

Minutes

PETITION HEARING - CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

07 September 2023

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Jonathan Bianco</p> <p>Officers Present: Steve Austin, Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager Ryan Dell, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Ward Councillors Present: Councillor Jan Sweeting Councillor Scott Farley Councillor Eddie Lavery Councillor Jagjit Singh</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 the business of the meeting would take place 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 PERMITS AND TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON NORTH ROAD, WEST DRAYTON <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>The Cabinet Member considered a petition requesting parking permits and traffic calming measures on North Road, West Drayton.</p> <p>Councillor Jan Sweeting addressed the Cabinet Member as Ward Councillor for West Drayton, and noted the following points:</p> <p>There were two issues affecting North Road, speeding and parking.</p> <p>The issue of parking had three facets: firstly, parking had been adversely affected by the new Elizabeth Line. North Road currently offered free parking for commuters wanting to use the Elizabeth Line and also offered a route through Drayton Garden Village and Holly Gardens to West Drayton Station. Secondly, there were people parking in West Drayton and travelling to Heathrow Airport, avoiding existing strict parking restrictions elsewhere in the area. For example,</p>

Porters Way had an existing Parking Management Scheme and Mulberry Parade had a partial Parking Management Scheme. Thirdly, there was a large development in Drayton Garden Village which had its own parking spaces, whereby visitors were not allowed to park, which had led to people parking in nearby roads such as North Road. The Ward Councillor supported the residents, and noted that North Road was a long road, and so any consultation on a Parking Management Scheme should seek to split the road into parts, as was the case in Mulberry Crescent.

On the issue of speeding, there were two roundabouts and a sharp bend close by and North Road was used as a cut through from Porter's Way to Sipson Road. Residents had met with their MP a year previously, at which the main issue presented was speeding. Previous speed and traffic surveys had been carried out over a week, and it was suggested that any future surveys be conducted over a longer period of time. It was noted that speed tables may not be suitable for North Road, but signs such as Vehicle Activated Signs may be appropriate.

The Cabinet Member noted Parking Management Schemes often crept onto other roads, and that there were concerns around the Drayton Garden Village area, especially with regard to visitor parking. Residents needed to park somewhere and traffic surveys could look at different areas of the road. It was noted that residents would be aware of the charge for parking permits, and it was also acknowledged that parking for Heathrow Airport was getting worse.

Officers clarified that previous speed and traffic surveys has been undertaken in October 2022, and that these were conducted 24 hours a day over seven full days.

It was noted that speed activated signs were a possible solution; speed cameras were not under the Council's authority; 'rumble strips' were often not popular with residents; and speed bumps were also often unpopular due to unintended consequences such as increased noise.

Councillor Scott Farley also attended as Ward Councillor, and made the following points:

There was also an issue of motorcycles speeding in the area. The option of a give-way section or chicanes in the road was suggested, although suitability was highlighted as a consideration. It was requested that, if traffic surveys were to be undertaken, that they are completed over a longer period than 7-10 days, such as 14 days.

The Cabinet Member noted that Parking Management Schemes often had the unintended consequence of reducing the amount of available parking, and noted the consideration of how much reliance there was currently on on/ off-street parking.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Listened to petitioners' request for the Council to implement traffic calming measures and a Parking Management Scheme in North Road;**
- 2) Noted the results of the previous 24/7 independent speed and traffic**

surveys undertaken in North Road;

3) Noted the results of previous consultations on options to manage parking in North Road; and

4) Asked officers to commission independent 24/7 traffic and speed surveys on North Road at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors, and to add the request for a Parking Management Scheme programme to the Council's extensive forward programme.

5. **REQUEST FOR TRAFFIC CALMING - EDINBURGH DRIVE, ICKENHAM** (*Agenda Item 5*)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition requesting traffic calming in Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham.

A written representation had been received from the lead petitioner:

The petitioner had lived in The Paddock, on the corner with Edinburgh Drive since 2016. It was a quiet, residential road where residents had driveways and permit parking outside their houses. These bays were usually full which narrowed both roads to a single lane and cars weaved to pass each other.

In the previous seven years that the petitioner had lived here, they had noticed a substantial increase in the traffic on Long Lane where cars travelled from the A40, through Ickenham and on towards Ruislip. Daily, it was common for drivers to come off of the A40 and hit standstill traffic, causing increase frustration. Cutting down Edinburgh Drive was an easy way round some of this traffic, but by the time cars reached this cut-through they would have already been queueing for some time and so typically, they would pull into Edinburgh Drive, round the bend by Douay Martyrs school and accelerate rapidly where there is a straight stretch of road. It was estimated that drivers would hit their top speed as they raced by The Paddock.

The Cabinet Member was informed of the petitioner's personal tragedy whereby their 2-year-old pet cat was hit by a driver who did not stop, and subsequently died of her injuries the following day.

It was time for a review of the traffic on Edinburgh Drive, given its proximity to a large secondary school and residential properties, which suggested that a 30mph speed limit, even if this was adhered to which the petitioner felt it was often not, was too high to protect the school children, residents and beloved family pets of the local neighbourhood.

Councillor Eddie Lavery attended as Ward Councillor for Ickenham and South Harefield, and made the following points:

Edinburgh Drive was a potential cut-through from Long Lane. It was a busy road and there was a large school nearby. Traffic surveys would be a good guide as to what solutions may be appropriate. It was noted that the school currently did not engage with the Council's school transport team, but they would be encouraged to do so.

The Cabinet Member noted that letters had recently gone out to all Hillingdon schools

to encourage them to engage with the Council's school transport team. Officers added that all Hillingdon schools were invited to participate in road safety schemes such as 'Bikeability' training, pedestrian training. Engagement on the school travel plan could lead to additional funding from Transport for London. Officers would follow up with Douay Martyrs.

The Cabinet Member noted that 20mph zones were sometimes implemented in close proximity to schools, and this could be investigated here for part of the road. Locations for traffic surveys would be discussed with petitioners and Ward Councillors.

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Listened to petitioners' request for the Council to introduce measures to reduce the speed of traffic on Edinburgh Drive; and**
- 2) Asked officers to commission independent 24/7 traffic and speed surveys on Edinburgh Drive at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors.**

6. SPEED CALMING MEASURES ON MANOR WAY, RUISLIP (*Agenda Item 6*)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition requesting speed calming on Manor Way, Ruislip.

The lead petitioner addressed the Cabinet Member and made the following points:

The petitioner had lived in Manor Way for three years and the road was becoming increasingly family-focused, while it had previously been home to a majority of elderly residents. The influx of younger families was partly due to the close proximity to schools and shops. Safety of pedestrians and drivers was paramount.

Manor Way was often used as a cut-through between Eastcote Road and the local High Street, particularly at peak hours but often at high speeds. The petitioner was not anti-driver but concerned about safety. The local Safer Neighbourhoods was noted.

Traffic surveys had not been completed since 2017, and new surveys would be welcomed. Warrender Primary School, which was located nearby, had recently requested speed measures as speed was presenting a problem for school children.

There were blind spots on the junction of West Hatch Manor and Windmill Hill.

The fact that there had been only three recorded incidents was surprising.

The Cabinet Member noted that Police Safer Neighbourhood teams could lend speed guns that could help to identify specific problem locations. This could be arranged through Ward Councillors.

A statement had been received from Councillor Philip Corthorne as Ward Councillor for Ruislip:

Councillor Corthorne had spoken to the petitioner previously and recently

undertaken a short site meeting.

Councillor Corthorne has written to the Cabinet Member in early August to suggest that the current situation may lend itself to some informal dialogue to discuss the problems and what kind of measures may or may not be appropriate at this location. It was thought that the prompt scheduling of bring this petition to a hearing had rendered this unnecessary/ inappropriate.

Councillor Corthorne had read the officer report and noted that the 2017 speed surveys had pre-dated him as Ward Councillor for this part of Ruislip. The comments of one resident, which had been reproduced in full in the report, was a reminder that there were differing viewpoints on this matter, and Councillor Corthorne would not favour speed humps.

Nevertheless, concerns which had given rise to the petition should not be dismissed out of hand and the Councillor Corthorne would favour fresh speed surveys to help determine whether the situation had changed significantly since 2017.

The petitioners themselves recognise that the area places constraints on what measures are possible, but they would welcome dialogue on their concerns and possible outcomes. It was hoped that the petition hearing would be a starting point to this, and Councillor Corthorne would follow up with residents after the meeting.

The Cabinet Member noted the issue at the junction of Manor Way and Windmill Way and highlighted that improved sightlines often led to more speeding. It was further noted that parked cars often deterred speeding. Locations for possible speed surveys were discussed with the petitioner. It was noted that speed humps often had the unintended consequence of more noise, and that while some residents may favour them in principle, residents often did not want them directly outside their own property. The possibility of signs or speed limit reminders was noted. It was noted that 20 mph speed limits were often only implemented near schools.

The petitioner re-iterated that they were not anti-driver, and that they would happily defer to the transport experts.

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listens to their request for “speed calming measures” on Manor Way, Ruislip;**
- 2) Noted the concerns raised by a resident concerning the petition;**
- 3) Noted the results of the previous speed and traffic surveys undertaken in July 2017; and**
- 4) Asked officers to commission independent 24/7 traffic and speed surveys on Manor Way at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors.**

7.

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PARKING ARRANGEMENTS IN MARVELL AVENUE, HAYES (*Agenda Item 7*)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition requesting a review of parking arrangements in Marvell Avenue, Hayes.

Petitioners addressed the Cabinet Member and made the following points:

There was an issue of parking at the end of the road, near numbers 104, 102, 87, 94 etc., where there was a hedge and gate. There was a curved 'T' shape at this end of the road and an issue of parking on the curved kerbs.

There was currently an informal 'no parking' sign in front of the hedge/ gate, but this was not always adhered to, which resulted in the road being bisected in two. This also made it more difficult for drivers to access or leave their driveways.

Delivery vehicles were not so much of an issue, but non-resident parking was an issue. A related problem was that residents often did not know who was parking inappropriately, and so residents could not ask people to move their cars.

Petitioners were requesting a marked outline so that drivers knew where it was acceptable to park.

Currently, residents parked with one wheel on the pavement and one wheel beside the kerb. This presented an issue as drivers often parked their vehicles too far inside the road, narrowing the road space. This was especially an issue if multiple cars were parked too far inside the road, which would also cause concerns for waste collection vehicles or delivery drivers, who may have to enter driveways to manoeuvre or reverse all the way out of the road, posing a danger to any children playing or pedestrians walking by.

Petitioners were requesting formal parking measures at the end of the road. Petitioners did not want to lose kerbside parking but wanted better-specified areas to park. One option would be yellow or red lines along the hedge/ gate, not the whole road. This hedge/ gate was not privately owned and did not lead anywhere. Another option would be marked parking bays on the edge of the kerb.

Petitioners clarified that they did not want resident-only parking and were only requesting marked bays towards the end of Marvell Avenue.

Officers noted that there had been informal footway parking introduced in November 1989, but these bays were no longer legally compliant to current standards. Petitioners noted that the remnants of former marked parking bays were still somewhat visible, but these were not adhered to.

Councillor Jagjit Singh addressed the Cabinet Member as Ward Councillor for Belmore, and noted the following points:

Councillor Singh supported the residents' petition and noted support for remarking the parking lines if possible.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that there was a question of what powers the Council had in terms of implementing a resolution. Yellow lines may be a hindrance if they were placed along the entirety of the road. Remarking the parking bays may lead to fewer available spaces if there had been changes in the required standards. Marked bays would not limit who could park in them. It was noted that a resident's parking scheme

would require the involvement of several roads and may lead to less available parking.

Officers suggested that a site visit take place to aid understanding of the issues.

Petitioners clarified that cars often parked too far into the road, whereby one wheel was on the kerb and one in the road. If these cars parking further onto the kerbside, this would aid access and egress. The petitioners submitted photographic evidence to officers.

The Cabinet Member asked and petitioners clarified that this was all all-day everyday problem, with no obvious times where the issues were more prevalent. Councillor Singh suggested that an evening site visit would better demonstrate the issues. It was noted that notice would be given before the site visit took place.

Petitioners further noted that by the hedge/ gate, drivers often parking along this gate, blocking adjacent driveways. Officers suggested residents register dropped kerbs with the parking enforcement team.

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listens to their request for parking bays or yellow lines the end of Marvell Avenue;**
- 2) Asked officers to conduct a site visit to assess the issues raised by petitioners; and**
- 3) Subject to the above, asked officers to add this request to the Council's extensive Parking Scheme Programme for further investigation.**

8. **PETITION TO HALT THE PLANNED ROAD WORKS ON SUTTON COURT ROAD**
(Agenda Item 8)

The Cabinet Member considered a petition to halt the planned road works on Sutton Court Road.

The lead petitioner addressed the Cabinet Member and made the following points:

There had been previous correspondence between petitioners and the Council, and there were a number of issues.

The road closure was not listed on the London Borough of Hillingdon website.

The petition was not to halt the planned road works indefinitely, but to halt them while a full consultation was carried out, as petitioners felt that there had been no adequate consultation, no survey, no check of safety regulations or of London Fire Brigade standards for width of road.

The lead petitioner's previous petition was in relation to pay and display parking. This was related to when the nearby Oak Wood school opened a new entrance on Sutton Court Road and increased its capacity by 375 places. At that time there was free parking available, but this was no longer the case.

Businesses on Sutton Court Road had had no customers for the past five to six weeks since the work had begun, in part due to the road being closed.

The lead petitioner had recently conducted a funeral consultation, which was interrupted by the noise of a pneumatic drill outside.

There had been no planning, no consultation. Air quality would not be mitigated by the planting of eight trees.

Petitioners had not had answers to their questions. Petitioners were still unaware of whether there would be a disabled parking bay or loading bay.

An additional crossing was going to be installed, whereas a zebra crossing was required.

There was no adequate bin provision.

Notice of the road closure was given on the Friday of a bank holiday weekend, and the road was closed from the following Tuesday, which was less than one business day of notice.

The times for pay and display parking were unsuitable for the businesses in the area. The 'until 09:30 loading only' time limit was unsuitable as some shops opened at 07:30. Therefore, some customers would have nowhere to park for the first two hours of trade. Also, deliveries did not only come before 09:30.

Petitioners were struggling to pay their rent this month as they had lost so much business.

It was unclear if the shop fronts would be cleaned.

Petitioners had had nothing but hostility from Hillingdon Council. Petitioners had not been supported by their Ward Councillors. The lead petitioner had been in contact with the local MP.

The road width was now 5.2 metres. The average width of a transit van was 2.47 metres. A lot of transit vans accessed the road and they made up a lot of trade of the local businesses. A gap of 30 centimetres to the kerb was legally permitted. A fire engine required 3.7 metres clearance by law. This totalled 6.4 metres, but the road was now only 5.2 metres. The petitioner stated that the London Fire Brigade requirement of 3.7 metres was for a road, and it was 1.3 metres for a gate. The 3.7 metres requirement was in particular for buildings taller than 12 metres. There was a three-storey school at the end of the road. Fire risk was the most pressing concern.

A meeting with business owners could have ironed out concerns. A statement from another business was submitted to officers.

Officers noted that an independent road safety audit would have been completed on the scheme and would have considered access. This would be fed back to the relevant team.

The Cabinet Member had spoken to both the local Councillors and the MP, and they were in favour of the scheme. The Cabinet Member had confidence that the proper approach had been taken but was happy to ask officers to double check.

Petitioners raised a further issue around not being able to park from 09:00. It was noted that customers often arrived between 07:00 and 09:00 and had nowhere to park. If customers could not park, they would go elsewhere. Officers advised that a report on the consultation on possible parking arrangements was currently being prepared, and so a decision on the parking arrangements had not been made. Officers would confirm this and report back to the Cabinet Member. The Cabinet Member noted that often, parking restrictions would apply from 09:00 onwards, and so people would be able to park before 09:00. Petitioners would be informed when a decision on the parking arrangements had been made.

Petitioners highlighted a central island that had been implemented in Ryefield Avenue, and that this had been described as a 'tried and tested' type of scheme. Petitioners noted that this central island was disliked by the Ryefield Avenue shopkeepers, and that on inspection, plastic pipes from the central island were broken or missing. The new design would make it difficult for deliveries to unload. The current space between the bakery and library most suitable for unloading, as lorries unloading in front of the shops would block the road. A dedicated loading space was essential for many of the businesses in this parade. A meeting prior to the road works being undertaken could have alleviated stress. The Cabinet Member noted that the parking/ loading measures could be looked into.

Petitioners further questioned why these road works were necessary. The issue of double parking could have been alleviated without the need for a central island.

Petitioners also questioned the cost of these road works, given the loss of business that had occurred for the shopkeepers, some of whom were now struggling with their rent. Petitioners further questioned the consultation.

Another business owner noted that they had opened their business during lockdown but were experiencing worse financial trouble during the past six weeks and had had to let go of two employees. The Cabinet Member advised that it may be possible to apply for temporary discretionary rate relief.

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

- 1) Met with petitioners and listened to their request for the Council to halt the planned road works in Sutton Court Road, Uxbridge, referring to his previous email exchanges with the lead petitioner;**
- 2) Noted that a separate report will be produced concerning the outcome of the recent consultation on the 'Stop and Shop' scheme; and**
- 3) Asked officers to review the situation with the central island and parking measures.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.20 pm.

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