

Minutes

**Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,
Transportation and Recycling
Wednesday, 17 November 2010
Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**



**Published on: 2 December 2010
Come into effect on: 10 December 2010**

	<p>Members Present: Councillor Keith Burrows</p> <p>Officers Present: David Knowles Steve Austin Nav Johal</p>	
1.	<p>HAYES END ROAD, HAYES - PETITION ASKING FOR REMOVAL OF BOLLARDS IN HAYES END ROAD</p> <p>Councillors Beulah East and Neil Fyfe were in attendance as Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The lead petitioner gave a brief history of Hayes End over the last 11 years, since the Hayes Park complex was built.• In 1999 residents lost at least four parking spaces, residents reported that they then got permission to park on the verge.• Two housing developments have resulted in more people parking in Hayes End Road. This parking issue had been going on for the last 10 years.• Residents were receiving numerous parking tickets for parking on verges and these tickets were appealed, all successfully.• John McDonnell MP had been helping with residents' problems with parking and residents said that he was surprised this issue was still on-going.• The petitioners felt that over the years they had not received adequate support or help from the Council, and that they were continuously fighting with the Council over this.• The petitioners questioned why the Council erected bollards on land that they did not own.• The petitioners stated that they were not consulted by the Council before the bollards were erected.• The issue with speeding on the road was noted.• The residents just wanted somewhere to park their cars; they suggested that instead of bollards the Council could replace this	Action by

with a few parking spaces.

- A lot of residents had spent money on having drives and dropped kerbs put into their homes to have somewhere to park.
- The parking problems were getting worse.
- People were parking beside the bollards which meant the road was narrowing, which made visibility on the road worse.
- Petitioners explored the idea of extending the double yellow lines with the Cabinet Member.
- Petitioners asked if they could have the details of the land owners so that they could contact them themselves.

The Ward Councillors had no comment.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.

- There was a request from local residents about their concern for speeding vehicles in the area.
- The actual siting of the bollards was on the approach to a mini-roundabout and double yellow lines.
- The Cabinet Member explained to petitioners that the Council could look into extending the double yellow lines if this was a road safety issue.
- The Cabinet Member suggested that if obstructed parking had become a problem then double yellow lines may be required.
- Noted that a recent letter from John McDonnell MP regarding this issue not been seen by The Cabinet Member or officers but the contents of the letter were noted.
- This was an unusual situation where the adoption of the land was never completed, and the bollards were erected in good faith but as it transpired on land that was not owned by the Council. The Cabinet Member noted that lessons had been learned and that this situation should not happen again.
- Before removing the bollards legally the Council must now request permission from the owners of the land.
- That if the land owners were not subject to public record then there was a data protection issue regarding the disclosure of who they were to the residents. However, as noted above, the lead petitioners' contact details can be passed to the agents acting on behalf of the landowners.

Officers advised that:

- They were attempting to contact the land owner and that they could ask them to contact the lead petitioner, and make them aware of the petition submitted to the Council.
- That a site visit would be carried out if recommendation 4 was to take place and within the consultation process.

	<p>DECISION</p> <p>That the Cabinet Member:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the petition and the request for the removal of bollards in Hayes End Road and listened to the concerns of the petitioners; 2. Instructed legal services to explore options for dedicating the land to public highway; 3. Asked officers to continue to liaise with the land owners to confirm if they want the bollards to be retained. 4. If the land was adopted and the London Borough of Hillingdon become the responsible authority for it further consultation with residents and Ward Councillors would be undertaken with regard to the retention or otherwise of the bollards. <p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their request for the bollards to be removed.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered:</p> <p>These were identified from the discussions with the petitioners.</p> <p>Relevant Wards:</p> <p>Charville</p>	<p>David Knowles Steve Austin</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>PARKFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON - PETITION CONCERNING PARKING, VOLUMES AND SPEED OF TRAFFIC IN PARKFIELD AVENUE</p> <p>Councillors Tim Barker and Pat Jackson were in attendance and spoke as Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead petitioner distributed photographs of the area (showing issues of concern) to officers and the Cabinet Member. • The lead petitioner told the Cabinet Member how Parkfield Ave was used as a cut through for people driving in the area. This included parents who were dropping their children off at nearby 	<p>Action by</p>

schools.

- The photographs highlighted the parking issues that residents encountered.
- People were parking on single yellow lines.
- Cars for sale were being parked on the road by the garages there. This could be an obstruction of highway.
- They were also test driving the cars on the roads at high speeds.
- Petitioners felt that with the current situation it was near impossible to have a safe road.
- There were issues with people parking in front of driveways.
- Petitioners questioned whether it would take for someone to get hurt before something was done about the speeding on the road.
- That traffic wardens drove there but people from the garage would move their cars when they saw the traffic wardens' car, and then move the cars back on the road when they left.
- The residents felt dictated to by the garages on where they could park their own cars in their own street.
- The residents would come home and there were no available parking spaces.
- The garages had so many cars they could not store them on their premises so parked on the street.
- There was no consideration for resident parking.
- The garage owners had a bad attitude against residents who tackled them about street parking.
- The speeding occurred all day.

The Ward Councillors commented on the petition:

- Councillor Barker spoke on behalf of all 3 Ward Councillors.
- The Ward Councillors were in full support of the petition and agreed with what the lead petition had to say.
- They highlighted the speeding concern and how this effected the residents.
- A speeding consultation was suggested by the Ward Councillors.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.

- A person's perception of speed could be different to what the speed the vehicle is travelling in actually is. Therefore a speed survey could be of benefit here.
- The parking issue was not acceptable for residents.
- That the traffic wardens were playing a cat and mouse game to try and catch people parking illegally but this was noted and would be highlighted to Parking Services.
- There was case law on how to undertake a consultation and this had to be followed. The surrounding roads would need to be

consulted on any parking schemes that could be implemented in the area.

- Once plans were drawn up the Cabinet Member agreed to send this to traffic order to advertise and to see if there are any objections. If objections came in the Cabinet Member would receive another report and then it would be for him to decide what to do. He would assess the impact on single lines after the plan came through.

Officers advised that:

- They made note of the issue of parking wardens and would pass the information to parking services. They would ask the wardens to approach the road on foot rather than drive through.
- Officers had other means of doing a survey on speed other than black strips. They could use a radar box, a 24/7 survey could be done and this information could be shared with the police if necessary.
- Officers would ask Planning Enforcement to check breach of licensing regulations for illegal street trading of vehicles for sale.
- Residents would need to be consulted for a parking management scheme.
- A consultation was rejected by the frontages on the Service Road – options had been proposed for a limited parking stop and shop scheme.
- A record of the number of parking tickets issues could be made available to the Ward Councillors.

DECISION

That the Cabinet Member

- 1. Met with and discussed with the petitioners' their concerns with speed of traffic and obstructive parking in Parkfield Avenue;**
- 2. Instructed officers to undertake a 24/7 speed survey of this area.**
- 3. Subject to (2) asked officers to place this request on the Council's road safety programme for subsequent investigation and the development of possible options;**
- 4. Instructed officers to liaise with the Police and local Safer Neighbourhoods teams to investigate and if appropriate undertake some local enforcement**
- 5. Instructed officers to draw up proposals for double yellow lines from New Broadway to Parkfield Ave as shown.**

David Knowles
Steve Austin

4.	<p>WATERLOO ROAD, UXBRIDGE - PETITION OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED RE-DESIGNATION OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING FACILITY TO COMMERCIAL PARKING IN WATERLOO ROAD, BESIDE MILLBRIDGE PLACE</p> <p>Councillor David Routledge was in attendance and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead petition had noted the points in the report from officers. • The lead petitioner had been living in the area since 1981 and over the years parking availability had shrunk. • There was a dense population in the area and Waterloo Road was a residential street. • Parking restrictions were brought into protect residents parking. • If crucial parking was taken away it would put even more pressure on the parking. • There was lots of space for vehicles in Swan Wharf, including during the day. • Residents were concerned that the short amount of parking space available would be taken away. • There was competition for parking amongst neighbours which it was alleged could at times become quite hostile, with notes being left on windscreens and cars being vandalised. • The 3 spaces that were being proposed to be taken away were valuable parking spaces. • It was important that residents could park near their homes; otherwise it could mean that had to move their cars in the mornings when they had not intended to use them. <p>The Ward Councillor commented on the petition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Routledge stated that they had fought for a long time to get parking for residents in Waterloo Road. • The Council had sold Uxbridge Trading Estate. • The Council would have no control over who buys the parking area. • By re-introducing business parking it would be going against Council policy, it would provide a limit on parking requirements. • That it would be an error to put commercial parking in these bays. • And that it would be better to increase parking numbers. <p>Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and</p>	Action by

	<p>responded to the points raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report now would be produced by an officer which would refer to the outcome of this petition for the Cabinet Member. • The report would also set out the views of the Ward Councillors. • A Cabinet Member Decision used the individual authority and power to make decisions. • The Cabinet Member could not prejudge the subsequent report which would be subject to the democratic process, including the possibility of call-in. • He was very mindful of the area and what residents had fought for, what the petition had said, and the developments in the area. • He gave his full assurance that in making this subsequent decision he would be mindful of the history of the area and the views of Ward Councillors. <p>DECISION</p> <p>That the Cabinet Member</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Met and discussed with the petitioners their concerns with the loss of parking in the southern end of Waterloo Road where a business permit parking place is being proposed. 2. Asked officers to take the petition into consideration when preparing the formal report on representations received to the statutory consultation on the proposals, which will be submitted to the Cabinet Member for a decision on whether the proposals proceed to implementation. <p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>The Council was required to consider all objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders. Following the Cabinet Member’s discussion with petitioners their comments could be included in the formal report to the Cabinet Member detailing all representations received from statutory consultation.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered:</p> <p>These may rise from the Cabinet Members discussions with petitioners.</p> <p>Relevant Wards:</p> <p>Uxbridge South</p>	<p>David Knowles Steve Austin</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>CUCKOO HILL, PINNER - PETITION REQUESTING PERMANENT TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND VEHICLES RESTRICTIONS ON CUCKOO HILL</p>	<p>Action by</p>

Councillors Andrew Retter, Jonathan Bianco and John Morgan were in attendance and spoke as Ward Councillors.

Councillor John Nickolay from LB Harrow was also in attendance.

Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:

- The lead petitioner advised that she was speaking on behalf of all the petitioners from Harrow and Hillingdon.
- They wished to make the road safe for residents.
- They had a letter of support from the head teachers of the surrounding schools.
- A traffic survey carried out showed that 85% of vehicles that drive there did an average of 39mph.
- Homes in the area kept accident response kits indoors as they regularly had to attend accidents outside their homes.
- An 18 year old was killed in an accident in May 2010.
- Petitioners wished for drivers to be forced to observe the 30mph speed limit. Physical means could be used to force them such as check points, speed tables, rumble strips or average speed camera.
- Petitioners wanted a safe place for pedestrians to cross the road. In some parts there was not a paved area on both sides of the road.
- Petitioners requested a preference for a zebra crossing or at least a crossing island.
- They wanted to prevent heavy/large vehicles from using the road; and petitioners suggested a width restriction being put on the road.
- There was no room for error on the road, a little slip up caused accidents.
- It was too important an issue to let geographical boundaries (i.e. borough boundaries) prevent anything going forward to improve the safety.
- This issue had been discussed at many lengths in many forums.

The Ward Councillors commented on the petition:

- Councillor Retter spoke to support the petitioners and on behalf of his Ward Councillor colleagues.
- It was a priority issue for the Ward Councillors.
- It was a very unusual road; the road was used to link Pinner and Ruislip.
- There had been an increase in traffic over the years in the area.
- Some drivers drove faster than 40/50mph on the 30mph road.
- That a tragedy would happen again if nothing was done.
- They needed to find a way to force drivers to slow down.

- They needed to look at way to reducing the speed limit on the road. Possibly consider a 25mph zone.
- A safe place with high visibility was required for crossing point.
- Speed cameras would assist in reducing the speeds of cars. An average speed camera would be more sufficient than a normal one, which would also be of use.
- A letter could be sent from the Cabinet Member to support the request for speed cameras to TFL.
- Cllr Bianco also spoke to explain that he shared the concerns of the residents.
- He encouraged officers to look at all options available.
- The Ward Councillor questioned the budget on road safety and whether the Council would have the money to do anything that was required.
- He questioned how much dependence was placed on Harrow Council.
- He also asked officers what timings the residents should expect.

Councillor Keith Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioners and responded to the points raised.

- The Council did not have any direct control over when or where speed cameras were put on roads. When these were considered figures of those killed and seriously injured (KSI) were looked at. This data was recorded on the police collision system. Slight knocks were usually not recorded.
- The figure of KSI's needed to be a certain level before it became a priority.
- The Cabinet Member was happy to send a letter on behalf of the residents and Ward Councillors to TFL.
- The speed limit reduction was not easy to put in place legally.
- A speed survey would indicate speeds, timings, etc. This information would be shared with the police if necessary.
- Residents should not feel uncomfortable trying to cross the road.
- The Council ran a road safety education course for students of Uxbridge College. A lot of young drivers speed due to peer pressure.
- Road Safety week was coming up and a “no drink and drive” campaign.
- Any fatality on a Hillingdon road was one too many and the concerns of the residents were being treated seriously.
- The road safety budget and money from TFL could be used as they saw fit for funding.
- The boundary runs at the edge of Cuckoo Hill so the Council could make the changes as required. Harrow Council would have to be consulted if a crossing was to be put it.
- He had recently agreed for the purchase of more road signs.

- The officers would move as quickly as they could. They did not want another fatality.
- Any changes would need to be advertised to see if they had any objections.

Officers advised that:

- The road survey could take place before Christmas. This would record the volume, speed of traffic and the type of vehicle being used.
- In the short term signs and markings, which were on order, could be put on the road.
- Flashing speed indicators could be put on for a 3 month period and officers would speak to Ward Councillors about the location for this.
- In the long term a study and survey would be done for substantial measures. Work would be done into the spring on this.
- The crossing would most likely be a traffic signal crossing. TFL would need to provide the traffic lights for this, and this could take up to 6 months to a year.
- Council's had their own capital programme for budgeting big schemes.
- The time line suggested by officers was, if something was agreed, next Summer/Autumn for substantial measures.
- Emergency services used the roads as a response route so the width restrictions suggested by petitioners may not have been viable.
- When looking at a location of the crossing the sight lines would be taken into consideration.
- The speed survey could be done in more than one point.
- Nothing would be introduced without consultation and dialogue with Harrow Council.
- In terms of funding from Harrow, they would have discussions with after the work was done.

DECISION

That the Cabinet Member

- 1. Met with the petitioners and discussed in detail their concerns with speeding and unsuitable vehicles using Cuckoo Hill;**
- 2. Subject to the outcome of 1 above asked officers to investigate any feasible measures identified as part of the Council's Road Safety programme;**

David Knowles
Steve Austin

	<p>3. Instructed officers to liaise with the Metropolitan Police including the local Safer Neighbourhood Team with a view to sharing information and practical solutions;</p> <p>4. Instructed officers to liaise with the Police and Transport for London with regard to the case for safety cameras in the vicinity and report back to the Cabinet Member;</p> <p>5. Instructed officers to explore appropriate joint initiatives with counterparts in the London Borough of Harrow.</p> <p>6. Instructed officers to undertake a feasibility study to install a crossing on Cuckoo Hill and report back to the Cabinet Member.</p> <p>7. Instructed officers to undertake a 24/7 speed survey.</p> <p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>The petitioners have identified a number of concerns that impact on road safety. The success of traffic measures which address these are largely successful if they are acceptable to local residents. These can be identified with petitioners for further detailed investigation by Officers within the Road Safety programme.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered:</p> <p>These may rise from the Cabinet Members discussions with petitioners.</p> <p>Relevant Wards:</p> <p>Northwood Hills</p>	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00pm, closed at 9.15pm.	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, officers, the press and members of the public.