

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Meeting of **Highways Committee** held remotely via Microsoft Teams on **Monday, 14 December 2020 at 9.30 am**

**Present:**

**Councillor C Kay (Chair)**

**Members of the Committee:**

Councillors D Bell, J Chaplow, S Dunn, K Hopper, S Hugill, K Liddell, S Morrison (Vice-Chair), R Ormerod, J Rowlandson, J Shuttleworth, K Thompson, J Turnbull and M Wilson

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Bennett, G Bleasdale, J Considine, D Hicks, O Milburn, P Sexton and A Simpson.

### **2 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **4 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and would be signed by the Chair.

### **5 Chester-le-Street - Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order 2020**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth regarding proposals for five locations in the Chester-le-Street area to introduce parking and waiting restrictions, and electric car charging bays for one of the locations (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Head of Transport and Contract Services, Dave Wafer informed the Committee that several requests had been received from local residents and representatives of Durham County Council to address issues in Chester-le-Street as follows:

### **Holmlands Park Estate**

The proposal for the Holmlands Park Estate: Holmlands Park, Eardulph Avenue, Lindom Avenue, Lindisfarne Avenue, Roman Avenue and St Cuthbert's Avenue, was to introduce a controlled 'Permit Holders Only' Area within the streets to address obstructive parking and improve accessibility throughout the estate.

There were 24 objections and 123 responses in favour of the proposals, all from local residents.

### **Oakdale Terrace**

The proposal for Oakdale Terrace would see an amended timeframe for existing 'Permit Parking' restrictions on Oakdale Terrace from 'Mon-Sat, 1011am, 2-3pm' to 'Mon-Sat, 11am-1pm, 4-6pm' to improve accessibility for residents and address a change in parking patterns.

There was one objection and one response in favour of the proposal.

### **Hilda Park**

The proposal for Hilda Park was to introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on the junction from Hilda Park onto Pelton Lane to improve accessibility and address obstructive parking.

There were three objections to the proposals.

### **Hilda Terrace**

The proposal for Hilda Terrace was to introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on the junction from Hilda Terrace / Glenmore Avenue onto Pelton Lane to improve accessibility and address obstructive parking.

There were no objections and one representation in favour.

### **Burn Greens Car Park**

The proposals came via a request from Durham County Council Officers to introduce two 'Electric Vehicle Recharging Bays' within the Burn Greens Car Park to facilitate access for electric vehicles.

There were no objections to the proposals.

The Chair thanked the Head of Transport and Contract Services and noted a local resident, Ms Penny Williams, was in attendance to speak in support of the proposals for Holmlands Park.

Ms P Williams thanked the Chair and Committee and explained she was speaking on behalf of the Holmlands Park Residents Association and confirmed the Associations approval of the scheme. She noted that over the past ten to twelve years, the issue of parking had been brought up at every residents' meeting, adding that it was not surprising, given the long list of those that parked on the estate including: shoppers; shop workers; officer workers; train station users, both those that leave their cars all day and those that would leave their cars while going on holiday; teachers; lunch-time staff; extra-curricular staff; Sixth Form students; gym users; football classes; dog walkers; park goers; croquet players; bowlers; cricket supporters; park runners; church goers; walkers and joggers.

Ms P Williams explained that on the basis of all of those that parked on the estate it was 'choc-a-block' from 7.00am until, frequently, 9.00pm. It was added that any large event within the park could cause havoc, with vehicles dumped anywhere. She noted that one organiser, Stanley Events, in terms of their annual fireworks event within the Riverside Park area, gave complete consideration to the estate and the Residents' Association were extremely grateful for that.

Ms P Williams noted that if the Council had allowed 9.30am – 6.00pm permit parking for Chester-le-Street, as in Durham City, with time out for school collections, the residents would have found that to be perfect. She added that the Residents' Association were aware that there were residents that objected to the proposal, many feeling that there should be no charge involved and already having a garage alongside the footpath. She noted that, however, a majority of 76 percent of properties were in favour, a huge number supporting the scheme, adding that the 24 percent included a number of properties that did not vote.

Ms P Williams reminded Members that the Holmlands Park Estate was surrounded by the Front Street, Park View School and the Riverside Park and added that while there was ample car parking provision, it was the cheaper option to use the housing estate as a free car park. She explained that caused a host of problems for residents, including the blocking of driveways and garages. She explained the issues in terms of funeral cars, with residents faced an additional burden when arranging a funeral in terms of arranging for Police cones, should the funeral cortege wish to leave from the deceased property. Ms P Williams noted issues in terms of access for emergency vehicles and explained on three occasions elderly residents had to be wheeled up to 50 metres to ambulances as they were unable to gain access. She noted she would hope fire appliances would simply bulldoze their way through if they were required. She explained that Council Refuse staff often had to wheel rubbish bins to the end of the streets or return at another time to collect them. The Committee were informed that the road sweeper was very rarely able to clean the gutters and the drain cleaner vehicle had to make multiple visits.

Ms P Williams explained that Park View School's main entrance was on Church Chare, not on the estate, and added that there was adequate parking on site, with over 65 spaces.

She noted that when there was an event, the school suggested parking within the housing estate, rather than on the school site or the nearer town centre parking facilities. She added the school's three minibuses often parked on the estate, usually on the ends of streets. Ms P Williams noted that the Headteacher of Park View School had suggested permit parking as a solution and would actively support that, however, the Residents' Association noted no cooperation from the school.

Ms P Williams noted while residents wished for businesses to thrive, they did not feel it should be at the expense of the wellbeing of the estate and reiterated there was adequate car parks. She noted yellow lines that were installed after multiple accidents, one involving an elderly resident that required them to be cut from their car. She noted the line had been extended, however, that had been to no avail. She explained that the Residents' Association was kindly asking the Committee to respect the wishes of 76 percent of properties on the estate and allow the estate to be just that, a housing estate and not a car park, making it safe for not only the many elderly residents, but all residents of the estate.

The Chair thanked Ms P Williams and asked the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Shuttleworth noted the majority of residents, 76 percent, supported the proposals and therefore he **Moved** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

Councillor S Dunn **Seconded** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

### **Resolved**

That the Committee endorse the proposals in principle to proceed with the implementation of the Chester-Le-Street: Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **6 Bishop Auckland - Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order 2020**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth regarding proposals relating to the introduction, amendment and removal of parking and waiting restrictions in seven locations at the Bishop Auckland (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Head of Transport and Contract Services informed the Committee that several requests had been received from local residents and representatives of Durham County Council to address issues at Bishop Auckland as follows:

*Councillor S Morrison entered the meeting at 10.00am*

### **Woodhouse Lane**

The proposal for Woodhouse Lane was to make the current temporary traffic regulation order 'no waiting at any time' restrictions near the three education establishments permanent due to inappropriate parking to improve access, visibility and road safety in the location. It was noted the proposals had been requested by local residents, parents of the school children and school staff with support from the local County Councillor.

There was one objection received from a local resident.

### **Bishop Auckland Train Station Car Park**

The proposal for Bishop Auckland Train Station Car Park was to introduce and amend restrictions to improve the parking availability within the station car park, including 20 'Long Stay Pay and Display' bays, two 'Blue badge holder only' bays and 14 'Limited waiting' bays. It was added the proposals were to reduce long stay commuter parking due to sections of the car park being unrestricted. The Committee noted the request came from the Train Station Manager and had been supported by the local County Councillor.

There was one objection received from a member of staff of a nearby business

### **Murphy Crescent**

The proposal for Murphy Crescent was to introduce 'restricted waiting' restrictions and a short extension to the 'School Keep Clear' restrictions to improve school gate parking, reduce congestion during school pick up/drop off times and improve access, visibility and road safety.

There were three objections received from local residents.

### **Acacia Road/ Oak Terrace/ Cedar Road/ Hawthorn Road**

The proposals for Acacia Road/ Oak Terrace/ Cedar Road/ Hawthorn Road were to introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions due to inappropriate parking to improve access, visibility and road safety in this location.

There were no objections to the proposals.

### **George Street**

The proposals for George Street were to remove a section of a 'no waiting at any time' restriction and to introduce a 'Loading Only' restriction to assist and improve local businesses loading/unloading facility. It was noted that the request had been from local business owners.

There were no objections to the proposals.

### **Kingsway**

The proposals for Kingsway were to introduce 'no waiting and no loading at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) due to inappropriate parking to improve access, visibility and road safety in this location, as requested by local residents.

There were no objections to the proposals.

### **Oaklea Terrace**

The proposals for Oaklea Terrace were to remove 'no waiting at any time' restriction on Oaklea Terrace to improve parking availability for residents and local businesses.

There were no objections to the proposals.

The Chair thanked the Head of Transport and Contract Services and asked the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Shuttleworth **Moved** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

Councillor K Hopper **Seconded** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

### **Resolved**

That the Committee endorse the proposals in principle to proceed with the implementation of the Bishop Auckland: Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **7 Durham City South East Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order 2020**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth regarding proposals relating to changes to parking bays and changes to 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions within Durham City - South East (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Head of Transport and Contract Services informed the Committee that the proposals to address issues were as follows:

### **New Elvet**

The proposal for New Elvet were to reconfigure the existing layby to accommodate parallel parking, vehicles currently parking at an angle of approximately 45 degrees to the kerb (echelon parking) and were therefore required to reverse out into oncoming traffic. It was noted that longer vehicles would protrude into the running lane causing a danger particularly to through traffic and cyclists. The Committee noted the proposal replaced two blue badge holder bays with a loading only bay to accommodate the requirements of adjacent commercial premises.

Members were informed that the existing blue badge bays were not in an ideal position as they required the occupants to alight onto the carriageway, on a gradient, and then traverse around the rear of the vehicle, in the live carriageway, to access the dropped kerb onto the footway. There are alternative, more suitable, blue badge holder bays close to this location and blue badge holders may also park for an unlimited length of time, without charge, in any of the nearby pay and display bays.

One objection to the proposal was received from a local business owner.

### **Whinney Hill**

The proposal for Whinney Hill was to replace a section of 'No Waiting At Any Time' and introduce Permit Holders or Pay and Display parking, as requested by residents in order to improve parking availability in this area of the City.

There were no objections to the proposals.

### **Hallgarth View**

The proposal for Hallgarth View was to replace a section of Permit Holder Only parking and introduce a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction to address access and safety issues due to obstructive parking from commuter and student vehicles. The request was from local residents with support of the County Councillor.

There were no objections to the proposals.

The Chair thanked the Head of Transport and Contract Services and asked the Committee for their comments and questions, noting Councillor R Ormerod was a local Member.

Councillor R Ormerod noted he would speak as a Committee Member and that he was in favour of the proposals, as reversing out of the parking bays at New Elvet was terrifying and the new arrangements would be much safer. He added with the main road bridge closed for repairs there was a good opportunity to carry out such works, though noted it appeared works had begun already. He noted the other proposals were welcomed and would help prevent people parking in an anti-social manner and thanked the Officers involved for their professional work on the schemes.

Councillor R Ormerod **Moved** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

Councillor J Shuttleworth **Seconded** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

Councillor S Dunn added that he agreed with the comments as regards the improvement in terms of safety relating to the parking at New Elvet, noting it was also on a bus route and suggested that while lines be added to clearly delineate spaces, similar to a scheme in his Division, to maximise the use of space.

## **Resolved**

That the Committee endorse the proposals in principle to proceed with the implementation of the Durham City South East Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **8 Unc. Glenhurst Road & Oak Road, Easington Colliery - Traffic Calming Measures**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth regarding proposals relating to changes to traffic calming measures at Glenhurst Road and Oak Road, Easington Colliery (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Head of Transport and Contract Services informed the Committee that the proposals to address issues of speeding, the Local County Councillor and residents having raised concerns regarding the speed of vehicles using both Glenhurst Road and Oak Road. He added that there was concerns raised as both streets are residential in nature, and an accident may occur due to the number of children living and playing in the area. Members noted that as a result of the concerns raised, the Traffic Assets Team proposed to introduce traffic calming measures on Oak Road and Glenhurst Road in order to maintain lower vehicle speeds.

The Committee noted a statutory notice of the proposal was posted in a local newspaper and at appropriate points within the affected streets between 29th August 2019 and 19th September 2019 and in addition, all statutory consultees including the Chief Officers of the Police, Fire Brigade and Ambulance Services were consulted as well as Local County Councillors, Councillor A Surtees and Councillor D Boyes.

It was explained one formal objection from a local resident of Oak Road was received during the notice period. The resident noted objections on the basis that there were not many children in the street and that speed humps can cause damage to cars.

The Head of Transport and Contract Services noted that the design of such traffic calming measures would provide benefits for residents in terms of speed reduction, and if motorists slowed to an appropriate speed, they would not cause damage to their vehicles.

Councillor J Shuttleworth **Moved** the recommendation as detailed in the report.

Councillor J Turnbull **Seconded** the recommendation as detailed in the report.



**Resolved**

That the Committee endorse the proposal in principle to proceed with the implementation of the traffic calming measures as detailed in Appendix 2 (Glenhurst Road Traffic Calming) and Appendix 3 (Oak Road Traffic Calming) to the Committee Report. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.