



**Democratic Services**

**Location:** Phase II  
**DDI:** 01895 250185  
**CMD No:** 2026/1681

**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, Residents Services  
c.c. Kevin Urquhart – Residents Services  
c.c. Ward Councillors for Ickenham & South Harefield

**Date:** 01 April 2026

**Non-Key Decision request**

**Form D**

**OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSALS FOR REVISED LENGTHS OF DOUBLE YELLOW LINES IN PYNCHESTER CLOSE, ICKENHAM**

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 Monday 13 April 2026** 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.

Liz Penny  
Democratic Services

**Title of Report:** Objections to the Proposals for Revised Lengths of Double Yellow Lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham

**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*

# OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSALS FOR REVISED LENGTHS OF DOUBLE YELLOW LINES IN PYNCHESTER CLOSE, ICKENHAM

<b>Cabinet Member &amp; Portfolio</b>	Councillor Steve Tuckwell, Cabinet Member for Planning, Housing & Growth
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Dan Kennedy - Corporate Director of Residents Services
<b>Report Author &amp; Directorate</b>	Kevin Urquhart – Residents Services Directorate
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendices A – D

## HEADLINES

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member on the responses received to the formal consultation to the revised proposals for double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham.
<b>Putting our Residents First</b>  <b>Delivering on the Council Strategy 2022-2026</b>	This report supports our ambition for residents / the Council of: Live in good quality, affordable homes in connected communities  This report supports our commitments to residents of: Safe and Strong Communities
<b>Financial Cost</b>	The estimated cost associated with the recommendations to this report is £500, to be funded from existing Transportation Services revenue budgets. The recommended revised proposals will be grouped with other road safety related proposals requiring formal consultation to help reduce the overall costs for the Council.
<b>Select Committee</b>	Corporate Resources & Infrastructure Select Committee
<b>Ward(s)</b>	Ickenham & South Harefield

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Housing & Economic Growth:**

- 1) Notes the responses received to the formal consultation for the revised proposals for the installation of double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham; and**
- 2) Following discussion with the local Ward Councillors, decides that a further formal consultation be carried out on proposals to introduce a formalised footway parking place opposite Nos. 1 to 5 Pynchester Close, Ickenham and accompanying double yellow lines as indicated on Appendix D of this report.**

### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

The recommendations reflect the responses received to the formal consultation on the revised proposals for double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham. Following discussions with the local Ward Councillors, the recommendations of this report are intended to address concerns raised by residents by proposing footway parking on a limited section of Pynchester Close.

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

The Council could have decided to install the double yellow lines as they were proposed, reverted back to the initial proposals or deferred the proposals altogether.

### **Democratic compliance / previous authority**

The proposals which were formally consulted on as set out within this report were subject to a Cabinet Member decision

Cabinet Member report - Objections to the proposed double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham – Published 7th November 2025 – Decision made as per recommendation -17<sup>th</sup> November 2025

### **Select Committee comments**

None at this stage.

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

1. As the Cabinet Member will be aware, the Council previously received a petition signed by a resident of Pynchester Close, Ickenham requesting the Council to consider the introduction of double yellow lines within their road to help prevent obstructive parking and enable safe and easy access to their off-street parking area.
2. Pynchester Close is a small cul-de-sac off Hoylake Crescent in a series of roads northwest of Ickenham Village town centre. The roads within this general area can occasionally suffer from non-residential parking associated with the town centre and commuter parking as several nearby roads benefit from a Parking Management Scheme.
3. Although the petition was only signed by one resident, a local Ward Councillor supported the request and therefore officers investigated these concerns as part of the road safety programme. Following discussion with the local Ward Councillors, officers developed proposals for double yellow lines to be installed at the junction of Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent, with a continuation of the double yellow lines on the northwest side of the road to help ensure clear access.
4. The resulting proposals as shown on Appendix C of this report were subject to formal consultation. During the consultation, the Council received two responses generally in favour of the proposed restrictions and three responses in objection to them. The main concern of the residents who were objecting to the proposals was that they felt the restrictions proposed

would result in the loss of valuable parking space which they stated is often used by residents who live in Pynchester Close and the surrounding streets. It was noted that although most residents have some form of off-street parking, most only have enough space on their driveways to accommodate one vehicle. As a result, residents must rely on the surrounding on-street parking if they have more than one vehicle or have any visitors.

5. The responses to the consultation were shared with the local Ward Councillors who indicated that they would support revised proposals to introduce double yellow lines at the junction of Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent as shown on Appendix A of this report. This is the minimum length of restrictions that could be considered effective in improving visibility for pedestrians and vehicles negotiating this junction whilst retaining as much kerbside parking space as possible.
6. Following the above, a formal consultation on these revised proposals was carried out between the 21<sup>st</sup> January to 11<sup>th</sup> February 2026. As part of the consultation all residents of Pynchester Close were delivered a letter and plan of the revised proposals, as well as a public notice displayed on site and advertised within the Uxbridge Gazette and London Gazette newspapers during this period. Attached as Appendix B to this report is a table of the responses that were received to formal consultation, some minor redactions have been made to these comments to help protect the identities of the respondents.
7. During the consultation on these revised proposals, a total of five responses were received from residents of Pynchester Close. The majority view expressed was that the Council should consider introducing footway parking in this part of Pynchester Close to allow vehicles to park partly on the footway to ensure clear access is maintained without the loss of any parking spaces. One response was opposed to the introduction of any parking restrictions; they felt that restrictions were unnecessary as they would reduce the amount of on-street parking which residents often rely upon especially those with limited off-street parking.
8. As the Cabinet Member is aware, the Council does not generally formalise footway parking along sections of a footway unless a minimum of 1.5 metres footway width can be maintained for pedestrians. This ensures that residents with mobility difficulties and pushchairs can safely use these footways without fear of an obstruction. During the formal consultation residents suggested that allowing partial footway parking one side of the road would help ensure there is enough clearance for vehicles to pass. Residents have provided evidence that vehicles are driving along the footway when vehicles are currently parked fully in the road and feel that sacrificing the width of one pavement would benefit road safety for both pedestrians and motorists.
9. As a result of the concerns raised during the formal consultation, officers have reviewed the footway layout along this part of Pynchester Close to see if there is any possibility to allow footway parking along this one section of the road as a special case. Officers have discussed the suggestion of a possible proposal for a formalised footway parking place 0.75 metres on the pavement opposite Nos. 1 to 5 Pynchester Close with the Council's Accessibility Officer, to get a view on a compromise proposal to allow footway parking specific to this part of Pynchester Close. The Council's Accessibility Officer has suggested that footway parking limited to this section along one side of Pynchester Close could be a viable compromise if accompanied with double yellow lines opposite the marked parking space to ensure that

clear access is always maintained to the footway opposite. As a result, officers have prepared a further proposal to allow some footway parking within Pynchester Close accompanied by double yellow lines opposite as shown on Appendix D of this report.

10. It is not recommended to extend footway parking to any other parts of Pynchester Close. As mentioned above, allowing footway parking to the extent where the footways are narrowed, clear access must be maintained on the opposite side of the road by the placement of double yellow lines. Determining which sides of the road footway parking should be allowed and parking prohibited, could cause dispute amongst the residents and potentially create other access issues to off-street parking areas. When the Council creates a designated parking place in the form of a marked bay, the powers of enforcement for vehicles crossover obstructions no longer apply. As discussed with the Council's Accessibility Officer, footway parking could be considered as a special case opposite Nos. 1 to 5 Pynchester Close where there are no adjacent property frontages.
11. Officers have discussed the responses to the formal consultation with the Cabinet Member, who, in discussion with the local Ward Councillors, suggests that officers proceed with formal consultation on the revised proposals shown on Appendix D of this report as this is the most viable solution that the Council can offer in response to the concerns and suggestions raised.
12. In summary, the Council has carried out two previous formal consultations on proposals to introduce double yellow lines for the benefit of access within Pynchester Close. The responses to these consultations have indicated that residents are unhappy with the overall loss of parking but would still like measures to be put in place to ensure vehicles can safely access their street. Following investigation and discussion with the local Ward Councillors, it is recommended that formal consultation be carried out on a final set of revised proposals as shown on Appendix D, which would involve formalising partial footway parking opposite Nos. 1 to 5 Pynchester Close with accompanying double yellow lines opposite to ensure clear access can be maintained at all times.

## **Financial Implications**

The estimated cost associated with the recommendations to this report is £500 if the revised proposals are implemented following formal consultation. Subject to the Cabinet Member's approval of the recommendations in this report, these costs can be funded within the existing transportation budget. The revised proposals will be grouped with other road safety related proposals requiring formal consultation to help reduce the overall costs for the Council.

## **RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION**

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

The recommendation of this report is to proceed with formal consultation on revised proposals for double yellow lines and a formalised footway parking place opposite Nos. 1 to 5 Pynchester Close. These revised proposals are in direct response to the comments residents have made during the previous consultations and are intended to help improve road safety for both pedestrians and motorists trying to access the road.

## Consultation & Engagement carried out (or required)

Formal consultation was carried out between 17<sup>th</sup> September 2025 to 8th October 2025 and between 21<sup>st</sup> January to 11<sup>th</sup> February 2026 for the proposed installation of double yellow lines at the junction of Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham.

If the recommendations of this report are approved, then further formal consultation will be carried out for the revised proposals as shown on Appendix D. If any objections are received in responses to these revised proposals, a further Cabinet Member report will be required to consider these comments.

## CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS

### Corporate Finance

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

### Legal

The Council's powers to implement the proposed traffic measures at Pynchester Close, Ickenham are set out in 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 a decision is taken after formal consultation to make an order for the proposed traffic measures, 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. This report states that the proposals have been formulated to help improve road safety for both pedestrians and motorists trying to access the road.

Pursuant to established public law principles on consultation, the decision maker, when deciding on progress of the proposals for traffic measures, must be satisfied that all consultation responses, which are set out within Appendix B, including those that do not accord with the officer's recommendation, 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. In this instance, the consultation responses have informed the revision of the proposals to provide some limited footway parking and accompanying double yellow lines (as shown in Appendix D) to ensure clear access is maintained for accessibility.

The Council must also be continuously mindful of its public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

It must be ensured that any proceeding formal consultation and action taken is in accordance with the rules and requirements mentioned above. A further report would be submitted regarding the outcome of that consultation and Legal Services would provide further comments at that point.

### **Property**

None at this stage.

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

None at this stage.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Cabinet Member report - Objections to the proposed double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham – Published 7<sup>th</sup> November 2025

Cabinet Member decision notice - Objections to the proposed double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham – Published 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025

Notice of intent for revised double yellow lines within Pynchester Close, Ickenham – Published 21<sup>st</sup> January 2026

## **TITLE OF ANY APPENDICES**

- Appendix A – Plan – Revised proposals for double yellow lines limited to the junction of Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham

- Appendix B – Table – Responses to the formal consultation for revised proposals for double yellow lines at the junction of Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham
- Appendix C – Plan – Initial proposal for double yellow lines in Pynchester Close and Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham
- Appendix D – Plan – Recommended revised proposals to introduce a formalised footway parking place and accompanying double yellow lines in Pynchester Close, Ickenham