
RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEMES - CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Responsible Cabinet Member - Councillor David Lyonette, 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 regulation orders in relation to two Residents' Parking Schemes in the area surrounding Darlington College. The proposed schemes are for Eastmount Road Area and Hundens Lane Area.

Information and Analysis

2. Residents of areas within walking distance of Darlington College were consulted in November 2006 on a draft proposal to introduce residents' parking and waiting restrictions that would alleviate parking problems they were having associated with the relocation of Darlington College.
3. Some amendments to the draft were made following comments received from residents. Ward Members were consulted on the final proposal before it was statutorily advertised.
4. Residents were informed in August of the results of the consultation and were given a summary of the proposed amendments and advised that the proposals would be advertised between 16 August and 10 September 2007 when they could make further representation.
5. Six letters of objection have been received from residents in Montrose Street, Hundens Lane and Dumfries Street. Four of these were the same letter sent by residents of two houses in Montrose Street. The objections/comments are summarised below:
 - (a) Streets close to the College should be entirely for residents' parking.
 - (b) Back street restrictions penalise residents.
 - (c) Extent of double yellow lines in Dumfries Street is excessive.
 - (d) Should be more residents' parking closer to Hundens Lane/Haughton Road junction.
 - (e) The College have not provided sufficient parking spaces considering that the parking provision at the previous site was inadequate and should now redevelop their green open spaces for extra parking.

- (f) Chesnut Street car park is within walking distance of the College and should be utilised as a pay and display car park to raise revenue.
 - (g) There has been an increased pedestrian flow and associated litter problems in Montrose Street since the College opened.
 - (h) May not be sufficient space for residents returning home before 6pm.
 - (i) Scheme should not operate on Saturdays.
 - (j) Scheme interferes with residents' way of life and affects their human rights.
 - (k) Should be a guarantee that the Council will not introduce a charge for permits in the future.
 - (l) Cannot assume 75% of residents who did not respond are in agreement with proposals.
 - (m) Do not consider that a proper consultation was carried out with residents.
6. The objections are summarised in **Appendix 1** along with officer comments in relation to each objection.
7. The Chief Constable supports the proposal.

Outcome of Consultation

8. The outcome of the consultation during the advertising period has been analysed in detail and the recommendations formulated in response to objections is shown in **Appendix 1**.

Legal Implications

9. 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.

Financial Implications

10. The cost of introducing two Residents' Parking Schemes around the College in the East Mount Road Area and Hundens Lane Area is £25,000 and £23,000 respectively and will be funded by The Local Transport Plan.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

11. 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.

Council Policy Framework

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

Decision Deadline

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

Key Decisions

14. 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.

Recommendations

15. It is recommended that:
 - (a) The objections be set aside.
 - (b) The proposals be implemented as advertised.

Reasons

16. The reasons for setting aside the objections are given in column three of Appendix 1.

**John Buxton,
Director of Development and Environment**

Background Papers

- (i) Letters of objection and proposals on file.

Brenda Bowles : Extension 2774
lb

Summary of Objections and Recommendation

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Streets nearest to the College should be entirely for residents' parking.	4 residents of Montrose Street	Council implements schemes that reserve sufficient parking for the daytime requirements of residents. Sections of unrestricted and short stay parking provide facility for visitors to both residential and commercial properties.
Residents need to be able to use back streets for washing cars etc and tradesmen need to use rear access to properties.	4 residents of Montrose Street	There could be displaced parking into back streets after implementation of the scheme and any parking in narrow back streets can cause obstruction to through traffic and residents requiring vehicular access to rear of properties. Vehicles can stop to unload and there are exemptions for vehicles associated with building work.
Double yellow lines in Dumfries Street will reduce available space for visitor parking.	Resident of Dumfries Street	Location of a commercial property off eastern end of street necessitates double yellow lines to prevent parking that obstructs access for long HGVs.
Proposal does not improve the parking situation for residents close to Hundens Lane/ Haughton Road junction.	Resident of Hundens Lane	On road safety grounds there should be no parking at junctions and the restrictions outside 2-4 Hundens Lane are necessary to prevent obstruction to turning traffic.
Insufficient parking was provided at College's previous site so why have they not provided sufficient space as part of new development. Should provide extra spaces by redeveloping green areas within College site.	4 residents of Montrose Street	The number of parking spaces provided in the new College is more than at the old site and complies with national planning guidance.
Chesnut Street car park should be utilised for College parking.	4 residents of Montrose Street	Students do have opportunity to use the free Chesnut Street car park.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Montrose Street has suffered a large increase in pedestrians and litter.	4 residents of Montrose Street	Increase in pedestrian flow may indicate that students are using Chesnut Street car park. Consideration can be given to extra litter bins.
Why is the scheme operational 8am to 6pm including Saturday? Several residents work shifts/flexi hours/part time and return home before 6pm and may not be able to find a parking space.	4 residents of Montrose Street	All Council schemes operate 8am to 6pm Mon to Sat to prevent commuter parking and for consistency. This consistent approach makes it clearer for residents, visitors and those seeking somewhere to park and aids enforcement.
Scheme interferes with residents' ways of life and it appears they may be stopped from going about daily business that affects human rights.	4 residents of Montrose Street	Scheme aims to enhance residents' lives by improving the local environment. Residents will not be prevented from doing daily business.
What guarantees will be given that residents will not have to pay for permits in the future?	4 residents of Montrose Street	Council have no plans to introduce charging in the foreseeable future but guarantees cannot be given for long term.
75% of residents did not reply to the consultation; this is a poor response rate, due to the questionnaire being biased and it could be assumed that 75% actually disagree with the proposal	4 residents of Montrose Street	Residents did have opportunity to object/comment on all aspects of the proposal. If you use the same argument could it be equally assumed that those who did not respond are in agreement otherwise they would have made objections. Everyone has a further chance to make objections during the statutory consultation phase.
Why have Council not conducted a proper consultation instead of assuming they know best?	4 residents of Montrose Street	Council carried out a full consultation with all residents but has to design an initial proposal for discussion. This proposal is based on surveys undertaken to determine the extent of residents' parking and road safety.