| ITEM NO. | |
|----------|--|
|----------|--|

PROPOSED RESIDENT'S PARKING CLEVELAND AVENUE - OBJECTIONS

Responsible Cabinet Member – Councillor Nick Wallis, Leisure and Local Environment Portfolio

Responsible Director – Ian Williams, Director of Economic Growth

SUMMARY REPORT

Purpose of the Report

1. To advise Members of an objection received to a resident parking proposal in Cleveland Avenue and seek a decision on whether to proceed with the proposal.

Summary

- 2. A request was received from a resident of Cleveland Avenue to introduce resident's parking restrictions to resolve a problem of commuter/student parking for extended periods of time outside the resident's properties.
- 3. The property is close to Queen Elizabeth Sixth Form College and the town centre. The properties affected do not have off street parking. Commuters and students are parking for most of the day restricting residents from parking close to their home.
- A resident only bay 24 metres in length was advertised to prevent commuter parking and give residents an option to park 8.00am – 6.00pm. (see plan at Appendix A)
- 5. An objection to the proposal has been received from a resident who is a neighbour of the person who requested the proposal. The objector thinks the proposal is unnecessary and there is always space on the opposite side of the road.
- 6. Officers recommend setting the objection aside and proceed to introduce the resident's parking.

Recommendation

7. It is recommended that Members consider the objection and set it aside and authorise officers to proceed with the proposal to introduce resident's parking as advertised.



Reasons

8. The recommendation is supported to improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

Ian Williams Director of Economic Growth

Background Papers

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report

Chris Easby: Extension 6707

| S17 Crime and Disorder | There are no direct implications |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Health and Well Being | There are no direct implications |
| Carbon Impact | There are no significant carbon impact |
| | implications in this report |
| Diversity | There are no direct implications |
| Wards Affected | College |
| Groups Affected | All |
| Budget and Policy Framework | This decision does not represent a change to |
| | the budget and policy framework |
| Key Decision | This is not a key decision. |
| Urgent Decision | This is not an urgent decision. |
| One Darlington: Perfectly | No significant implications. |
| Placed | |
| Efficiency | The proposal will prevent commuter parking |
| Impact on Looked After | Does this report impact on Looked After |
| Children and Care Leavers | Children or Care Leavers |
| | |

MAIN REPORT

Information and Analysis

- 9. A resident of Cleveland Avenue made a complaint that the unrestricted space outside his property was parked up Monday to Friday 8.00am until 6.00pm by commuter/student parking.
- 10. Officers have observed the parking and consider that the majority of the cars that do park in this area belong to commuters and students. The parking is therefore long term on a daily basis.
- 11. A resident from the same stretch of Cleveland Avenue has made an objection to the proposed residents' parking bay. The reason for this objection is he thinks the proposal is unnecessary and there is always space on the opposite side of the

- road. The displaced parking will only exacerbate the pressure on free parking in other areas necessitating a need for more resident parking.
- 12. The Ward Councillors were consulted and they did not make any comments on the proposals.
- 13. The proposed restrictions will improve the amenities for residents and enable parking during the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm.
- 14. Subject to Cabinet approval, the restrictions will be introduced in accordance with the Councils powers as set out in Part 1 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984.

Financial Implications

15. The proposal will be funded from the traffic management budget.

Legal Implications

16. The traffic orders have been statutorily advertised for the required period.

Consultation

17. Officers have consulted the residents of 32-44 Cleveland Avenue (seven properties) with the proposed resident parking restrictions. The proposal has also been statutorily advertised in the press, following delegated authority to progress a traffic order.

Outcome of Consultation

18. One resident of Cleveland Avenue has objected as he does not consider the restrictions to be warranted as he rarely has a problem finding parking. He considers that the restricted parking will exacerbate the pressure on unrestricted parking in the area which will necessitate more resident parking. Four of the residents that were consulted are in favour of the proposed restrictions.

APPENDIX A

