
PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME – STANHOPE ROAD AREA

Responsible Cabinet Member - Councillor Nick Wallis, Highways and Transport Portfolio

Responsible Director - John Buxton, Director of Development and Environment

Purpose of Report

1. For Members to consider the objections that have been received to the Publication of the Traffic Orders for the Stanhope Road Area Residents' Parking Scheme which were advertised between the 20 April and 15 May 2006 and consider the proposed recommendations.

Information and Analysis

2. The Residents' Parking Scheme for this area that was advertised earlier this year has evolved from several area wide local consultation exercises and the publication of two previous proposals. This background information is set out below.
3. Residents of the Stanhope Road area were first consulted in 2002 on a residents' parking scheme designed to alleviate parking problems they experienced associated with living in close proximity to the town centre, Darlington College and Queen Elizabeth Sixth Form College.
4. Following preliminary consultation, amendments were made to the draft proposal to accommodate comments made by residents in an attempt to introduce a scheme that best fitted the wishes of the residents whilst still being operationally practical.
5. The proposed scheme was statutorily advertised in February 2003 and many objections were received, in particular from some streets where residents were bitterly opposed to having any resident permit parking in their street. These streets included Cleveland Terrace, Fife Road and the western ends of Uplands Road and Langholm Crescent. The main objections were that some residents did not consider a parking problem existed and/or were opposed to having to purchase a permit to park outside their homes if resident bays were introduced on their frontages.
6. There were also objections made to the proposed loading bay in Cleveland Terrace that was to be introduced to serve both 'Ken Warne' and the 'Wine Shop'.
7. In the light of objections received, the proposal was amended to delete those areas where residents were strongly opposed to residents' parking being introduced. Residents were advised that it would not be possible to reintroduce residents' parking into those streets where it had been removed at residents' request should a displacement of commuter parking

become a problem in these streets. This revised scheme was advertised in April 2005.

8. Even with the amendments, this second published scheme received 36 objections, which are briefly summarised below:
 - (a) Not enough residents' bays proposed in some streets.
 - (b) A request for residents' bays at the eastern end of Cleveland Terrace.
 - (c) Residents' bays be reinstated in Uplands Road and Fife Road, where they had previously been rejected on the basis that the recent introduction of paid parking in the town centre streets had displaced additional commuter parking into this area.
 - (d) Requests from some streets to remove the proposed waiting restriction from the back streets.
 - (e) Request from two streets for the proposed waiting restrictions in the back streets to be increased from a daytime to a 24 hour restriction.
9. The scheme was again amended to introduce some residents' bays into the eastern end of Cleveland Terrace and the western end of Uplands Road, remove waiting restrictions from certain back streets, particularly where resident bays were not being proposed in the front street, and introduce 24 hour restrictions in two back streets where evening parking was occurring that regularly caused obstruction. Single yellow lines were also removed from the proposal in parts of all back streets where it was considered that parking would either not be a road safety hazard or was not possible due to the location of garages.
10. This updated scheme was agreed with the local Members before it was formally advertised on the 20 April 2006 with the objection period ending on the 15 May 2006. It is this proposal and the subsequent objections which are the main subject of this report.

Analysis of Scheme Advertised on the 20 April 2006

11. The scheme attracted 33 letters of objections and two letters of support from the public plus a petition signed by 554 customers of Ken Warne's shop (of which 337 were local residents) requesting limited waiting outside 'Ken Warne' for customer use. The responses from the public are broken down at **Appendix 1**. The Police have also objected to one of the waiting restrictions included in the proposals.
12. The objections/comments on the proposals can be broadly categorised under four general headings:
 - (a) Requests for more residents' parking bays
 - (b) Issues relating to the loading bay outside Ken Warne
 - (c) Waiting restrictions in back streets
 - (d) Waiting restrictions at other locations and general parking issues

The objections are summarised at **Appendix 2** along with officer comments in relation to each objection.

13. However, given the protracted history of this scheme and the considerable pressure from many residents for this scheme to be introduced it is felt that parts of the scheme should be implemented as soon as possible.
14. Once a scheme has been advertised it is not possible to add extra restrictions or change the restrictions proposed without re-advertising the new proposals. It is possible, however, to remove elements from the scheme. Therefore, it is proposed that Members set aside or uphold objections as detailed in Appendix 2 and implement the bulk of the advertised scheme. To deal with the objections that have been raised it is proposed a secondary order is drafted immediately and advertised as soon as possible. This will allow the bulk of the scheme to be implemented quickly whilst at the same time giving a firm commitment to addressing agreed amendments requested by objectors that can be safely introduced. It is proposed that the secondary order be published by the 15 September 2006.

Requests for More Residents' Parking Bays

15. Representations have been made directly and through the Ward Councillors to increase the amount of resident parking bays. Some of the residents who rejected the introduction of residents' bays previously were not at that time experiencing particular parking problems. However, since then there has been an increase in the commuter parking in this area, which could be related to displacement caused by paid parking on-street and the subsequent higher enforcement levels. There is also likely to be additional displacement once the new waiting restrictions and resident parking are introduced in this area.
16. Officers therefore recommend that additional residents' parking be advertised in the secondary order as follows:
 - (a) Uplands Road (north side between the junction of Fife Road and Swinburne Road).
 - (b) Swinburne Road (extend bay on east side in front of Nos 40 to 46 and west side in front of 29 to 37).
 - (c) Cleveland Terrace (in front of Nos 26 to 34 and Nos 21 to 23).
 - (d) With regard to Abbey Road (in front of Nos 27 to 31) improved access to off street parking will be achieved using extended access protection markings instead of residents' parking provision.

Issues relating to the loading bay outside Ken Warne

17. Ken Warne has objected to the introduction of the loading bay outside the shop/Post Office in Cleveland Terrace. The grounds of objection are set out in **Appendix 2**. The loading bay has been included in the scheme to assist deliveries and avoid the hazards of double parking by heavy goods vehicles servicing the shop. It is proposed that the loading bay operates between 8:00am and 12 noon and outside those hours would return to unrestricted parking. However, the post office highlight that the majority of its customers are elderly and require transport to use the post office, there will be a smaller number of available parking spaces in the area once the proposals are in place and hence it is their view that it

will be impossible to park anywhere near the Post Office. They have carried out works to improve the accessibility of the post office but still have concerns about its vulnerability to closure if its regular use is adversely affected by the scheme.

18. Officers consider a loading bay is necessary to assist deliveries and avoid the hazards of double-parking by HGVs. The presence of the loading bay will also prevent commuters parking on the frontage of 'Ken Warne' in the morning peak.
19. Officers recommend that the loading bay be removed from the advertised order and the secondary order advertises a loading bay with operational hours 8:00am to 10:30am Monday to Saturday and a restriction limiting waiting to 30 minutes from 10:30am to 6:00pm Monday to Saturday.
20. It should be noted that whilst Mr Warne has requested a very short limited waiting period and Council officers are proposing to include this in the secondary order the Police may have operational issues with enforcing a short limited waiting period and as the enforcing body may object to the order. Pre decriminalisation, therefore, enforcement may not be forthcoming.

Waiting Restrictions in Back Streets

21. Generally in resident parking schemes, waiting restrictions are introduced in back streets to prevent commuters from simply moving from the front street to the back street and thereby creating obstruction to through traffic, refuse collection and access to garages.
22. In parts of the Stanhope Road area there is already a problem with people, in particular Sixth Form students, parking in the back streets around Swinburne Road and Trinity Road. In back streets in nearby areas restrictions already exist restricting parking Monday to Saturday between 9.00 am to 5.00 pm.
23. As part of the advertising process some residents have objected on the basis that more back street protection should be provided. This has been reinforced by Ward Member representations to include more areas of protection.
24. As mentioned previously, it is not possible to amend the advertised order to accommodate this and hence officers recommend that the secondary order be advertised restricting parking between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm Monday to Saturday in the following back streets to cover all representations received:
 - (a) Back Streets to rear of No. 39 to 51 Swinburne Road including the lanes to the North and South of the extreme properties.
 - (b) Back Street to rear of No.1c to 15 Swinburne Road
 - (c) Back Street to rear of No. 24 to 38 Swinburne Road
 - (d) Back Street Adjacent to No.24 Swinburne Road
 - (e) Back Street to adjacent to 46 Fife Road and 37 Swinburne Road

- (f) Back Street to rear of No. 22 to 28 Langholm Crescent
- (g) Back Street along the side of No. 4 Langholm Crescent
- (h) Back Street adjacent to 62 Vane Terrace
- (i) Back Street to rear 9 to 27 Abbey Road

Waiting Restrictions at Other Locations & General Parking Issues

25. There have been a number of other objections relating to individual aspects of the scheme. These are summarised in **Appendix 2** with an officer response to the objection and recommendation.

Outcome of Consultation

26. The outcome of the consultation during the advertising period has been analysed in detail and the recommendations formulated in response to objections.
27. Officers recognise the concerns raised in the objections but there is a considerable amount of people who will welcome the introduction of this scheme and thus improve their quality of life. It is for these reasons officers are recommending that the bulk of the scheme be introduced with follow up work to address the issues raised by objectors addressed via the secondary order.
28. It should be noted that whilst the recommendation involves the processing of a secondary order to implement some of the amendments to the scheme, the same statutory processes must be followed and it is possible that some objections may be raised to aspects of the secondary order and would have to be considered in a similar manner.

Legal Implications

29. This report has been considered by the Legal Services Manager for legal implications in accordance with the Council's approved procedures. There are no issues which the Legal Services Manager considers need to be brought to the specific attention of Members, other than those highlighted in the report.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

30. The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the requirements placed on the Council by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, namely, the duty on the Council to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.
31. The proposed scheme may have positive deterrent benefit on autocrime by introducing uniformed council officers patrolling the streets
32. The scheme may also reduce tensions between residents and commuters and avoid potential confrontations over parking spaces.

Council Policy Framework

33. The issues contained within this report do not represent change to Council policy or the Council's policy framework.

Decision Deadline

34. For the purpose of the 'call-in' procedure this does not represent an urgent matter.

Key Decisions

35. This is a key decision since the scheme has potential to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in the area.

Recommendation

36. It is recommended that:

- (a) The objections to the proposals advertised between 20 April 2006 and 15 May 2006 be set aside or upheld as set out in Appendix 2.
- (b) That the proposals as advertised be implemented subject to the following amendments:
 - (i) The loading bay in front of 'Ken Warne Shop' be removed from the advertised order.
 - (ii) The waiting restrictions at the junction of Milbank Crescent/Milbank Road be removed from the advertised order.
- (c) A secondary traffic order be published by 15 September 2006 to include:
 - (i) Additional residents' parking bays be introduced as identified in paragraph 16 of this report.
 - (ii) A loading bay in front of 'Ken Warne shop' be advertised providing a loading bay with operational hours 8.00 am to 10.30 am Monday to Saturday and a restriction limiting waiting to 30 minutes from 10.30 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Saturday.
 - (iii) Additional restrictions are advertised providing back lane protection as identified in paragraph 24 of this report.
- (d) Further consideration be given to the following locations with a view to their inclusion in the secondary traffic order:
 - (i) Double yellow lines around the junction of Stonedale Crescent.
 - (ii) The junction at The Woodlands/Milbank Road with a view to possible inclusion of waiting restrictions.

- (iii) The junction of Milbank Crescent/Milbank Road be discussed with the Police with the possible inclusion of waiting restrictions in the secondary order.

Reasons

37. The recommendations are supported by the following reasons:

- (a) To introduce a residents' parking scheme that is needed to manage parking in the area and improve the quality of life of the community.
- (b) To address the concerns raised by objectors during the statutory advertising period of the Traffic Regulation Order for the Residents' Parking Scheme – Stanhope Road Area.

John Buxton
Director of Development and Environment

Background Papers

Objection letters received.

Dave Winstanley : Extension 2752
cc

**Stanhope Area Residents Parking Area Proposal 2006
Response from Public**

- Revised proposal advertised 20 April – 15 May 2006
- 33 letters received and same letter submitted as a petition by 554 customers of Ken Warne (337 are local residents and 217 from out of town)

Objections by Street:

Street	Total Replies	Letters of Objection	Letters in Support
Zone I			
Trinity Mews	4	4	
Woodland Road	1	1	
Stonedale Crescent	1	1	
Cleveland Avenue	1	1	
The Woodlands	3	3	
Milbank Road	1	1	
Zone J			
Stanhope Road South	2	1 (not valid)	1
Swinburne Road	6	6	
Cleveland Terrace	7 + petition	7 plus Ken Warne & 200 customers	
Vane Tce	1		1
Fife Rd	4	4	
Uplands Rd	2	2	
Langholm Crescent	-		1
TOTAL	33 + petition		

Summary of Objections & Recommendation

Requests for More Residents' Parking Bays

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Request more resident bays	21, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34 Cleveland Tce 17, 19 Uplands, 21 Swinburne Rd, 28 Fife Rd Also received via local Ward Members.	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objections a secondary order will take into account the issues that have been raised. A more detailed response and recommendation is documented within the body of the report.

Issues relating to the loading bay outside Ken Warne

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Does not want loading bay outside shop, prefers waiting restrictions or 15 minute limited waiting that permits customer parking but excludes commuters. (Note that in initial consultation the shop owners requested that proposed loading bay between 19-25 was enlarged to cover entire frontage of shop).	Ken Warne Shop	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection the secondary order will take into account the issues that have been raised. A more detailed response and recommendation is documented within the body of the report.
Post Office customers have difficulty parking now and proposal reduces available space. Need scheme for delivery vehicles to unload safely and customers to park.	22 Cleveland Terrace	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection a secondary order will take into account the issues that have been raised. A more detailed response and recommendation is documented within the body of the report.
Loading bay not needed as will be abused but suggests operational from 9.00 am to noon Monday-Friday	26 Cleveland Terrace	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection a secondary order will take into account the issues that have been raised. A more detailed response and recommendation is documented within the body of the report.

Waiting Restrictions in Back Lanes

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Need yellow lines in back streets	8 Fife Road 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38 and 40 Swinburne Road Also raised by local Ward Members	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection a secondary order will take into account the issues that have been raised. A more detailed response and recommendation is documented within the body of the report.

Waiting Restrictions at Other Locations & General Parking Issues

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Wants more yellow lines in back street and at junctions of Cleveland Terrace Back Street with Scarth Street and Swinburne Road.	4 Cleveland Terrace	No	It is not considered necessary to provide junction protection at back streets due to low volume of traffic exiting. Other residents in this part of Cleveland Terrace are opposed the back street restrictions.
Wants double yellows on both side of Trinity Mews.	18, 23, 24 and 25 Trinity Mews	No	Officers have assessed the situation and do not consider it necessary on road safety grounds.
Removing yellow lines from Cleveland Avenue will encourage commuter parking. Protection needed at Stonedale Crescent junction to improve visibility and prevent obstruction.	10 Stonedale Crescent	No	Whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection a secondary order could take into account the issues that have been raised and consideration could be given to double yellow lines around the junction of Stonedale Crescent.
Opposed to double yellows on frontage.	41 Cleveland Terrace	No	The lines do not extend across the frontage of the objectors property. However, they do reduce overall parking capacity. They are considered necessary in the interests of road safety to prohibit parking adjacent to the refuge on approach to roundabout.

Waiting Restrictions at Other Locations & General Parking Issues (continued)

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Double yellow lines requested across driveway.	74 Cleveland Avenue	No	The property has a drive access protection line. It is considered that this provides sufficient warning of the presence of a drive access and provides the Police enforcement capability.
Wants permission to park his car across garage at rear but otherwise supports yellow lines in back street	23 Swinburne Road	No	It is not desirable to exempt residents from restrictions as this would lead to difficulties with enforcement and potentially encourage non-residents to park ignoring the restriction. The front of house has unrestricted parking and resident can also use garage for parking.
Want junction protection at The Woodlands/Milbank Road to improve visibility.	24, 28 and 30 The Woodlands	No	The junction is wide at this location and in the past the Police have not supported requests for yellow lines. However, whilst the recommendation is not to uphold the objection when preparing the secondary order, further dialogue will be undertaken with the Police with a view to possible inclusion of waiting restrictions in the secondary traffic regulation order.
Waiting restrictions at Milbank Road/Milbank Crescent not necessary as no parking or visibility problems.	Police	Yes	The Police have objected to the proposal and as such it is proposed to remove the waiting restrictions from scheme. These areas of junction protection were included following requests from the Ward Councillors. Whilst the recommendation is to uphold the objection and withdraw the restrictions when preparing the secondary order, further dialogue will be undertaken with the Police with a view to possible inclusion of waiting restrictions in the secondary traffic regulation order.

Waiting Restrictions at Other Locations & General Parking Issues (continued)

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	Officer response
Wants central island removed from eastern end of Cleveland Terrace and roundabout at Cleveland Avenue reduced to a mini roundabout then double yellows would not be needed.	22 Cleveland Terrace	No	Officers consider the central island is needed to assist pedestrians cross the wide junction. Officers also consider the large roundabout to be an appropriate design and helps to reduce traffic speed.
Proposal does not improve environment as circulating traffic will be competing for less spaces.	15 Swinburne Road	No	The proposals will improve the situation for residents who will be able to find a parking space more readily and this will reduce their 'hunting' for space. Commuters will soon recognise that parking is no longer available in certain areas and find elsewhere to park.
Proposal does not address problem of people not using town centre car parks. Suggest every street within a set walking distance of town is made 50% residents' parking.	2 Fife Road	No	The proposal may disperse commuters further from town centre or it may encourage them to park in long stay car parks. The situation is monitored to address issues where people feel they have unacceptable levels of commuter parking. Schemes are implemented gradually to avoid 'overkill' and residents being subject to restrictions that are not necessary.
Reducing space available for residents to park and not addressing commuter parking problems.	24 Cleveland Terrace	No	Proposals for resident parking bays does address commuter parking but this section of street opposed earlier scheme that included resident bays. However, the proposed secondary order does include more resident parking bays in the immediate vicinity.
Opposed to charging residents to park on their frontage. Parking problems are due to town centre charging.	1 Fife Road	No	The Council feels it appropriate for residents to pay a small charge towards the administration of schemes. The charge also ensures that residents consider whether they need a permit thereby minimising the issue of unused permits.

Waiting Restrictions at Other Locations & General Parking Issues (continued)

Objection/Comment	From	Uphold Objection	<i>Officer response</i>
Reduction in public parking space in Vane Terrace will affect customers of Guest House.	63 Woodland Road	No	There is unrestricted parking in Woodland Road on frontage of Guest House and in Vane Terrace for guests' parking. Guests can also unload cars on the yellow lines in back street before moving car elsewhere to park.