

## Minutes

Petition Hearing - Cabinet Member for Planning,  
Transportation and Recycling  
Wednesday, 23 March 2011



Meeting held at Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Steve Austin (Traffic Management, Principal Engineer) and Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p> <p><b>Also Present</b> Councillors Timothy Barker, Wayne Bridges, Patricia Jackson, Brian Crowe, John Riley, Michael Bull and Anita MacDonald</p>	
1.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE BUSINESS OF THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC.</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED – That all items will be considered in public.</b></p>	Action by
2.	<p><b>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE OFFICERS ON THE FOLLOWING PETITIONS RECEIVED.</b></p>	Action by
3.	<p><b>RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON - PETITION REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF GRANITE BLOCK SAFETY HAZARDS</b></p> <p>Councillors Barker, Bridges and Jackson attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors in support of the petition.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The granite blocks were a major hazard to drivers when a vehicle was parked opposite them. Ryefield Avenue was not wide enough for two vehicles travelling in the opposite direction to safely pass each other and would result in drivers having to take part in 'a game of chicken' to see which driver would give way. The other option to drivers was to mount the blocks which might cause suspension damage to the vehicle concerned.</li><li>• When the blocks were covered by snow they posed a great danger to two wheeled vehicles such as motor cycles and cyclists, who if they were unaware of the blocks, could hit them</li></ul>	Action by  Steve Austin

and be thrown across Ryefield Avenue.

- The blocks caused cyclists (which were aware of them) to evade the blocks by cycling in the centre of the road which was dangerous.
- The blocks were expensive as they required ongoing maintenance and repairs.
- The blocks caused drainage problems. In cold weather it was noted that the accumulated standing water turned to ice which led to a dangerous road surface.
- The rumble strips were not moderate as stated in the officer report and were not easy to drive over.
- One of the cobbles in the scheme was much more prominent than the others and there was concern that this could cause tyre damage.
- Considerably more than just one of eight over-runnable areas had required repair over the years.
- The lead petitioner provided a list of possible solutions to the issues created by the granite blocks to the Cabinet Member which were passed to the Traffic Officer for consideration.
- Ward Councillors suggested that if the blocks were not removed then steps could be taken to improve them.

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioner and responded to the points raised:

Councillor Burrows explained that the design of the chicanes was deliberately intended to reduce the speeds of traffic flows and the design had been employed with success throughout the United Kingdom. In this particular case, the accident data provided in the report including the findings from the Metropolitan Police illustrated that this design had been effective. The accident data in the report also stated that none of the accidents could be attributed to the over-runnable areas.

Discussion took place on the merits of removing the granite blocks and replacing them with tarmac or maintaining the current scheme. It was noted that when the original consultation took place and was reported to the Cabinet member in July 2006, 69% of respondents had been in favour of the scheme.

Cllr Burrows explained that officers would take into account the list of possible solutions provided by the lead petitioner but that he would need to assess all the information available, including any parking issues, before a final decision could be made as to whether to retain or remove the granite blocks.

**RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Considered the petitioner's request and discussed in detail their concerns in regards to the traffic calming measures.**

	<p>2. Notes the level of support for the proposals at the time of the original public consultation prior to the scheme being built, and of the level of support for the more recent measures in Windsor Avenue near Oak Farm School.</p> <p>3. Notes the reduction of accident levels and traffic speeds since the scheme was introduced.</p> <p>4. Asks officers to conduct a further review of the traffic calming measures under the Road Safety Programme and investigate any Parking issues connected to the scheme within Ryefield Avenue; and</p> <p>5. Asks officers to thoroughly review the construction and condition of the over-runable areas in Ryefield Avenue and to report back to the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors</p>	
4.	<p><b>ICKENHAM ROAD, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING PAY-AND-DISPLAY PARKING BAYS</b></p> <p>Councillors Crowe and Riley attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors in support of the petition. Councillor Corthorne was unable to attend the meeting and sent his apologies.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overzealous traffic wardens on motorbikes were not allowing sufficient time for the public to purchase parking before tickets were being issued. As a result, local businesses had been massively affected and were losing a considerable number of customers.</li> <li>• The petitioner requested that the two current loading bays be retained.</li> <li>• In relation to the current disabled parking on Ickenham Road, it was noted that a series of bollards set into the pavement inhibited vehicle door movement and hence access to vehicles. It was suggested that the current disabled parking bays be moved to the opposite side of the road to negate the problems posed by the bollards and for the Council to consider adding an additional three stop and shops bays with 30 minutes free parking with parking charges thereafter.</li> <li>• Ward Councillors agreed it was a good suggestion to move the current disabled parking provision away from the pavement bollards to the opposite side of the road.</li> <li>• In relation to the business bays it was suggested that an assessment be undertaken to determine how frequently these were used.</li> <li>• Ward councillors supported the petitioners suggestion to extend the "Stop and Shop" parking scheme to Ickenham Road from the junction of High Street to the Thomas Moore Building if this is</li> </ul>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

	<p>feasible.</p> <p>Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioner and responded to the points raised:</p> <p>Councillor Burrows agreed that a reassessment of parking provision in Ickenham Road would be a useful exercise and assured the petitioner that all the businesses in Ickenham Road would be consulted. He explained that officers would be tasked with conducting a feasibility and impact assessment and that part of this process would involve looking at looking at traffic plans and traffic flows at different times of the day to ascertain robust data.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Considered the petitioner’s request for pay and display parking outside the shopping parade in Ickenham Road close to the junction of High Street, Ruislip;</b></li> <li><b>2. approves the addition of a “Stop &amp; Shop” parking scheme for this part of Ickenham Road to the Council’s parking programme as soon as resources permit.</b></li> <li><b>3. asks officers to look at the feasibility of more stop and shop parking in this area.</b></li> </ol>	
5.	<p><b>NORTH ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - PETITION REQUESTING A RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEME</b></p> <p>Councillors Bull and MacDonald attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillors in support of the petition.</p> <p><i>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents explained that parking in North Road had become very problematic and this was described as ‘a nightmare’.</li> <li>• Displaced parking from Park West meant that North Road residents were often forced to park some distance from their homes and this was particularly difficult for women with young children when carrying their shopping.</li> <li>• Residents highlighted that Park West had a number of parking spaces on site but many of these had been sold off privately.</li> <li>• Residents had explored the price of installing drive ways on their properties but quotes for installing these had been cost prohibitive.</li> <li>• Most residents in North Road owned one car but there were also a variety of works vehicles and other cars which used the available parking spaces.</li> <li>• Ward Councillors acknowledged that parking was difficult</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

	<p>throughout the day and most of the local congestion appeared to stem from the old RAF site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An informal consultation had taken place in February 2009 in the roads surrounding West Drayton and Yiewsley Town Centres to try and determine whether there was support for parking controls in the area. At this time, residents of North Road opted not to join the scheme. However, it was acknowledged that when this decision was taken, the full extent of parking impact was not known.</li> </ul> <p>Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioner and responded to the points raised:</p> <p>Councillor Burrows agreed that in this particular case the inclusion of nearby roads into a parking management scheme had caused a degree of displaced parking which had affected North Road.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Considered the petitioner's concerns with parking in North Road.</b></li> <li><b>2. Asks Officers to discuss with Ward Councillors a suitable Parking Management Scheme in this area which will include North Road.</b></li> </ol>	
6.	<p><b>LONGFORD GARDENS, HAYES - PETITION REQUESTING 'KEEP CLEAR' ROAD MARKINGS</b></p> <p>No Ward Councillors attended the meeting.</p> <p>Concerns and suggestions raised at the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over the last few years residents had experienced difficulties in exiting Longford Gardens onto Uxbridge Road at peak times due to congestion and high vehicle speeds.</li> <li>• It was noted that there had been a number of near misses and minor accidents (such as scratches to vehicles) which had not generated Police accident reports.</li> <li>• The number of Police recorded accidents which had occurred on Uxbridge Road at its junction with Longford Gardens in the three years to August 2010 was questioned by the petitioner. The petitioner suggested that the 2 accidents identified in the officer report seemed very low and if CCTV footage was checked then the number of accidents might increase.</li> <li>• Uxbridge Road was one of Hillingdon's main distributor roads that linked Southall to Hayes and Uxbridge. Uxbridge Road changed from 3 lanes to 2 lanes abruptly at Brookside Lane which made</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Steve Austin</p>

the road dangerous at this point.

- The speed limit of 40mph on Uxbridge Road made it difficult for buses to execute 90 degree turns in the face of oncoming traffic.
- Many local residents had been fined because traffic flows had forced them to use the bus lane to avoid fast moving traffic.
- Many bus stops had been extended in length on the Uxbridge Road which had affected traffic flows and created problems.
- The difference in speed limits between Longford Gardens at 30mph and Uxbridge Road at 40mph had caught many drivers unaware (especially those who were not from the local area).

Councillor Burrows listened to the concerns of the petitioner and responded to the points raised:

Councillor Burrows explained the Council had no jurisdiction over the speed limit on Uxbridge Road as this was controlled by Transport for London (TfL). If the Council wished to reduce the speed on this road then representations would need to be made to TfL which could be a protracted process. With reference to the two accidents mentioned in the officer report, Cllr Burrows explained that this was so as only two had been formally reported to the Police. In relation to the length of bus stops on the Uxbridge Road, officers explained that these had been lengthened to enable buses to deploy ramps so that disabled users could use Public Transport and to ensure they were compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act.

To address the concerns raised at the meeting, Cllr Burrows asked officers investigate the feasibility to introduce “Keep Clear” road markings or a yellow box junction marking at the junction of Uxbridge Road and Longford Gardens under the Road Safety Programme. He explained that the Council’s feasibility study would involve officers taking photographs and recording traffic flows at different times of the day to build an accurate picture of road usage at the junction concerned. Officers would then report back to him and present a number of possible options before a final decision was taken.

**RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member:**

- 1. Considered the petitioner’s concerns and explored in detail potential options to address the issues that would be acceptable to local residents.**
- 2. Asks officers to investigate the feasibility to introduce “Keep Clear” road markings or a yellow box junction marking at the junction of Uxbridge Road and Longford Gardens under the Road Safety Programme.**