

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

1 February 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Jonathan Bianco</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Ryan Dell, Democratic Services Officer David Knowles, Head of Transportation Poonam Pathak, Head of Highways Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Ward Councillor Roy Chamdal Ward Councillor Farhad Choubedar Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne Ward Councillor Peter Smallwood</p>
9.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
10.	<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 of business were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
11.	<p>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED: <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p>
12.	<p>TEMPLE PARK, UXBRIDGE - PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF A "RESIDENTS' PERMIT" PARKING SCHEME <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>The Chairman considered a petition from residents requesting a residents' parking management scheme in Temple Park, Uxbridge.</p> <p>A petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Temple Park was a small cul-de-sac comprising six houses and eight flats;• Parking restrictions had been introduced in neighbouring roads hence residents from surrounding roads were now using Temple Park as a place to park free of charge;• Some cars were left for weeks on end and others were parked across driveways resulting in stress and confrontation;

- On occasion residents from surrounding roads parked on the pavements thereby blocking footpaths and endangering the residents of Temple Close one of whom was registered blind;
- Some people were using Temple Park as free airport parking then taking the A10 bus to the airport;
- Commercial vehicles and customers of the nearby Prince of Wales Pub also parked in Temple Park;
- Residents of Temple Park were often unable to park near their houses when returning late at night;
- The parking situation had led to an increase in crime – one resident's car had been hit twice by a hit and run driver and two catalytic converters had been stolen;
- A parking management scheme was being requested to resolve these issues – it was acknowledged that a proposed parking scheme had previously been rejected; however, at the time, residents of Temple Park had not fully understood the repercussions of the introduction of parking schemes in surrounding roads.

Ward Councillor Roy Chamdal was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member in support of petitioners. Councillor Chamdal reported that driving into and out of Temple Park was often challenging as cars were parked across driveways. Cars were also often parked outside the garages to the rear of the properties. The same cars and vans were frequently seen in Temple Park and sometimes parked there for prolonged periods of time. The residents of Temple Park took pride in their road and had a valid reason for bringing their petition before the Council.

The Cabinet Member sought clarification as to the hours of operation of the parking schemes in surrounding roads – it was confirmed that these were operational from 09:00 hours to 22:00 hours.

Having listened to the concerns of residents and the Ward Councillor, the Cabinet Member raised no objection to the introduction of the requested parking permit scheme in Temple Park and asked officers to devise a suitable scheme for consultation with residents. The Head of Transport and Projects suggested that a Residents' Only parking sign at the entrance to the road could be an effective measure. Yellow lines across individual driveways were not an option; however, white barways were a possibility. It was agreed that officers would devise a scheme which residents would be consulted on prior to implementation. It was noted that charges for parking permits were likely to increase in the near future. The garages to the rear would not form part of any scheme as they were privately owned.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1. met with petitioners and listened to their request for a Parking Management Scheme;**
- 2. noted the results of the previous consultations with residents of Temple Park, as detailed in the body of the report; and**
- 3. asked officers to add this request to the Council's extensive Parking Scheme Programme for further investigation and possible informal consultation.**

13. **PERMIT PARKING ZONE 'U8' UXBRIDGE - PETITION REQUESTING THAT PERMIT PARKING ZONE 'U8' BE MERGED WITH PERMIT PARKING ZONE 'U1'**
(Agenda Item 5)

The Chairman considered a petition from residents requesting the merge of Uxbridge permit parking zones U8 and U1.

The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member. Key points highlighted included:

- The petitioner had recently moved into the area and worked in the City – travelling home from Uxbridge station was proving challenging; particularly late at night;
- The petitioner usually had to walk home from the station and felt anxious when walking alone late at night – her parents did not drive therefore were unable to pick her up;
- Parking in the centre of Uxbridge or on a privately rented driveway was unaffordable;
- The merge of the two parking zones U8 and U1 was requested to resolve the issue as parking in zone U8 was very limited. An alternative solution would be the option for residents in U8 to buy a U1 parking permit;
- The Lead Petitioner's neighbours supported the proposal;
- There were only approximately 200 houses in zone U8 therefore the impact on zone U1 would be limited in terms of congestion;
- Bus services U10 and U9 were inadequate as the services were limited and did not run late at night.

Ward Councillor Farhad Choubedar was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member. Councillor Choubedar expressed his sympathy for the petitioner's predicament but did not feel the proposal would be beneficial and was therefore unable to support it. He felt the merge of the two zones would meet with opposition as most residents were happy with the status quo.

The Cabinet Member listened to the testimony of the Lead Petitioner and the Ward Councillor and confirmed that parking management schemes were intended to enable residents to park near their homes rather than close to public transport. It was suggested that one option open to the petitioner would be to purchase a parking permit for the multi-storey car park near Uxbridge Station.

It was recognised that the Borough was not particularly well-served in terms of buses; however, this matter lay outside the Council's control. It was noted that a petition was currently running with a request to extend the hours of the U1 zone. A merger of the two zones would require the agreement of residents in both zones and would likely be met with opposition from those in zone U1. It was therefore not possible to grant the petitioners' request on this occasion.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

1. **Met with petitioners and listened to their request for parking permit zone U8 to be merged with parking permit zone U1; and**
2. **Decided that officers should not take any further action in respect of the request.**

14.

EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP - REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF RAISED ZEBRA CROSSING (*Agenda Item 6*)

The Chairman considered a petition from residents requesting the removal of the raised zebra crossing in Eastcote Road, Ruislip.

The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member. Key points highlighted included:

- Petitioners had not requested a raised table in their original petition and this option had not been mentioned at the hearing with the previous Cabinet Member;
- In June 2021 officers had emailed petitioners proposing the option of a raised table but the matter had not been discussed further and residents had been shocked to read about the installation plans in the Uxbridge Gazette;
- Residents had subsequently received a letter on 7/2/22 stating that the installation of the raised table was about to commence. A sign had been adhered to a nearby lamp post but residents had not seen it – no other notification had been given;
- The original petition had been in relation to HGV traffic, but the current situation was worse than ever – the noise and vibrations caused by vehicles traversing the raised table was horrendous both day and night and residents were unable to sleep;
- Health and safety was an additional concern as, when HGVs and skips passed over the raised table, debris often flew off into residents' gardens or onto the pavement;
- Terrible flooding had been an issue following the installation of the ramp.

Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member expressing his sympathy for the residents. Councillor Corthorne noted that he had not been Ward Councillor for the area at the time of the installation. However, he had visited residents to discuss the matter since and now understood the issue. Councillor Corthorne agreed that the raised zebra crossing had resulted in noise and disturbance to neighbours. He queried whether residents had been fully made aware of its likely impact prior to installation and enquired whether a 'halfway house' solution could be reached at this point.

Ward Councillor Peter Smallwood was also in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member in support of residents. He emphasised the importance of ensuring residents understood the impact of raised tables and wondered if more could be done to ensure this. Councillor Smallwood also indicated that he would welcome a 'halfway house' solution.

The Cabinet Member listened to the concerns of residents and Ward Councillors and observed that he had not been the Cabinet Member when the original decision had been made. However, it was noted that urgent safety measures had been requested at the time to slow the traffic down and options had been somewhat limited. Vehicle activated signs were of limited use and it was not possible to install a barrier on such a major road.

It was noted that raised tables had to be built to a certain standard – it was possible to alter them, but this was not a straightforward matter. A wider ramp would potentially

reduce the impact on residents but would mean traffic could travel faster over it. It was confirmed that raised tables were expensive both to install and to remove.

The Head of Transportation addressed the Cabinet Member advising that the reinstallation of islands which would meet current standards was not an option in this case. It was acknowledged that the raised table had not been discussed at the original petition hearing. Officers had not intended to install something that was not wanted by residents, but alternatives had been very limited. Vertical or horizontal chicanes had been considered but these were usually installed outside villages and came with other consequences. Safety cameras were not an option as they fell under the remit of the Mayor of London rather than the Council. It was confirmed that conversations with HS2 and the ASB team had since taken place in relation to the skip lorries passing over the raised table, but little could be done to address this.

At the request of the Cabinet Member, it was agreed that the Head of Transportation would investigate both the drainage issue and the angle of the current ramp to ascertain if the latter was too steep and could be altered.

A resident was in attendance who reiterated the flooding issue which was reportedly at its worst outside number 271 - closest to the ramp. The Cabinet Member heard that the resident's house vibrated when large lorries passed over the hump at speed. The resident suggested that a higher ramp (such as that in Cuckoo Hill) would force vehicles to slow down.

In response to this it was confirmed that a steeper ramp would be likely to result in increased noise, whereas a longer raised table at a reduced angle would prove more effective in noise reduction.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

1. Met with petitioners and listened to their request for the removal of a raised zebra crossing on Eastcote Road, Eastcote;
2. Noted the previous petitions and communications from residents, requesting improvements to road safety in the area, as detailed within the body of the report;
3. Noted the benefit of the raised zebra crossing, as detailed in the report;
4. Considered the cost of removal of the zebra crossing, as outlined in the report;
5. Reviewed the work done to date by officers to investigate the concerns being raised by the petitioners, as provided within the report; and
6. Based on the above, instructed officers to investigate the issues raised in respect of drainage and the angle of the ramp to establish possible mitigation options and report back to the Cabinet Member.

15. **KINGSEND, PEMBROKE ROAD, WEST END ROAD, RUISLIP - REQUESTS FOR (I) TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES & (II) RESURFACING** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The Chairman considered two related petitions from residents requesting traffic calming measures and resurfacing in Kingsend, Pembroke Road and West End Road,

Ruislip.

The lead petitioner for both petitions was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member. Key points highlighted included:

- A presentation had been prepared by the lead petitioner a copy of which had been circulated to the Cabinet Member;
- The one mile stretch of road from Ruislip Manor to the White Bear Pub was heavily used and had now degraded to such a point that his house shook when HGVs passed along the road;
- Vehicles travelled at considerable speed along the long stretch of road and there was nothing to remind them of the speed restrictions.

The Cabinet Member listened to the concerns of the petitioner and invited officers to comment further.

The Head of Transportation confirmed that TfL would be requested to explore the efficiency of the junction in question.

The Head of Highways stated that a site inspection had been carried out in this location. Condition data was routinely collected every two years and was considered along with other factors to inform the forward plan. Monthly inspections were also carried out. It was confirmed that the road in question was not considered a high priority at this stage but would continue to be monitored regularly.

The Cabinet Member noted that speed cameras did not fall within the remit of the Council. It was suggested that vehicle activated signs could help as they reminded people to slow down in accordance with the 30mph speed limit.

Ward Councillor Peter Smallwood was in attendance and addressed the Cabinet Member commenting that he would not welcome raised tables in this location, nor would he recommend the re-routing of buses. However, he supported the idea of speed surveys which could be undertaken prior to installing signs then again at a later stage to establish if the signs were making a difference. Councillor Smallwood confirmed that he would continue to push for resurfacing in the location in question.

Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne was also in attendance and observed that there were issues with drain capacity in the area in question which gave rise to flooding – this could negatively impact on the condition of the road.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that he was happy for speed surveys to be undertaken and recommended that locations be agreed between the Head of Transportation and the lead petitioner. Subject to the results of the surveys, vehicle activated signs could be an option – cameras and humps would not be feasible. The Cabinet Member noted that the condition of the road would continue to be monitored but the Council had to prioritise those roads that were most in need of repair.

The lead petitioner confirmed that he would welcome vehicle activated signs and confirmed that cameras and humps were not being requested. He acknowledged that the current pot holes did not violate standards but asked that the quality of the road be considered in the context of the tolerance required given the heavy HGV use. The Head of Highways confirmed that such matters were factored in, and inspections were risk-based. In respect of the drainage issues, it was confirmed that Thames Water would hopefully be addressing this matter in the near future. The lead petitioner

highlighted an area at the back of Waitrose where the drain regularly erupted – it was agreed that further details would be provided to the Head of Highways outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1. With regard to the first petition (traffic calming):**
 - a. met with petitioners and listened to their request for traffic calming measures on Kingsend, Pembroke Road and West End Road, Ruislip;**
 - b. noted the request for the provision of ‘speed cameras’ – more formally ‘road safety cameras’ and informed residents that these were not under the jurisdiction of the Council;**
 - c. invited petitioners to consider whether they had alternative suggestions to be considered to address their concerns over speeding vehicles;**
 - d. instructed officers to consider the undertaking of 24/7 speed and vehicle classification surveys and asked petitioners to liaise with the Head of Transportation to identify locations for these); and**
 - e. subject to the outcome of the surveys, instructed officers to undertake further investigations and report back; and**

With regard to the second petition, seeking road resurfacing at the same junction:

- a. noted the letter sent to the lead petitioner by the Head of Highways, details of which had been included within the report;**
- b. subject to the above, listened to the testimony of the petitioners on the subject of resurfacing and further clarification from the Head of Highways on the Council’s resurfacing prioritisation regime. Highways officers to investigate the flooding concerns at the junction; and**
- c. welcomed the offer from TfL to explore the efficiency of the junction in question.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.24 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.