
**SOUTHEND AVENUE AREA RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

Responsible Cabinet Member - Councillor David Lyonette, Transport Portfolio

**Responsible Director - Cliff Brown,
Director of Community Services**

Purpose of Report

1. For Members to consider the objections that have been received on publication of the traffic regulation order in relation to the proposed residents' parking scheme in the Southend Avenue area and decide how to proceed with the scheme.

Information and Analysis

2. The area surrounding Southend Avenue has been identified as a location that is suffering from commuter parking and there have been requests for resident parking for a number of years. The parking is making it difficult for certain residents to find a parking space within reasonable distance of their property. The level of parking is also causing road safety concerns at some locations.
3. A scheme was designed to try and alleviate the parking problems and Ward Councillors were invited to a briefing on the proposals. In December 2006 residents living in the area around Southend Avenue were consulted on the proposal.
4. The results of the initial consultation identified a series of issues with the original proposals. A consultation report was produced that analysed the issues on a street by street basis. Where possible officers adjusted the scheme to resolve or accommodate issues that had been raised.
5. Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member with the Transport Portfolio were invited to a briefing where the scheme and issues raised were considered on a street by street basis. A series of options were considered in light of the consultation and agreement was reached to take the revised scheme forward to the statutory advertising process.
6. In December 2007 residents were advised of the results of the consultation and a detailed letter explained the modifications that had been made as a result of the consultation. The letter also advised the amended proposal was being statutorily advertised between 12 December 2007 and 7 January 2008 when they could make further representation or formally object to the proposal.

7. During the advertising period 13 letters of objection have been received from residents of Beechwood Avenue, Coniscliffe Road, Grange Road and Southend Avenue. A number of representations were made direct to Ward Councillors. All comments and objections have been considered in producing this report. The objections are summarised in **Appendix 1**.
8. When a resident parking scheme is designed it is necessary to try and contemplate the displacement that may occur. In this case the scheme was extended along Grange Road to an area where residents do not currently experience a problem.
9. As a result of this a series of objections were received from residents of the Grange Road area south of Marlborough Drive, in particular from blocks 58 – 64, 78 – 82 and 169 – 187.
10. A meeting was arranged between officers, residents and the local Members on 11 February 2008 to explore their concerns in more detail and find a way forward.
11. At the meeting officers explained the potential for the displacement and if residents were not included at this stage it may be sometime before the area was re-visited. Officers and the local Members advised the residents of their experience in other areas.
12. The residents at the meeting were unanimous that they were prepared to take a risk and requested that the element affecting them be removed from the proposal. This is technically possible at this stage.
13. As part of the scheme the opportunity has been taken to mark the existing bus stops with a clearway regulation as all bus stops in the Borough are gradually being converted to clearways. The residents felt that this reduced their available parking space and requested a review be undertaken to relocate the stops.
14. Grange Road residents also considered the provision of double yellow lines between Marlborough Drive and Kendal Close was excessive and a closure in the rear alley off would exacerbate problems. Some of these proposals were originally included in the scheme at the request of residents.

Outcome of Consultation

15. From the objections received an area can be identified where the majority of residents appear to accept the proposals and the Council remains of the view that the scheme will bring benefits to the area. However, further work is required in the Grange Road area.
16. The issues raised during the advertising period, and at the meeting held with Grange Road residents, have been analysed and the officer response to objections are shown in **Appendix 1**.
17. To move the scheme forward it is recommended that all the objections be set aside and the scheme be introduced, minus a section of Grange Road. It is also recommended that further work be undertaken on the issues raised by Grange Road residents.

18. The further feasibility work will involve a number of stakeholders and as such the timescale is likely to extend beyond the introduction of the scheme, should Members be minded to approve the recommendation.
19. Another order can be made for this part of Grange Road following the review and consolidated with the initial order. This will give Grange Road residents opportunity to see the effects of the initial scheme and assess whether they do get displacement parking before making their final decision. Naturally these residents will have further opportunity to object if they are still not happy with the second proposal.
20. The Chief Constable supports the original proposal.

Legal Implications

21. 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

22. The cost of introducing the residents' parking scheme in the Southend Avenue area is £32,000 and will be funded by The Local Transport Plan.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

23. 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. It is not considered that the contents of this report have any such effect.

Council Policy Framework

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

Decision Deadline

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

Key Decisions

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

Recommendation

27. It is recommended that:

- (a) The objections be set aside and the proposal implemented without the sections of Grange Road from Nos 163-189 and 58-82.
- (b) Further investigation be undertaken to consider the issues and objections in the Grange Road area with a potential to progress a second order.

Reasons

28. The recommendations are supported in order to introduce a parking scheme that improves the quality of life for the community.

Cliff Brown
Director of Community Services

Background Papers

- (i) Letters of objection.
- (ii) Consultation Report.

Brenda Bowles : Extension 2774
Cc

Summary of Objections and Recommendation

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
<p>Scheme not supported by residents. Majority of residents voted 'No' to residents' parking at the initial consultation stage.</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd and Beechwood Ave</p>	<p>The first phase of consultation resulted in a significant number of issues raised. After the amendments there are a relatively small number of formal objections. The Grange Road area objections have been considered and the recommendation is to review the scheme in this area. In Beechwood Ave 6 out of 26 properties disagreed with proposals at consultation stage and the detailed issues are commented upon in this appendix.</p>
<p>Implement scheme for Southend Ave, Beechwood Ave, Oakdene Ave residents and their visitors initially then extend if necessary</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd</p>	<p>Darlington's policy for residents parking schemes is to have a mixture of residents parking, limited waiting and unrestricted parking rather than designating whole streets for residents and their visitors. The risks of not covering a wider area have been highlighted to residents of Grange Road and they are prepared to take the risk. A review has been recommended to allow the scheme to be extended.</p>
<p>Council has no right to charge for permits and number of permits should be limited to available space. Cost of permit is too high.</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd and Beechwood Ave</p>	<p>Powers are available to make a charge for permit schemes. The charge is set at a level to contribute towards the overall cost of administering the scheme.</p> <p>Residents can choose whether to purchase a permit or not depending on whether they feel they will benefit.</p> <p>The residents' spaces are to ensure a resident with a permit can park somewhere close to home.</p>

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Council has no right to charge for permits and number of permits should be limited to available space. Cost of permit is too high Ctd/...	Resident of Grange Rd and Beechwood Ave Ctd/..	Residents can also park in unrestricted and limited waiting areas, there is no need to limit number of permits issued.
Scheme should not be to raise revenue	Resident of Grange Rd	Schemes are to assist residents living close to town centre where there is extensive commuter parking and improve their environment. Schemes are not introduced to raise revenue.
Bus stops should not restrict parking space for residents. Stops should be relocated to Garage and Vet frontages	Resident of Grange Rd	The bus stops have been in situ for many years and it was considered necessary to protect them from potential displacement and obstructive parking. The bus stop outside Nos 62/64 has been relocated to increase the parking on frontage 58/60. The review that is recommended will re-visit this issue.
Removing parking from back street will have detrimental effect on resident's life. Restriction will prevent residents load/unload cars	Resident of Grange Rd, Beechwood Ave and Coniscliffe Rd	Parking in back streets can be obstructive to traffic flow and to residents with off street parking. Restrictions are necessary to prevent displaced commuter parking from front streets. Residents can load/unload on yellow lines. Extra residents' parking has been introduced in Polam Road to compensate those residents of Grange Rd between Polam Road and Polam Lane for loss of back street parking.
No problem with parking in Grange Rd to south of Marlborough Drive	Resident of Grange Rd	It is officer's views that the scheme should cover this area but the recommendation is to remove the proposals and review the situation.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
<p>Not enough spaces for residents of both sides of road, particularly on evening. Scheme does not account for car ownership. Insufficient residents' parking.</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd and Beechwood Ave</p>	<p>It is not physically possible to provide space for all residents' vehicles that require highway parking when there is a large car ownership. Many residents do have an off street parking facility for 1 vehicle. Residents' spaces are allocated depending on the daytime needs determined from survey. There is a high percentage of residents' parking spaces in Beechwood Avenue in relation to the number of properties (84%).</p>
<p>Not sufficient space for residents' parking on evening due to waiting restrictions and bus stops. Scheme should extend past 6pm</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd</p>	<p>Aim of scheme is to provide sufficient space for residents who need daytime parking when there is regular commuter parking taking place. There is no commuter parking on evenings. Where there is high car ownership there may not be sufficient kerbside to accommodate all resident' cars and operating the scheme after 6pm will not resolve this. The review that is recommended will re-visit the waiting restrictions and bus stop issues.</p>
<p>Will make parking more difficult for residents. All non-residents funnelled into small areas leaving no available spaces by 8:45 causing residents and parents to double park.</p>	<p>Resident of Beechwood Ave</p>	<p>Scheme is designed to provide sufficient resident parking for those residents who require daytime parking. Commuters will utilise unrestricted areas where residents are not parked and parents have the benefit of limited waiting sections.</p>
<p>No reason to remove parking from frontage Majestic Wine</p>	<p>Resident of Grange Rd</p>	<p>Officers and the police consider double yellow lines are necessary outside Majestic Wine on road safety grounds to improve visibility from car park egress.</p>

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Most parking problems relating to road safety issues are at junctions so a scheme of waiting restrictions only should be introduced.	Resident of Beechwood Ave	Commuters are parking in Beechwood Ave to the detriment of residents and without any residents' parking the situation for residents will not improve as displaced parking will compound the pressure on spaces.
Residents have an inalienable right to park on frontage without a further charge to Council Tax and Road Fund Tax.	Resident of Beechwood Ave	In Highway law no person has the right to park on the highway. The Council will consider the most appropriate use of the available highway space and allow parking where it is safe to do so. Where a resident parking scheme is introduced, the residents who benefit from the scheme are expected to contribute to the cost of operating the scheme.
Parents will use residents' spaces for a few minutes	Resident of Beechwood Ave	It is inevitable that some parents may use empty residents' spaces for a few minutes but they will be risking a parking ticket. This will be very short term parking.
All parking should be limited to a max 4 hours	Resident of Beechwood Ave	The current proposals provide a mixture of parking. There are resident bays, uncontrolled bays and bays limited to 2 hours. This provides for a balance of needs within the community.
No case for the scheme has been laid out	Resident of Beechwood Ave	The scheme is desperately required along Southend Avenue and other areas. The commuter parking is appearing in Beechwood Avenue.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
No case for the scheme has been laid out Ctd/..	Resident of Beechwood Ave Ctd/..	<p>Beechwood Avenue has been included to prevent the situation from displacing into the street if other areas mentioned are controlled by a resident parking scheme.</p> <p>The proximity of Beechwood Ave to the town centre means that displacement of commuter parking is a real possibility and the scheme should offer some protection to residents.</p>
Some residents without residents' parking on their frontage will have more difficulties than now	Resident of Beechwood Ave	Scheme is designed to provide residents with daytime parking close to their homes. If they cannot actually park on their own frontage space should be available nearby. This will improve the current situation for a significant amount of residents and ensure residents are protected if displacement occurs.
Commuters leaving cars during evening will prevent residents' using the unrestricted parking	Resident of Beechwood Ave	Residents and non-residents share the unrestricted public parking areas. Generally most commuter parking ceases after 6pm.
Residents parking should extend full length of residential side leaving other side unrestricted or limited waiting like Southend Ave	Resident of Beechwood Ave	Amount of residents' parking proposed is based on parking surveys undertaken to determine the daytime parking needs of residents.
Disabled residents should have specific parking place on their frontage	Resident of Beechwood Ave and Coniscliffe Rd	Residents are required to share the available space when relying on the highway for their parking. The Council do not provide specific disabled bays in residential areas. Disabled parking bays are provided for communal use in areas where there is a demand. For example the town centre.

Objection/Comment	From	Officer response
Section of double yellow lines where school crossing patrol operates for 2 short periods will reduce residents' parking provision at all times so the patrol site should be relocated to other side of Beechwood Ave	Resident of Coniscliffe Rd	School crossing patrol site is located in the safest place for the main pedestrian flow children towards town and into Cleveland Tce.
Back streets should have residents' parking on one side	Resident of Coniscliffe Rd	Parking on one side of a back street can still be obstructive to traffic flow. Council does not encourage parking in unlit back streets.
No need for a section of waiting restrictions that can be used by ambulances	Resident of Coniscliffe Rd	Residents of flats requested an access area for ambulances and an area to be collected / dropped off. This area will also be useful for load/unloading and blue badge holders.
Scheme discriminates against businesses in area. Staff should have permits.	Business in Southend Ave	There will still be unrestricted parking for use by staff. The proposed limited waiting will benefit customers who will now be experiencing parking problems.