

FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP- PETITION FOR A NIGHTTIME RESTRICTION OR BAN ON LARGE GOODS VEHICLES MOVEMENTS

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Cabinet Member | Councillor Keith Burrows |
| Cabinet Portfolio | Planning, Transportation and Recycling |
| Officer Contact | Sophie Wilmot, Transport and Projects |
| Papers with report | Appendix A - Site Plan |

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

| | |
|---|--|
| Summary | To advise the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from the residents of Field End Road, Ruislip requesting a night-time restriction or ban of Large Goods Vehicles (LGVs) along Field End Road. |
| Contribution to our plans and strategies | The petition will be considered within the context of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Implementation Plan including the transport strategy and road safety strategy. |
| Financial Cost | There are no direct financial implications at this stage. Marginal costs to undertake traffic surveys would be incurred if these are commissioned by the Cabinet Member. |
| Relevant Policy Overview Committee | Residents' and Environmental Services |
| Ward(s) affected | South Ruislip, Cavendish and Eastcote & East Ruislip |

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Meeting with the petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

- 1. listens to their concerns regarding the social problems being created by the passage of Large Goods Vehicles (LGVs) during the night and their request to restrict or ban this LGV traffic during night-time hours.**
- 2. subject to the above, asks officers to undertake a 24/7 traffic volume and speed survey, with the location of the survey to be agreed with petitioners.**
- 3. subject to the above, asks officers to consider the petitioners' suggestions, undertake further considerations and report back to him.**

Reasons for recommendations

To give the Cabinet Member the opportunity to discuss in detail the petitioners' concerns. To investigate in further detail the request by petitioners.

Alternative options considered / risk management

Options will be discussed with the petitioners.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 50 signatures has been submitted to the Council under the following terms:

'This petition is in respect of the social problems being created by the constant passage of LGV's (Large Goods Vehicles) used to deliver stock to local businesses during the night using Field End Road. In particular, but not limited to Ocado. A requirement is needed to restrict or ban this traffic between the hours of midnight and 6am'

2. Field End Road, Ruislip is around 2.6 miles (4,185m) in length, running from the junction with High Road, Eastcote to where it merges into Eastcote Lane at the Borough boundary. Field End Road has a mix of uses including a large number of residential properties; smaller retail units making up Eastcote Town Centre; larger retail units and schools. Access to Eastcote Underground Station is also via Field End Road. Given the length of Field End Road, it is located within three Wards: South Ruislip; Cavendish and Eastcote & East Ruislip.

3. The signatures on the petitions are mainly located within a 350m stretch of Field End Road from Parkfield Crescent at the recreation ground to the junction of Field End Road with Well Close. This is entirely within the South Ruislip Ward. It should also be noted that the majority of the signatures came from residents on the eastern side of the road. It is not known whether the petitioners' views are shared by residents on the other side of the road or in other areas of Field End Road.

4. Field End Road is a single carriageway in both directions but is very wide, being around 10m wide along its length. There is also a bus route, 282, which operates along the entire length of Field End Road, providing a service between Mount Vernon Hospital and Ealing Hospital with the first bus being at 05:21 and the last bus being 00:15. There are also two further bus services, the 398 and H13, which intersect Field End Road close to Eastcote Station.

5. Field End Road is one of the key roads in this area for the distribution of traffic with the majority of roads accessed from it being residential in nature. In addition to this, there are a number of height and weight restrictions in the area limiting options for the movement of larger vehicles in the area. The most notable restriction hampering access between the A40 and the

industrial areas off of Victoria Road is the 3.6m height restrictions of the railway bridges along Station Approach, South Ruislip.

6. The petition request specially refers to the operation of deliveries for the Ocado depot. The Ocado depot is located along Stonefield Way, South Ruislip, accessed from Victoria Road. The Ocado depot is located in an area with a large number of industrial units; car showrooms and larger retail outlets such as Homebase, Pets at Home and Wickes.

7. As part of the planning application for the erection of a vehicle maintenance workshop at the Ocado site in 2013 (52416/APP/2013/2249), a Travel Plan was submitted that highlights that the anticipated number of LGVs which would arrive at the site per day as 12. The Travel Plan also outlines the timings of these. These are summarised in Table 1.

| Table 1: Summary of stated Large Good Vehicle Movements associated with Ocado, South Ruislip | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>Large Goods Vehicles arriving at the site are scheduled to arrive in pairs</i> | | | | | |
| AM | | | PM | | |
| 1&2 | 3&4 | 5&6 | 7&8 | 9&10 | 11&12 |
| 05:00 | 05:45 | 06:30 | 13:00 | 13:45 | 14:00 |

8. The lead petitioner, a member of the South Ruislip Residents Association, wrote to the Ocado Group Head Office asking if it *'would be possible to open the lines of communication to discuss your articulated lorries which distribute to your South Ruislip depot. In particular, the route taken by the drivers to reach the depot.'*

9. A response was received from the General Manager - Service Delivery of Ocado who stated the following:

'Unfortunately there are legal restrictions on the routes we are able to take in order to reach the Depot. In order to comply with our legal obligations, the route currently taken by our vehicles is one that has been formally agreed with the London Lorry Control Scheme. This scheme is run by London Councils.'

The Depot site is within a road network which is controlled by the London Lorry Control Scheme. This means that night-time and weekend movements are restricted, which is why we were legally obliged to seek authority to determine a permitted route. The London Lorry Control Scheme has to take account of the fact that our trailers are 4.9 meters high and cannot pass under the low bridges which are in the vicinity of the Depot. This is why the route which we were forced to take is not the most direct route from the A40.'

10. The London Borough of Hillingdon is not currently a subscriber to the London Lorry Control Scheme, but is still supportive of lessening the impact of LGV movements on residents of the Borough. Even though the Council is currently not a subscriber, the London Councils website states that the Traffic Order for the restriction applies in all 32 London Boroughs and the City of London. However, currently only 29 of the boroughs allow London Councils to enforce the restriction. The London Borough of Hillingdon is one of the 4 boroughs that does not currently permit this enforcement.

11. The Cabinet Member will be aware that the Council works with businesses on delivery and servicing plans as well as freight management in order to ensure the impact of freight

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

movements on residents and users of the Borough are kept to a minimum. The Cabinet Member may therefore wish, after hearing from the petitioners, to consider instructing officers to undertake further investigation into the issues surrounding LGV movements in this area; investigation into possible options and to report back the findings to him.

12. The Cabinet Member will be further aware that the Council sometimes commissions special 24/7 traffic surveys to establish the volume and speed of traffic in a particular location. These surveys can provide information of the size and time of LGV movements, which may be beneficial to undertake in the area where the majority of petitioners are located. The Cabinet Member may therefore wish to consider instructing officers to commission such a survey along a section of Field End Road with the location of the survey to be agreed with the petitioners, reporting the survey results back to him and Ward Members.

Financial Implications

None at this stage. However, marginal costs of £200 for a 24 hour Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) in two locations would typically be incurred should traffic surveys be commissioned. This cost would be contained within existing budgets.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

It will allow for consideration of petitioners' concerns over the movement of Large Goods Vehicles and consideration of ways to lessen the impact on residents.

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 above, noting any marginal costs arising from the recommendations will be contained within existing revenue budgets.

Legal

There are no special legal implications for the proposal to discuss with petitioners their request for a night-time restriction or ban of Large Goods Vehicles along Field End Road, 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 policy, factual and engineering issues are 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.

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 recommendations. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

Should there be a decision that further measures are to be considered, then the relevant statutory provisions will have to be identified and considered.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.