



## Democratic Services

**Location:** Phase II

**Ext:** 0636

**DDI:** 01895 250636

**CMD No:** 1572

**To: COUNCILLOR STEVE TUCKWELL  
CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, HOUSING &  
GROWTH**

c.c. All Members of the Corporate Resources &  
Infrastructure Select Committee

c.c. Dan Kennedy – Corporate Director for Residents  
Services

c.c. Caroline Haywood – Resident Services  
Directorate

**Date:** 24 November 2025

## Non-Key Decision request

## Form D

### **BLOSSOM WAY / PORTMAN GARDENS, HILLINGDON – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

Dear Cabinet Members,

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 Tuesday 02 December 2025** 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.

Naveed Ali  
Democratic Services

**Title of Report:** BLOSSOM WAY / PORTMAN GARDENS, HILLINGDON – OBJECTIONS  
RECEIVED 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 Planning, Housing & Growth

# BLOSSOM WAY / PORTMAN GARDENS, HILLINGDON – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

<b>Cabinet Member &amp; Portfolio</b>	Councillor Steve Tuckwell Cabinet Member for Planning, Housing & Growth
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Dan Kennedy - Corporate Director, Residents Services
<b>Report Author &amp; Directorate</b>	Caroline Haywood – Resident Services
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendix A - Location Plan Appendix B - Plan of Proposal

## HEADLINES

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that objections have been received to the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens, Hillingdon.
<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: Stay living independently for as long as they are able</p> <p>This report supports our commitments to residents of: Safe and Strong Communities</p> <p>The request can be considered as part of the Council's annual programme of road safety initiatives.</p>
<b>Financial Cost</b>	The estimated cost associated with the recommendations in this report is £479, to be managed within existing Transportation Service revenue budgets.
<b>Select Committee</b>	Corporate Resources & Infrastructure Select Committee
<b>Ward(s)</b>	Hillingdon West

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Housing and Growth:**

- 1. Considers the objections received from the statutory consultation for the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions on Hume Way, Ruislip.**
- 2. Approves the introduction of the proposed 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens, Hillingdon, as shown at Appendix B to this report.**

## Reasons for recommendation(s)

To improve access on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens yet still maintain parking for residents.

## Alternative options considered / risk management

The Council could decide not to proceed with the installation of the 'at any time' waiting restrictions as advertised.

## Select Committee comments

None at this stage.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. Blossom Way and Portman Gardens are residential roads within Hillingdon West Ward. Portman Gardens is a cul-de-sac. Blossom Way links Sweetcroft Lane with Vine Lane. There are existing single yellow lines all along Blossom Way operational 11am – midday and double yellow lines on its junction with Portman Gardens. A plan of the area is shown on Appendix A to this report.
2. The Council received a request from one of the local Ward Councillors for double yellow lines on the start of Portman Gardens and on parts of Blossom Way close to Portman Gardens to improve access due to parked vehicles. As a consequence, a detailed site investigation was undertaken by Council officers.
3. Officers observed that the existing single yellow lines were working well although some vehicles were observed parking outside of these hours. These parked vehicles could restrict two-way traffic.
4. As a result of the site observations, a proposal was developed to increase the operational hours of the single yellow line to 'at any time' at the start of Portman Gardens and on two sections of Blossom Way in order to keep this area clear of parked cars to improve forward visibility and promote road safety at all times. The proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions are shown on the plan attached as Appendix B of this report.
5. The Cabinet Member agreed to take the proposal 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 four objections.
6. The **first objector** stated "*I wish to oppose the proposal for double yellow lines outside our house. There are no issues with parking as we already have restrictions which work perfectly well. .... I think this will be a waste of public money. I can see no issues in parking in Portman as there are no drives on that part of Portman Gardens and it's not affecting anyone. We have a big family and occasionally need to park in Portman with our elderly relatives. After speaking to our neighbours they all think it is unnecessary.*"

7. The **second objector** stated *“We would like to lodge an objection to the proposal. The reason for the objection is: We already have a restriction on Blossom Way which prevents people from parking on the road between 11:00am-Noon. The creation of double yellow lines outside our house will prevent people from parking for a short time when they drop their children or a social visit, for a short time.”*
8. The **third objector** stated *“We have never experienced or witnessed any issues that would necessitate the implementation of these proposed changes for Blossom Way. We have consulted with our neighbours, and they concur this to be their experiences too. We, therefore, strongly object to these proposals. We trust that as residents of Blossom Way you will seriously consider our views”.*
9. The **fourth objector** stated *“There is already existing parking restrictions in this area, adding to these is a waste of resources in an area which does not suffer from any problems with parking. There are hardly any spaces left in the borough to park, and this is necessary for visitors or when residents have contractors etc. These restrictions will reduce available on-street parking for residents, carers and deliveries There has been insufficient evidence of safety issues, congestion or obstruction that would warrant a permanent restriction. Double yellow lines should be proportionate and justified and there is insufficient evidence of any problems in this area. It's not really is either. A light of the above, I respectfully requested the council reconsider the proposed double yellow lines in order to meet the needs of the wider community.”*
10. The local Ward Councillors have been consulted, and one has responded stating *“ Whilst I fully respect that from the objectors perspective, there may not appear to be an issue, they are not the drivers turning in or out of Portman Gardens who face the challenges identified – and it these residents who have come to us en-mass. The proposed changes will undoubtedly improve road safety with minimal impact on those living nearby. There would still be ample (largely unrestricted) on-street parking along the lengths of Blossom Way and Portman Gardens, and every property of both streets has provision to park several vehicles on a driveway.”*
11. After careful consideration of the comments received from the statutory consultation and the thoughts of the local Ward Councillors, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member agrees to proceed with the proposed ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens, Hillingdon in Appendix B to this report.

## Financial Implications

The cost associated with the recommendations to this report is estimated at £479 and will be managed within existing revenue budgets for the Transportation Service.

## RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION

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

The effect of increasing the operational hours of the existing waiting restrictions on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens will be that access and safety is maintained whilst maintaining parking for residents.

### **Consultation & engagement 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 has reviewed the recommendations to this report and concurs with the financial implications as set out above.

### **Legal**

The Council's power to implement the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions on Blossom Way and Portman Gardens, Hillingdon is set out in section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The consultation and order-making statutory procedures to be followed are set out in Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Consultation must also meet the standard set by established common law principles in public law, namely fairness and adequacy.

If the decision is taken to make the order introducing the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions, Part 5 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 set out the signage requirements, which must be observed.

In exercising any of the powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, section 122 of the 1984 Act requires the Council to consider its statutory duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians), and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:

- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
- (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve amenities of the areas through which the roads run;
- (c) the national air quality strategy;
- (d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
- (e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

Moreover, the Council has various statutory duties in relation to road safety, such as under section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, which are relevant when deciding on road traffic measures. To this end, the report states that the proposed

waiting restrictions will improve forward visibility and promote road safety by keeping the area clear of parked cars.

Pursuant to established public law principles on consultation, the decision maker, when deciding whether to approve the recommendation to introduce the proposed waiting restrictions, must be satisfied that all consultation responses, which are set out within this report, including those that do not accord with the officer's recommendation (of which there are a number), were conscientiously taken into account. Regulation 13 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 also requires the Council to consider all objections made. The Council must also be mindful of its public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

### **Property**

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 emails

## **TITLE OF ANY APPENDICES**

Appendix A - Location Plan  
Appendix B - Plan of Proposal



## APPENDIX B - PLAN OF PROPOSAL

