



## Democratic Services

**Location:** Phase II  
**Ext:** 0420  
**DDI:** 01895 250420  
**CMD No:** 653

**To: COUNCILLOR JONATHAN BIANCO  
CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, HIGHWAYS  
& TRANSPORT**

c.c. All Members of the Property, Highways &  
Transport Select Committee  
c.c. Steve Austin – Place Directorate  
c.c. Perry Scott – Corporate Director of Place  
c.c. Ward Councillors for South Ruislip

**Date:** 02 December 2022

## Non-Key Decision request

## Form D

### PARKFIELD CRESCENT, RUISLIP - OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Dear Cabinet Member,

Attached is a report requesting that a decision be made by you as an individual Cabinet Member. Democratic Services confirm that this is not a key decision, as such, the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 notice period does not apply.

You should take a decision **on or after Monday 12 December 2022** in order to meet Constitutional requirements about publication of decisions that are to be made. You may wish to discuss the report with the Corporate Director before it is made. Please indicate your decision on the duplicate memo supplied, and return it to me when you have made your decision. I will then arrange for the formal notice of decision to be published.

James Jones,  
Democratic Services

**Title of Report:** Parkfield Crescent, South Ruislip - Objection to Proposed Waiting Restrictions

**Decision made:**

**Reasons for your decision:** (e.g. as stated in report)

**Alternatives considered and rejected:** (e.g. as stated in report)

Signed ..... Date.....

*Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport*

## PARKFIELD CRESCENT, RUISLIP - OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

<b>Cabinet Member(s)</b>	Councillor Jonathan Bianco
<b>Cabinet Portfolio(s)</b>	Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport
<b>Officer Contact(s)</b>	Steve Austin, Transport and Projects
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendices A, B & C

### HEADLINES

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that an objection has been received to the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in Parkfield Crescent, Ruislip.
<b>Putting our Residents First</b>  <b>Delivering on the Council Strategy 2022-2026</b>	<p>This report supports our ambition for residents / the Council of: <i>Be / feel safe from harm</i></p> <p>This report supports our commitments to residents of: <i>Safe and Strong Communities</i></p>
<b>Financial Cost</b>	The cost associated with the recommendations to this report is estimated at £476 and will be funded by existing revenue budgets within the Transportation Service.
<b>Relevant Select Committee</b>	Property, Highways & Transport Select Committee
<b>Relevant Ward(s)</b>	South Ruislip

### RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways & Transport:

1. considers the objection received from the statutory consultation for the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions in Parkfield Crescent, Ruislip; and,
2. approves the implementation of the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions as shown in Appendix C.

## **Reasons for recommendations**

To improve access and prevent obstructive parking.

## **Alternative options considered / risk management**

The Council could decide to proceed with the installation of the 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions as advertised.

## **Democratic compliance / previous authority**

None at this stage.

## **Select Committee comments**

None at this stage.

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

1. Parkfield Crescent is a mainly residential road comprising of semi-detached houses, many of which appear to benefit from off-street parking provision. A plan of the area is shown on Appendix A to this report.
2. Following a residents' 'Street Surgery' the Ward Councillors received a number of enquiries in relation to additional double yellow lines in Parkfield Crescent. Councillors advised that residents have expressed concerns over the potential hazard caused by parked vehicles on the bends of the road. As a result of the concerns raised, a detailed site investigation was undertaken by Council officers.
3. At the time of the officer's site visit, vehicles were observed parking on the bends. These vehicles did reduce forward visibility and could have a negative impact on road safety.
4. As a result of the site observations, a proposal was developed to install double yellow lines at two locations in Parkfield Crescent. The first location is close to Nos.26 & 28 Parkfield Crescent and the second location was on the bend adjacent to No.90. The proposed waiting restrictions are shown on the plans attached as Appendices B and C of this report.
5. The Cabinet Member agreed to take the proposals through the statutory 21-day consultation process, which involved the placing of advertisements in the local press and the display of public notices on site. During this period, the Council received one objection to the proposals adjacent to Nos. 26 & 28 Parkfield Crescent but not to the proposals adjacent to No.90. As a result, these restrictions were subsequently installed so this report considers the objection to the proposals close to Nos. 26 & 28 Parkfield Crescent.
6. The objector stated the following:

*" Objection to proposed At any time waiting restrictions – Parkfield Crescent*

*Dear Sir/Madam*

*You are proposing that double yellow lines are placed o/s 26 Parkfield Crescent and you claim that this is because of sightlines and obstruction.*

*Firstly, I will deal with the statement of obstructive parking:*

- i) You provide no evidence of obstructive parking – Obstructive parking would suggest that an offence was being committed. In the period of time I have lived in Parkfield Crescent (in excess of 30 years) no one has been prosecuted for causing an obstruction.*
- ii) An obstruction would suggest that the free flow of traffic was prevented. This is not the case here. Even with vehicles parked along this stretch of road there is sufficient room for two vehicles to pass each other*
- iii) Existing yellow lines around the adjacent island have ensured that this open area of carriageway is maintained*
- iv) Enforcement – I feel that it is likely not to be enforced by the LBH. I have only ever seen one officer who in fact ignored a parked vehicle on these existing lines.*

*Secondly the issue of sightlines:*

- i) The area of Parkfield Crescent has a bend that can be described as a progressive bend in that when approached by traffic from either direction the view around the bend opens up very quickly providing very reasonable sightlines unlike the bend o/s 90 Parkfield Crescent which is a severe right-angled bend.*

*General Observations:*

*In the time I have lived here I have never known of any accidents on the bend o/s 26 Parkfield Crescent other than one occurring as a result of a police pursuit of a vehicle.*

*When the yellow lines were placed around the island to prevent parking it was part of the application at the time to include yellow lines o/s 26 Parkfield Crescent and it was not deemed necessary*

*It is my opinion that any issues at this bend are in fact as a result of vehicles approaching the bend too frequently in excess of the 30 mph speed limit, vehicles approaching the bend approaching on the wrong side due to vehicles parked along Parkfield Crescent beyond the bend reducing the carriageway to a single carriageway where vehicles are automatically pushed to the centre of the road.*

*It is likely that removing the parking at this point will encourage drivers to approach and enter the bend faster meaning they might encounter other vehicles approaching from the opposite direction in the centre of the carriageway actually causing accidents.*

*It is my view that a far more sensible approach to any perceived issues along Parkfield Crescent would be to make Parkfield Crescent one way. This would negate the potential of any vehicles meeting any other vehicle on the bends and would make it much safer for pedestrians crossing the road throughout its length.”*

7. This objection and several photographs have been shared with the Ward Councillors.
8. After careful consideration of the comments received from the statutory consultation the views expressed by one of the ward councillors; it is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the implementation of the proposed ‘At Any Time’ waiting restrictions on the bend close to No.26 Parkfield Crescent as shown on the plan attached as Appendix C to this report.

## **Financial Implications**

The cost associated with the recommendations to this report is estimated at £476 and will be funded by existing revenue budgets within the Transportation Service.

## **RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION**

### **The benefit or impact upon Hillingdon residents, service users and communities?**

The effect of introducing the proposed waiting restrictions on Parkfield Crescent will be that access and safety is maintained whilst maintaining parking for residents.

### **Consultation carried out or required**

Consultation has been carried out on this proposal through a notice on site and in the local press. Local Ward Councillors have also been consulted.

## **CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

Corporate Finance have reviewed the recommendations to this report and concurs with the financial implications as set out above.

### **Legal**

Legal Services confirm that there are no legal impediments to the Cabinet Member agreeing the recommendations set out in the report which are in accordance with the outcome of the statutory consultation.

### **Infrastructure / Asset Management**

There are no property implications resulting from the recommendations set out in this report.

### **Comments from other relevant service areas**

None at this stage.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Traffic order
- Objection letter

## **TITLE OF ANY APPENDICES**

Appendix A - Location plan

Appendix B & C - Plan of proposals