
**STANHOPE AREA RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME
SECONDARY TRAFFIC ORDER**

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 secondary traffic order in relation to the Stanhope Area Residents' Parking Scheme and the proposed recommendations. This secondary proposal was advertised between 14 September and 9 October 2006.

Information and Analysis

2. The residents' parking scheme for Stanhope Area was advertised in April 2006 and Cabinet considered objections to the scheme at its meeting on the 11 July 2006.
3. Cabinet resolved (Min C27(3)/Jul06) to proceed to make the traffic regulation order for the Stanhope Area Residents' Parking Scheme with certain amendments. Cabinet also agreed to publish a secondary traffic order as set out below in the extract from the Cabinet Report recommendations to introduce additional waiting restrictions:

Extract from Cabinet Report dated 11 July 2006

(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.*

4. The secondary proposal was advertised between 14 September and 9 October 2006 and an objection was received from Ken Warne, plus a petition signed by 608 of his customers, and a similar objection letter from four residents. These are summarised below.
 - (a) Further residents' parking spaces will reduce availability of customer parking for the shops.
 - (b) Loading bay will reduce availability of customer parking for the shops.
 - (c) The proposed 30 minutes parking outside Ken Warne from 10:30am to 6pm will not allow sufficient turnover for cars for people using the Post Office (within Ken Warne).
 - (d) Lack of parking space close to shops will threaten the survival of Post Office
 - (e) Provision of a loading bay in a residential street will cause early morning noise and air pollution.
 - (f) Shop customers will park in residents' bays.
 - (g) Proposed residents' bays in Cleveland Terrace will displace vehicles to other parts of the street.
 - (h) Insufficient short term parking for customers of all business premises in Cleveland Terrace.
5. The objections are summarised in **Appendix 1** along with officer comments in relation to each objection.
6. In addition six letters supporting the proposal have been received from residents of Cleveland Terrace, Swinburne Road and Fife Road.
7. Amendments to the proposed loading bay outside Ken Warne have been made throughout previous consultations that have resulted in the section of road outside Ken Warne now being proposed to operate as a loading bay from 8.00am to 10.30am and as 30 minutes limited waiting from 10.30am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. Effectively this provides daytime waiting for vehicles associated with Ken Warne on the shop's entire frontage. Staff of Ken Warne will not however be able to park on the shop frontage.
8. The objections raised by Ken Warne centre around concerns that if the additional residents parking bays are introduced, this would reduce the potential parking provision to the shop for his customers, which would threaten the survival of the Post Office. (For the full list of objections see **Appendix 1**.) The petition from his customers needs to be viewed against the background of the campaign that the shop has had against the proposals. Whilst undoubtedly there are objections to the scheme, it is difficult to be sure that all, or indeed

what proportion, are fully informed objections.

9. Oddbins and other businesses in Cleveland Terrace have made no representation throughout the three years of consultation regards the proposed scheme.
10. The Chief Constable supports the proposal apart from reservations regarding the inclusion of double yellow lines at the junction The Woodlands/Milbank Road where he does not consider that they are needed. Accordingly, it is proposed that these be deleted from the scheme.

Outcome of Consultation

11. The outcome of the consultation during the advertising period has been analysed in detail and the recommendations formulated in response to objections.
12. Officers recognise the concerns raised in the objections but there is a considerable amount of people who will welcome the introduction of this secondary traffic order as a means of helping to improve their quality of life.

Legal Implications

13. This report has been considered by the Borough Solicitor for legal implications in accordance with the Council's approved procedures. There are no issues which the Borough Solicitor 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

14. 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.
15. The proposed scheme may have positive deterrent benefit on autocrime by introducing uniformed Council officers patrolling the streets.
16. The scheme may also reduce tensions between residents and commuters and avoid potential confrontations over parking spaces.

Council Policy Framework

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

Decision Deadline

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

Key Decisions

19. 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

20. It is recommended that:

- (a) The objections be set aside.
- (b) The proposal as advertised, with the omission of the waiting restrictions at the junction The Woodlands / Milbank Road, be implemented.

Reasons

21. The recommendations are supported by the following reason:

- (a) To address concerns raised by objectors during the previous statutory advertising period from 20 April to 15 May 2006 of the traffic regulation order for the Residents' Parking Scheme – Stanhope Road Area.
- (b) To introduce a parking scheme that improves the quality of life for the community whilst reserving parking space for visitors to the shops.

John Buxton
Director of Development and Environment

Background Papers

- (i) Letters of Support.
- (ii) Letters of objection and Petition.

Brenda Bowles : Extension 2774
cc

Summary of Objections and Recommendation

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
This proposal in addition to the main scheme reduces parking for customers by 18 spaces	Cleveland Post Office, Petition	Main aim of scheme is providing reserved daytime parking in a residential area for residents where there is a large amount of commuter parking. Customer parking has been provided over entire frontage of shop 10.30am – 6.00pm and there are 44 unrestricted spaces close by.
Proposal to remove 8-9 parking spaces in vicinity of Post Office	Petition	Main aim of scheme is providing reserved daytime parking in a residential area for residents. There are 10 spaces proposed but shop customers with a blue parking badge will be able to wait in the residents' parking space.
Adequate car parking arrangements is fundamental to continued existence of Post Office	Cleveland Post Office	Not all customers visit by car and for those that do there is short term and unrestricted parking close by.
Nobody will be able to park close to the Post Office before 10.30am	Cleveland Post Office, Petition	Not all customers visit by car and for those that do there is unrestricted parking close by.
3 short term parking spaces will be used by customers and visitors to all properties in Cleveland Terrace	Cleveland Post Office	No business can claim part of the highway for exclusive use by its customers.
All unrestricted parking will be used by town centre commuters to detriment of local businesses	Cleveland Post Office	Commuter parking is the main reason for the need of a residents' parking scheme but not all unrestricted areas will be filled with commuters. Some residents who have parked in unrestricted spaces overnight will move by 9.00am and leave available spaces.
Unfair to Post Office and its customers that loading bay outside can be used for deliveries to Oddbins and other properties	Cleveland Post Office	A loading bay on highway is for the use of vehicles loading/unloading goods and cannot be specific to any particular property.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
30 minutes waiting will not allow sufficient turnover for cars visiting Post Office	Petition	30 minutes is sufficient time for most customers and there will be those who park for less time therefore creating a higher turnover.
Request loading bay to be extended so as to also service Oddbins	Cleveland Post Office	The original proposed scheme did provide a loading bay sited outside the houses between Ken Warne and Oddbins and 2 hour parking between Ken Warne and No 5 but objections were made by residents. Ken Warne did request at that time that it be extended to No 15 thereby removing all parking from his frontage. It is best to provide a loading bay where the majority of deliveries are undertaken.
Request that loading bay only operates 8am – 10am	Cleveland Post Office	Daily deliveries are generally made between 7.00am and 11.00am therefore reducing to 10am may result in the practice of double-parking prevailing.
Request short term parking of 15 minutes 10am – 6pm to provide regular turnover	Cleveland Post Office	Feasibly 30 minutes is the least time that will provide a regular turnover and enough time for some of the customers. In reality many customers will stay for much less than 30 minutes so there will be a higher turnover. Enforcement of a 15 minute period is impractical
Request that all residents' parking spaces be on opposite side of road to Post Office between No 28 and Cleveland Avenue	Cleveland Post Office	The original proposal did have the residents' parking only on the north side but due to objections and a request from residents on the south side we now propose residents' spaces on both sides.
Not had a fair representation of views throughout consultations	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	There have been several consultations with residents but it has not been possible to make amendments to address all views expressed.
Elected Member has not been able to debate issue in open Council	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Local Members have been involved throughout the consultation.
Residents have not been invited to discuss issue at Cabinet	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Not usual policy to invite the public to Cabinet.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Loading bay detrimental to residential area due to early morning noise and air pollution from HGV and their refrigeration units	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Deliveries to a local shop will be made regardless of the presence of a loading bay.
Loss of early morning parking	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	There are only 3 parking spaces that are not available after 8.00am.
Not sufficient 30 minutes parking spaces therefore shop customers will displace into the adjacent residents' parking area needing a constant enforcement presence	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Any parking restriction is liable to abuse and enforcement cannot be provided 24/7. Residents will benefit from the reserved parking spaces and appreciate that there is always the possibility of short-term abuse.
Residents' parking unnecessary and will displace vehicles into other sections of Cleveland Terrace	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Majority of residents agree that the provision of residents' parking is necessary to enable them to park close to home in an area that is used for long-term commuter parking.
No of residents' vehicles outweighs provision of residents' parking spaces	4 residents of Cleveland Terrace	Not all residents require daytime parking and they are not confined to parking in the reserved spaces. The reserved spaces merely guarantee that residents will be able to find a space within the zone if not always able to park outside their home.
Reconsider proposed waiting restrictions for The Woodlands/ Milbank Road as there are no road safety and/or congestion issues at this junction.	Chief Constable	The Woodlands has a wide junction mouth and parked vehicles in Millbank Road close to the junction do not obstruct visibility to an extent to warrant waiting restrictions. There are dropped disability access kerbs on radii of junction therefore cars cannot park too close. If problems arise then consider white keep clear lines across dropped kerbs.