZONE E PARKING PERMITS FOR RESIDENTS ON FIELD END ROAD. *(Agenda Item 5)*

The Chairman considered a petition from residents requesting Zone E parking permits for residents on Field End Road.

The Lead Petitioner was in attendance and made a number of points, including:

- Reminded the Chairman that he had also submitted the same petition 5 years prior. It was highlighted that a parking stress survey was conducted, which was to assess the parking capacity in Zone E. The Lead Petitioner alleged that the Council communicated to him and fellow petitioners suggesting they could see no reason why petitioners were not included in the Residents' Parking Scheme.
- However, the Lead Petitioner divulged that after consultation with ward Councillors at the time of the previous petition, the decision was changed to not include the petitioners in the Residents' Parking Scheme.
- The Lead Petitioner highlighted that he had made contact with his local Member of Parliament [Mr David Simmonds CBE] over this petition who supported the Lead Petitioners concerns and suggested that he submit another petition to the Council on the matter.

The Chairman accepted the contextualisation to the petition provided by the Lead Petitioner and confirmed the Lead Petitioner's assertion that the Ward Councillors representing residents at the time had decided against the petitioners being incorporated into the Zone E Residents' Parking Scheme. Furthermore, the Chairman reminded those present that Field End Road at the time had been shared between 2 wards which meant 6 Councillors were involved in the original consultation and decision. To juxtapose the Member of Parliament for Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner; the Chairman noted that the Residents' Parking Scheme in question related to the streets off Field End Road and not to Field End Road itself as it had a different scheme.

Officers seconded the Chairman's remarks and clarified that Field End Road uniquely possessed a hybrid parking scheme as it allowed for free 'stop and shop' and 'pay and display' parking between certain hours and also awarded residents above the flats in this vicinity with permits to park in nearby car parks. Further to this, officers pointed out that if the petitioners were to join the Zone E Resident's Parking Scheme as requested, the current permissions would be rescinded.

The Lead Petitioner accepted the statements made by the Chairman and officers on the matter but, in additional regard to earlier remarks on the previous petition that he had submitted, questioned the purpose and intention behind the parking stress survey report that was conducted if the Council didn't originally sympathise with the petitioner's request.

The Chairman responded to the Lead Petitioner’s query and argued that the original parking stress survey was justified in the way that it allowed officers to explore possibilities. The Chairman also informed the Lead Petitioner that he would have to give this matter a bit more thought but also that he was encouraged by the fact that residents were currently allowed to use nearby car parks free of charge.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) met with petitioners and listened to their request to be entitled to join “Zone E” residential parking scheme and any comments made by Ward Councillors.
- 2) Noted the results of the previous parking stress surveys undertaken and the views expressed at the time by the Ward Councillors.
- 3) Agreed to discuss the matter with the Cabinet Member for Residents’ Services; and,
- 4) subject to the outcome of the above, would decide if officers should add this request to the Council’s extensive Parking Scheme Programme for further investigation.

Reasons for decision

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

Alternative options considered and rejected

None at this stage.

6. PETITION SEEKING FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES TO THE MODUS OPERANDUM OF THE CAR PARKING PAY AND DISPLAY ARRANGEMENTS. (Agenda Item 6)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition from local businesses requesting fundamental changes to the modus operandi of the car parking pay and display arrangements.

The Lead Petitioner was present and made a number of points, including:

- That they had been in correspondence with the Parking Management Team at the Council since the petition’s original submission in 2020 and that several site visits had been carried out.
- Informed the Chairman that when the petition was first submitted that there was no facility in place to process tickets and log registration numbers for ‘stop and shop’ parking in the locality. As a result of this, the scheme was alleged to have been widely abused, which had the knock-on effect of causing long queues

on Uxbridge Road and as a result, the disruption of traffic flow. This was compounded by the fact that the houses located at the back of the parade had restricted access, and therefore also got stuck on Uxbridge Road.

- Traffic congestion was reported to have been particularly bad after 5pm and Sundays were the busiest days for the Lead Petitioner and fellow small business owners in the area.
- Significant health and safety concerns were expressed by petitioners, which stemmed from the issues reported in this petition.
- The Lead Petitioner disclosed that he had carried out his own research comparisons with neighbouring boroughs and their approach to similar situations. He reported to the Chairman that Hounslow West had experienced a similar incident, which they had responded to by extending the restricted parking hours (as requested by the Lead Petitioner in that case).
- Emphasised that small independent traders were those primarily suffering from the current parking arrangements outlined within the petition.

Officers clarified with the Chairman that the current scheme operated from Monday-Saturday [8:00am to 6:30pm] and that the Lead Petitioner wanted to extend this to [8:00am to 8:00pm everyday].

The Chairman acknowledged this and also the Lead Petitioner's remarks in relation to reports of people taking advantage of the 30 minutes free parking that the Council offered at the location in question. It was also declared that various solutions were currently being explored to the problems mentioned by the Lead Petitioner and that cooperation with the Parking Management Team was required. The Chairman pondered the possibility of using a temporary traffic order in the short term but asserted that before any solutions could be agreed/ instructed, post-meeting discussions with officers would have to be held.

The Chairman proceeded to ask the Ward Councillor for Belmore, Councillor Labina Basit to speak on the petition. Councillor Basit made the following arguments in support of the petition:

- Echoed the Lead Petitioner's statements as she had lived experience of the issues at hand, especially in regard to traffic congestion when entering or exiting the parade, which had also proliferated into the sideroads. This was a particular concern for the Councillor as she mentioned that this was causing difficulties for emergency vehicle access.
- Pointed out that problems reported were exacerbated after 5pm, and principally on a Saturday evening when people were alleged to be parking without restrictions, which resulted in actual customers struggling to find spaces and consequently deterring future visits.
- Divulged that a senior figure in the ASB sub-department of the Council had carried out a site visit and witnessed the issues reported by petitioners.
- Councillor Basit summarised by echoing the Lead Petitioner's

request for extending the parking restriction times but also suggested a parking stress survey which could provide helpful data.

The Chairman accepted the points made by Councillor Basit but juxtaposed the Councillor's proposals for a parking stress survey. The Chairman also mentioned:

- Ongoing discussions for a new car pound in the Borough which could serve as an additional deterrent to those taking advantage of the Council's parking schemes.
- Accepted the concerns expressed by the Lead Petitioner and Councillor Basit, but remarked that there appeared to be two separate issues which would warrant further investigation and collaboration with the Parking Team.
- Hinted that some problems had been known to have been caused by shopkeepers themselves in the past by taking up available spaces with goods vehicles etc.

In regard to the Chairman's point about previous examples of shopkeeper contributions to parking problems, Councillor Basit responded that, in this instance, quite a few of the shop owners had allocated parking on the backstreets and thus, were not at fault for the issues reported by the petitioners.

The Lead Petitioner confirmed Councillor Basit's argument and reiterated that parking in front of the shops on the parade was the main issue.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1. met with petitioners and listened to their request to amend the times and days of operation that the existing 'Stop and Shop' parking scheme operates.**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the above, asked officers to add this request to the Council's extensive Parking Scheme Programme for possible informal consultation with business occupiers and residents in an area agreed with local Ward Councillors; and,**
- 3. noted the suggestion that required a vehicle registration number to be added when purchasing a ticket from a pay and display machine and advised petitioners that this was being investigated separately and was outside the remit of this report.**

Reasons for decision

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

	<p>Alternative options considered and rejected</p> <p>None at this stage.</p>	
7.	<p>PETITION IN REGARD TO SPEEDING NEAR CRANFORD DRIVE AND CROWLAND AVENUE. (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>The Cabinet Member considered a petition from residents in regard to speeding near Cranford Drive and Crowland Avenue.</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner was present and made a number of points, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had spoken to many residents and acknowledged that 20 signatures would have sufficed in order to validate the petition; however, the Lead Petitioner wanted to convey the strength of feeling from residents towards the matters contained within the petition. • Noted that she had sent in additional photographic evidence in support of the petition. • Remarked that she was surprised at the fact that none of the accidents witnessed had been included in any police reports. <p>The Chairman enquired as to whether the problems were originating from both directions and whether parking on the road was unrestricted.</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner responded that problems were coming from both directions and also referred to the photo evidence she had submitted, which served to reinforce her argument. The Lead Petitioner also informed the Chairman that pedestrians had been struggling to cross the road and that it was only small/narrow, which amplified the problems caused by reports of HGVs and vans parking on the road. The Lead Petitioner stipulated that extending the existing double yellow lines could help combat this primary interest of hers.</p> <p>The Chairman accepted the concerns of the Lead Petitioner and mentioned that 20mph zones and speed tables had been previously employed to remedy similar concerns, but that there had been several significant drawbacks to the installation of these. It was also emphasised by the Chairman that there would be substantial difficulty to finding an appropriate solution that would completely eradicate the problems reported.</p> <p>The Chairman invited a fellow petitioner who was present to speak. They made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaffirmed her support for the Lead Petitioner. • Disclosed that she had witnessed an incident on the road where an emergency vehicle could not get through. • Had experienced these issues from a pedestrian perspective and that safety had been her main worry in this regard. These concerns were extended to children and families who were present in the area. • Declared that the yellow lines warranted examination by the 	

Council as they were alleged to have been causing problems, particularly on the bend / 'blind corner' between 16-20 Cranford Drive, as seen on the site map attached to the officer report.

- Suggested that a Residents Parking Scheme could alleviate some of the issues at hand.

The Chairman recognised the points made by the co-petitioner and accepted the assertion that extending yellow lines would have cleared the roads in question. However, the Chairman highlighted that this would have also likely resulted in increased speeding as cars parked on both sides tends to serve as natural speed-calming for motorists. The Chairman pledged further investigation into the matters raised by petitioners and also acknowledged the support for the petition from Pinkwell Ward Councillor's that was communicated by Councillor Kuldeep Lakhmana via email prior to the hearing.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1. met with petitioners and listened to their concerns regarding speeding near Cranford Drive and Crowland Avenue [Hayes].**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of the above, asked officers to undertake 24/7 speed and vehicle classification surveys to determine the extent of the issues on Cranford Drive and Crowland Avenue [Hayes]; and,**
- 3. subject to the outcome of surveys, instructed officers to investigate the possible measures to calm traffic on Cranford Drive and Crowland Avenue.**

Reasons for decision

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

Alternative options considered and rejected

None at this stage.

**8. PETITION REQUESTING SPEED MEASURES IN LONG DRIVE.
(Agenda Item 8)**

The Cabinet Member considered a petition from residents requesting speed measures in Long Drive.

The Lead Petitioner was present and made a number of points, including:

- Enquired as to whether the Chairman had received photographic evidence submitted by the Lead Petitioner prior to the hearing and proceeded to pass these images on in person for the Chairman's viewing. These photos evidenced an incident

that occurred on Long Drive which served as the catalyst behind the Lead Petitioner's motivation for the petition request. The Lead Petitioner informed the Chairman that both cars involved were written off as a result of the collision on Long Drive.

- Discussed how there was a strong sense of feeling amongst residents surrounding the issues highlighted in the petition and noted that three petitions had previously been submitted to the Council which concerned the same problem and requested similar measures.
- Informed the Chairman that it was worrying that there had already been three previous petitions on the same issue and what appeared to be insufficient Council action to date on the matter. Communicated that the safety of his family, as well as that of his neighbours was the primary reason behind the petition and referenced the Council's duty to care of its residents in support of this.

The Chairman accepted the points made by the Lead Petitioner and in response, emphasised that the Police, as opposed to the Council hold jurisdiction and enforcement powers in relation to speeding. It was advised by the Chairman to the petitioners present that communication be established and maintained with the Police when concerned with speeding matters. The Chairman also enquired as to whether the speeding was occurring in both directions.

The Lead Petitioner accepted the comments made by the Chairman but reaffirmed his desire for action in order to combat the apparent speeding. The Lead Petitioner, in response to the Chairman's question; suggested that speeding was indeed happening in both directions and that this encompassed all types of vehicles; motorbikes were also alleged to have been using Long Drive as a road for doing wheelies.

Officers asked the Lead Petitioner to expand on the police response to the speeding collision raised and invited the Lead Petitioner and the Ward Councillor present to collaborate on potential locations for speed surveys.

The Chairman seconded the officer's invite and the complexities highlighted by the Lead Petitioner. Further to this however, the Chairman reminded the Lead Petitioner those potential solutions would also contain significant drawbacks. For example, the installation of speed tables would be problematic due to the topography of Long Drive and would also hinder emergency vehicle access. Moreover, a Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) would not necessarily deter speeding as some motorists had been known to unfortunately ignore such signs. The Chairman asserted that data collection and subsequent analysis ought to be the first action taken and furthermore, that contact be made with the police once evaluation of this quantification had been carried out.

The Chairman asked the Ward Councillor for South Ruislip present, Councillor Steve Tuckwell to speak on the petition. Councillor Tuckwell made the following points:

- Declared that fellow South Ruislip Ward Councillors were also in support of the petition.
- Acquainted the Chairman with the fact that the North Eastern half of Long Drive already had raised tables. Further to this, Councillor Tuckwell explained that the driver entrance to Queen’s Walk was somewhat of a curtailed journey due to the presence of these speed tables, but that as soon as these were passed, drivers sped up for the remainder of Long Drive (South Western section).
- Reported that the police had referenced this at one of their Ward Panel meetings, which Ward Councillors attended quarterly. Additionally, that the Police had been active in Community Speed Watch campaigns but agreed that there should be increased action.
- Informed the Chairman that Long Drive was known to be used as a ‘rat run’ by motorists.
- Echoed the Lead Petitioner that the main concern was community safety, compounded by the presence of numerous nearby schools.
- Suggested a VAS sign and other possible deterrents to address the issue of speeding.

The Chairman accepted the points made by Councillor Tuckwell and reiterated the need for cooperation with police on this matter as well as his concern surrounding the over-population of speed tables in the Borough.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) met with petitioners and listened to their request for traffic calming in Long Drive, South Ruislip.
- 2) Noted the background of previous petitions and work done to date on Long Drive, as detailed within the body of the report.
- 3) Subject to the outcome of the above, asked officers to undertake 24/7 speed and vehicle classification surveys to determine the extent of the issues on Long Drive; and,
- 4) subject to the outcome of surveys, instructed officers to investigate the possible measures to calm traffic on Long Drive.

Reasons for decision

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

Alternative options considered and rejected

None at this stage.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.11 pm.

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