

MAHLON AVENUE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF THE GATE

Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Danielle Watson – Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services
Papers with report	Appendix A

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents living in Mahlon Avenue, Ruislip requesting the removal of the gate.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The request can be considered as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.
Financial Cost	There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services.
Ward(s) affected	South Ruislip

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their request for the removal of the barriers/gate located on the junction of Edwards Avenue and Mahlon Avenue, Ruislip.**
- 2. Notes that two separate petitions have been received from residents, one for the gate removal and one against the gate removal.**
- 3. Subject to the outcome of discussions with petitioners, asks Officers to include the request and possible options in the Road Safety Programme**

Reasons for recommendation

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners – 23 May 2012

It is not clear from the petition exactly what the issues are in Mahlon Avenue, South Ruislip. The discussion with petitioners will help identify suitable options to address petitioners concerns.

Alternative options considered / risk management

These can be identified from the discussions with petitioners.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 24 signatures has been received from residents living in Mahlon Avenue, South Ruislip, which represents 17% of households in this road, under the following heading:

'We request that the Council removes the Gate in Mahlon Avenue at the earliest opportunity and puts in place alternative restrictions to deter speeding drivers'.

2. Mahlon Avenue is a residential road, the location is shown on the plan attached as Appendix A. This petition is signed by residents living in Mahlon Avenue between its junctions with Station Approach and Edwards Avenue.

3. There is a diagonal road closure installed on the junction of Edwards Avenue and Mahlon Avenue which is referred to by petitioners as 'the Gate'. This gate was installed some years ago to prevent traffic from Station Approach by-passing the signal installation for access to West End Road and vice versa.

4. Council officers have previously investigated residents' concerns regarding vehicle speeds in Edwards Avenue, a speed survey was undertaken and the results showed that the majority of vehicles were travelling at or below the speed limit. There was a small minority exceeding the speed limit and this was reported to the local Safer Neighbourhood Team to investigate further and deal with as appropriate.

5. The Cabinet Member will be aware of the counter petition to retain the gate which will be reported separately.

6. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns, and subject to the outcome, asks officers to consider options to address residents' concerns under the Council's Road Safety Programme. The Cabinet Member may in particular value the knowledge and views of the local Ward Councillors on the likelihood of wider community support in the surrounding roads for such a measure, bearing in mind that traffic may displace to other roads.

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations of this report. However, should the eventual outcome be a decision to undertake some works a funding source would need to be identified. The Council's Capital Road Safety programme would typically be used for this type of scheme, subject to the usual approvals and release procedure.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns and explore possible options that could be introduced to address their issues.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None at this stage.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and concurs with the financial implications as stated.

Legal

There are no special legal implications for the proposal, which amounts to an informal consultation. A meeting with the petitioners is perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise, especially where consideration of the suggestion is still at a formative stage. Fairness and natural justice requires that there must be no predetermination of a decision in advance of any wider non-statutory consultation.

It is recommended that the petition to retain the gate, produced and signed by other residents of Mahlon Avenue, is considered in conjunction with this petition in order that the decision maker is informed of all views when reaching a decision.

In considering any informal consultation responses, decision makers must ensure there is a full consideration of all representations arising including those which do not accord with the officer recommendation. Accordingly, the Council must balance the concerns of the objectors with its statutory duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

Should the outcome of the informal discussions with petitioners require that officers include the petitioners' request and other possible options in the Road Safety Programme, there will need to be consideration of the Highways Act 1980, the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Traffic

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners – 23 May 2012

Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, which govern road traffic orders, traffic signs and road markings. If specific advice is required in relation to the exercise of individual powers Legal Services should be instructed.

Corporate Property and Construction

Corporate Property and Construction is in support of the recommendations in this report.

Relevant Service Groups

None at this stage.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition for gate removal received – May 2012

Petition for gate to be retained received – May 2012

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners – 23 May 2012