



Highways Committee

Date **Wednesday 9 April 2014**
Time **9.30 am**
Venue **Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham**

Business Part A

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Substitute Members
3. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2014 (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Declarations of interest, if any
5. The County Council of Durham Claypath & A690 Claypath: One Way & Two Way Slip Roads, Durham City - Traffic Regulation Order 2014 - Report of Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development (Pages 7 - 14)
6. Crook - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order - Report of Corporate Director, Economic Development and Regeneration (Pages 15 - 22)
7. Such other business, as in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration

Colette Longbottom
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

County Hall
Durham
1 April 2014

To: **The Members of the Highways Committee**

Councillor G Bleasdale (Chairman)
Councillor C Kay (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors J Allen, B Armstrong, D Bell, H Bennett, I Geldard,
O Gunn, D Hall, D Hicks, K Hopper, O Milburn, S Morrison,
R Ormerod, J Robinson, J Rowlandson, P Stradling, R Todd,
J Turnbull, M Wilkes and R Young

Contact: Michael Turnbull

Tel: 03000 269 714

This page is intentionally left blank

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **Highways Committee** held in Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham on **Wednesday 12 March 2014 at 9.30 a.m.**

Present:

Councillor G Bleasdale in the Chair

Members of the Committee

Councillors C Kay (Vice-Chairman), B Armstrong, D Bell, H Bennett, O Gunn, D Hall, D Hicks, K Hopper, O Milburn, S Morrison, R Ormerod, P Stradling, R Todd, J Turnbull, M Wilkes and R Young

Also Present:

Councillor J Blakey, B Glass and M Williams.

1 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Allen and I Geldard.

2 Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of interest

Councillor Wilkes commented that he had previously made his feelings clear in relation to the use of bus lanes at previous forums, some of which had been reported in the media and would abstain from voting on this issue.

5 Standardisation of existing Bus Lane Traffic Regulation Orders to allow use by Buses, Taxis, Motorcycles and Cycles

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development which sought to standardise a number of existing bus lanes across the County allow use by buses, taxis, motorcycles and cycle (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Strategic Traffic Manager informed the Committee that a variety of restrictions were in place, none of which currently allowed taxis. Research with neighbouring authorities had

reflected that a combination of buses, taxis and other vehicles were allowed to access bus lanes across the North East region and were all encouraging more taxi use.

The Strategic Traffic Manager summarised the proposals for the bus lanes that were proposed to be amended to allow use by buses, taxis, motorcycles and cycles and extended to include Sunday's. The proposals would affect 12 bus lanes across the County and one bus lane in Croxdale fell outside the review as separate regulations applied. The locations of the bus lanes were detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.

The Committee heard that objections to the proposals had been received from both Arriva North East and Go North East. Their objections related solely to taxi issues and appeared to be standard objections more akin to problems encountered in large city centres as opposed to the bus lanes subject in the report. The Strategic Traffic Manager then summarised the objections detailed within the report and highlighted the following points:

- in relation to objection 1 - bus lanes in the County did not invite motorists to go in different directions;
- there was no particular reason as to why anyone would park in a bus lane and it was considered that the representations made in objection two wouldn't pose any problems as it did not currently happen in any of the localities referred to;
- in terms of objection three, it was felt extremely unlikely that taxis would pick-up fares from the locations detailed in the report;
- concerns about u-turns taking place in front of traffic after picking up a fare in a bus lane would unlikely to be an issue within Durham as the majority of the bus lanes were not within residential areas or areas likely to generate fares that would require taxis to stop;
- objection 5 could be managed and delays to buses with taxis blocking bus lanes, which could occur in Milburngate could be managed and would be unlikely to occur;
- in relation to objection 6 - the service had looked at the busiest bus lanes, however, numbers would be relatively small, for example, one every two minutes and this wouldn't have a dramatic effect on the bus lane
- Objection 7 referred to speed limits which vehicles should adhere to; and in relation to objection 8, a survey of the area had shown one taxi travelling every two minutes without causing any form of delay.

Councillors Blakey and Williams referred to the bus lanes at Croxdale and expressed concerns about speeds travelled in the area and felt that cyclists should not be encouraged to use the bus lane.

The Strategic Traffic Manager explained that the existing bus lane at Foster Terrace, detailed in the report was currently used by buses and cyclists however, the alternative would be to exclude cyclists and ultimately force cyclists to use the carriageway. The Council wished to provide good quality, wide facilities for cyclists next to main roads wherever possible, however, some cyclists would choose to use the main carriageway regardless of any facilities provided.

Councillor Williams commented that road signage in Croxdale on the roundabout continued to cause issues and motorists were not observing the roundabout correctly and felt that the proposal in the report should not go ahead.

The Strategic Traffic Manager explained that the comments made by Councillor Williams related to a bus lane in Croxdale that fell outside the review being considered by the Committee.

Councillor Stradling referred to objection one and asked why the County Council could not make a condition in the traffic orders whereby taxis could not park in bus lanes. The Strategic Traffic Manager informed the Committee that the changes to the orders would not change any existing parking restrictions. If parking became a problem then a separate restriction could be introduced in that specific area

Councillor Gunn commented that as a Councillor who served on Licensing and shared similar concerns to those of Councillor Stradling.

Councillor Wilkes accepted the points that had been raised and with the exception of one area (Milburngate) where conditions were already in place for vehicle. All of the other bus lanes were on main routes and agreed with the view of the officer that it was something that would not likely to be a problem.

Councillor Ormerod referred to objection three and commented that there appeared to be an expectation that taxis would behave in certain ways which wouldn't always be the case. Councillor Ormerod expressed concern about enforcement, particularly in relation to the bus lane on Gilesgate.

Councillor Armstrong also referred to the bus lane on Gilesgate and had often witnessed taxi drivers driving down the restricted area in an attempt to get to their destination as fast as they could. Councillor Hall expanded on this point and felt that allowing taxis to use the bus lane on Gilesgate would not only make the issues highlighted by Councillors Ormerod and Armstrong worse, but would also result in more congestion and aggressive driving and result in taxis trying to 'push in' front of other motorists who wouldn't wish to give way to let them in. Councillor Hall suggested that the bus lane at Gilesgate be excluded from the proposals on that basis.

Councillor Turnbull then expressed concern about traffic crossing the bus lane on the A690 (Stonebridge) with vehicles already having to turn left across a bus lane to access a petrol station. Vehicles also had to cross two lanes from the opposite direction to gain access to the petrol station. Councillor Turnbull highlighted that two vehicles had been 'written off' in six months at the location, one of which occurred in the bus lane and expressed concern that extra traffic utilising the bus lane would result in more accidents occurring in the location.

The Strategic Traffic Manager responded that vehicles did have to cross a vehicle lane and bus lane at present and felt that there would be no marked increase in additional vehicles with the exception of a taxi every two minutes, which was relatively modest number.

Councillor Gunn queried if the Committee were minded to agree the recommendations detailed within the report, with a proviso that the workability of the scheme could be reviewed and reported back to the Committee. Councillor Gunn also referred to enforcement aspects and wished to see some joined up thinking between licensing and

highways given that licensing should have it within their powers to provide information to taxi drivers on their driving behaviour.

The Strategic Traffic Manager confirmed that if the Committee were minded to introduce the changes they could review them at any time and that the licensing groups had originated the idea initially.

Councillor Wilkes commented that all objections had come from large bus companies with no objections from anyone else and explained that there was no reason not to introduce the proposals.

Councillor Glass indicated that whilst he was not a Committee member, he was Chairman of a taxi licensing Committee and said that problems often occurred because many local authorities in the North East operated with many different traffic regimes in place and taxi drivers travelling to Durham from different areas were simply not aware of the differing arrangements between authorities and believed that the standardisation of the existing bus lanes would be beneficial.

Councillor Stradling commented that subject to the points made by the Committee and because there had been no objections from the general public would support the proposals contained in the report, together with an undertaking that all taxi drivers would be written to and that the scheme be revisited in four months' time to enable the Committee to review the effects of the proposal.

Councillors Gunn and Hall confirmed that they were happy with the recommendation as amended.

Resolved

- (i) That the recommendations in the report be agreed; and in addition
- (ii) That the licensing authority remind taxi drivers of their responsibilities in terms of driving behaviour and the new rules;
- (iii) That a feedback report be brought back to the Committee in four months of operation of the scheme.

6 Albert Road, Consett (Off-Street Parking Places Order) 2013)

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director Regeneration and Economic Development regarding objections received to a formal consultation on a proposed traffic regulation order relating to Albert Road Car Park, Consett. The effect of the order proposed that a Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6pm, 3 hour limit, no return within 1 hour restriction be implemented within the car park. (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Committee received a presentation from the Strategic Traffic Manager which detailed the location plan of the area. Albert Road Car Park, Consett was the largest and most generally recognised, convenient off-road parking facility within the town and was well used by workers and shoppers alike on a regular basis given its location next to a pedestrianised area.

The County Council had a commitment to try and manage the parking facilities within the town to encourage economic activity and the intentions of the traffic order would allow people from the outskirts to park near the town centre and carry out their shopping.

Parking surveys had been undertaken on two separate occasions in July 2013 and the Council had held a number of meetings with Councillors and traders in the area. The results of the survey had indicated that Albert Road car park was 90% occupied by 9 a.m. on the dates monitored. 121 vehicles had been parked up for 3 hours or more. 80% of spaces were being used for long-stay parking which essentially acted to the detriment of others. 94 vehicles had entered the car park and exited without being able to find a space. It was felt that a more efficient way would be to limit parking time for three hours which would ensure a constant turnover of spaces.

Twenty objections had been received, some of which had similar themes. These had been grouped together in the report and were summarised to the Committee. Many of the objections provided reasons to have some form of control mechanism in place. It was felt that the three-hour limit was common in most town centres regionally and it was felt that three hours parking in Consett would be adequate.

One of the aims of the scheme was to prevent people who worked in the town to obtain prime parking location and added that there were many other areas in the town centre to park, even if they were not as convenient as Albert Road. The Council wished to move the emphasis and prioritise shoppers over people that worked in the town centre.

The Strategic Traffic Manager informed the Committee that it would be important to keep an eye on any displacement of traffic to neighbouring streets and if that transpired the Council would have to look at remedying the situation.

One specific objection made reference to there being too much disabled parking and loading areas throughout the town taking up valuable parking space. The Committee were informed that the current level of provision was required for people to access various facilities and the Council had worked with local shopkeepers to achieve the right balance and mix of loading facilities, with the Council always willing to change those facilities if need be.

In terms of the other representations that had been made, the Strategic Traffic Manager informed the Committee that there was no resource to subsidise park and ride in the area, therefore, this was not a valid option.

Councillor Glass, one of the local Councillors for the area commented that cross-party support had been received for the proposal presented. Traders in Consett desperately needed turnover in their businesses. In addition to this small shops were failing and the town had recently seen the demise of in-shops and there was competition from out of town shopping centres. Councillor Glass also commented that there were a number of smaller car parks that could be utilised by shop workers.

Councillor D Hall commented that the issues highlighted had been ongoing in Consett for some time and it was fair to suggest that cars were being parked there all day. A local Aldi supermarket had a limit of 1 hour and 30 minutes to prevent the same issue and felt that

three hours was an ample amount of parking time. Councillor Hall asked who would be responsible for enforcing the parking time limit.

The Strategic Traffic Manager confirmed that the enforcement would be carried out by the Council's enforcement team.

Councillor Ormered was in favour of the proposal and was pro-business and felt that people needed to think about the economic wellbeing of the town centre.

Councillor Armstrong commented that the Council were correct in introducing the proposals which would encourage more people to visit the town centre and shop.

Councillor Olga Milburn commented that she had worked in the town centre for eight years and Albert Road car park had always been problematic. It was often the case that if people were unable to park at Albert Road, they would simply travel to other areas.

Councillor Wilkes found it incomprehensible that traders would park in places primarily meant for shoppers and that businesses should be encouraging customers rather than deterring them in the current economic climate.

Resolved

That the recommendation contained in the report be agreed.

Highways Committee

9 April 2014

**The County Council of Durham
Claypath & A690 Claypath : One
Way & Two Way Slip Roads,
Durham City**



Traffic Regulation Order 2014

Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Economic Development

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 To advise Members of the objections received to the formal consultation on the experimental traffic regulation order relating to the waiting restrictions on Claypath, the A690 Claypath One Way Slip road and the A690 Claypath Two Way Slip Road.
- 1.2 To request members consider the objections made during the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) consultation period.
- 1.3 Should the objections to this ETRO be upheld then the restrictions will revert back to how they were prior to October 2012. Should the objections to the ETRO be set aside, then the restrictions held within the ETRO will be made permanent.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Claypath area of Durham has become popular in recent years and it attracts large numbers of visitors, particularly on a weekend owing in the most part to its thriving night time economy. As a result of this activity and increased footfall, there is a clear demand for taxi provision in this part of the City.
- 2.2 Whilst this increased activity has had a positive impact on the local economy it has also brought some concerns relating to the traffic movements in the area. The majority of these concerns are associated with the taxi provision in the area during the evening. This has led to many requests for change over a prolonged period of time from the residents of Upper Claypath. These residents have been subject to antisocial behaviour / noise and disturbance created by taxis queuing to the front of their properties.

- 2.3 Prior to the implementation of the experimental order the designated taxi area on Claypath was located on the carriageway fronting the takeaways / businesses towards the southern end of the street. Whilst this in itself was not viewed as a problem, the number of taxis using the city often meant that the taxi queue extended up through the Providence Row traffic lights and at times, right up to the Gilesgate roundabout.
- 2.4 In light of these complaints and concerns, discussions took place between various Sections and Departments of the County Council and Durham Constabulary to ascertain the most appropriate course of action to take in this instance.
- 2.5 Consideration was therefore given to amending the areas where taxis operate on Claypath. Several alternatives were considered before the decision was made to experiment with a split taxi area that would be operated from 8am – 9pm on the one way Claypath slip road and 6pm – 8am on the two way Claypath slip road.
- 2.6 When implementing this new taxi area provision it was proposed to monitor its effects over the 18 month experimental period to ascertain its effects and determine whether or not the order should be made permanent.
- 2.7 During the initial 6 month objection period following the introduction of the order we received 25 objections. The majority of these objections were from taxi drivers and are addressed below.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 An announcement regarding the proposed changes was made well in advance of the operational start date of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order via the County Taxi Working Group and various Press Statements. Leaflets were also printed and distributed to all taxi drivers and posters were provided and displayed in prominent locations throughout the City.
- 3.2 The ETRO came into force on the 26th October 2012 and as with all ETRO's could be in operation for a maximum period of 18 months. After the 18 month period, a decision must be made to either make the Order permanent or revert back to the situation prior to its implementation.
- 3.3 Some of the parking arrangements within the ETRO were modified in September 2013 to maintain the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic within Claypath.

4 Objection 1 – Taxi Drivers still use Claypath

- 4.1 A number of taxi drivers have reported that whilst the majority of drivers adhere to the rules and use the new arrangement, some are still using Claypath. The view is that these taxis are poaching the majority of the fares and this has led to a rise in ill feeling between drivers. The majority of responses noted that the new system worked reasonably well in the initial

weeks when joint Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary enforcement action was applied. Unfortunately it has not been possible to sustain enforcement at the level required and when there is no enforcement present, drivers revert back to using the old rank on Claypath.

5.0 Response

- 5.1 The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and associated lines and signs on site clearly state that there are now no designated taxi areas on Claypath.
- 5.2 Licenced Hackney Carriages are legally entitled to drive down Claypath and can pick up passengers if they are 'hailed' by them. Passengers may also board and alight taxis within this area.
- 5.3 As with all traffic regulation orders a robust and effective enforcement regime is required to ensure that regulations are adhered to. Unfortunately the level of enforcement offered during the initial period was unsustainable. That said, the County Council are currently operating a mobile enforcement camera in Claypath. It is anticipated that this camera will lead to a greater compliance with the current traffic restrictions.

6.0 Objection 2 – The New Designated Taxi Area is Unsafe / Does Not Have Sufficient Capacity for Number of Taxis

- 6.1 Comments have been received in relation to the above noting that on weekends and other busier times that taxi queues on the Two Way Slip road extend onto Elvet and into the area near the traffic lights / Elvet bridge.
- 6.2 It has also been noted that the Two Way Slip Road Taxi Area is not large enough to accommodate the number of taxis using it at busier times of the week

7.0 Response

- 7.1 A number of potential taxi areas were considered during the feasibility stage prior to implementing this ETRO. Whilst it is appreciated that the current provision is not ideal it is considered the most suitable location for taxis supplying the busy night time trade originating from the Claypath area.
- 7.2 The previous designated taxi areas on Claypath had provision for approximately 10 taxis. It must be noted however that taxis did extend onto the waiting restrictions through Providence Row traffic lights and at times up to Gilesgate roundabout. Therefore whilst the impression was that there was far more space on Claypath, in reality there was a similar 'official' amount.

8.0 Objection 3 – Public Safety Is At Risk on New Taxi Rank

- 8.1 Concern has been raised with regards public safety relating to the new taxi area location.

9.0 Response

- 9.1 The head of the new taxi area is at the top of the Two Way Slip Road near to the zebra crossing / Market Place entrance. Whilst this location is perhaps not viewed as convenient as the previous taxi area, public safety matters are not considered to be an issue.
- 9.2 The area is located in close proximity to a zebra crossing in a well-lit part of the City. Footpaths in the vicinity are considered to be ample in terms of width.
- 9.3 The manner in which taxis previously operated from Claypath could have been considered unsafe and as previously noted the back of the queue extended into the residential part of this street. Inappropriate parking coupled with the volume of pedestrians exiting the Gala zone and various fast food outlets in this area resulted in an increased risk of pedestrian / vehicle conflict.

10.0 Objection 4 – The Taxi Rank Should Revert back to Claypath and the One Way Slip Road should be available for Taxi Use after 9pm

- 10.1 A number of drivers consider that the previous taxi provision on Claypath should be reinstated. They consider that this area was more appropriate for taxi usage and was a better solution than the current ETRO.
- 10.2 It has also been suggested that the One Way Slip Road could be used for taxis beyond its current 9pm limit.

11.0 Response

- 11.1 As mentioned initially, the rank needed to be relocated from its previous position on Claypath owing to the volume of complaints from residents in the area and the concerns relating to pedestrian safety. Of the alternative solutions investigated, the current one outlined in the ETRO was considered the most appropriate.
- 11.2 The possibility of utilising the One Way Slip Road beyond its current 9pm limit was investigated. However, following discussions between Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary it was decided not to pursue this option owing to the potential road safety hazard created by vehicles queuing back onto the A690.

12.0 Objection 5 – Taxi Numbers Should be Capped

- 12.1 Representation was made in relation to the number of taxis now using Durham City on a weekend and that consideration should be given to restricting the amount that are able to do so.

13.0 Response

- 13.1 This is not a highways matter and is not considered an appropriate reason for objection in this instance.

14.0 Objection 6 – Claypath Should be Made a Pedestrian Zone

- 14.1 Suggestions were put forward that Claypath should be made a pedestrian zone during the evening.

15.0 Response

- 15.1 This suggestion has been investigated but the presence of public transport vehicles and a number of businesses that require access mean that this option is not feasible at this present time. Restrictions would need to have exemptions for the aforementioned vehicles and as a result it is considered that abuse would be likely and the proposal was not progressed.

16.0 Objection 7 – Taxis Should Use Walkergate

- 16.1 A suggestion was made that taxis should queue on Walkergate and exit via the slip road on the A690.

17.0 Response

- 17.1 Again, this suggestion has been investigated and was rejected on public safety grounds. It is also worth noting that amendments would need to be made to the one way system between Walkergate and the A690 to allow this area to operate as noted above.

- 17.2 Road safety concerns were also highlighted with regards to this proposal relating to vehicles turning right onto the A690. Provision would need to be made to restrict right turning vehicles which would essentially mean that any vehicle wanting to travel east would have to negotiate Milburngate roundabout to do so.

18.0 Objection 8 – Claypath should be made Taxi Only

- 18.1 A suggestion was made that Claypath should be made a taxi only zone.

19.0 Response

- 19.1 As was the case with the lower end of Claypath being made a pedestrian only zone, there are a number of issues that make this suggestion unfeasible.

- 19.2 As well as access being required for public transport vehicles and loading / unloading associated with the businesses in this area, there are also a number of disabled parking bays in this area that are well used and are a vital facility for road users with limited mobility.

19.3 Successful City Centres require good management of the competing demands for kerb space and the removal of all provision other than that of designated taxi areas is considered a contradiction of this.

20.0 Objection 9 – There is no Provision for Personal Hire Taxis.

20.1 Representation was made that following the changes implemented during the experimental order there is now no provision for personal hire taxis within Claypath.

21.0 Response

21.1 It is not possible to provide dedicated road space for private hire vehicles in this area. Such provision is not catered for within the current regulations outlined in the Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions (TSRGD) 2002.

21.2 It is considered that private hire taxis should arrange their pick ups with their customers so that they do not have to wait within the busy Claypath area.

22.0 Local member consultation

22.1 The Local members have been consulted and offer no objection to the proposals.

23.0 Recommendation

23.1 It is RECOMMENDED that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the objections and proceed with the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders.

Background Papers

Correspondence and documentation on Traffic Office File and in member's library.

Contact: Lee Mowbray Tel: 03000 263 693

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital

Staffing – Carried out by Strategic Traffic

Risk – Not Applicable

Equality and Diversity – It is considered that there are no Equality and Diversity issues to be addressed.

Accommodation - No impact on staffing

Crime and Disorder - This TRO will allow effective management of traffic to improve economic activity, reduce congestion and improve road safety

Human Rights - No impact on human rights

Consultation – Is in accordance with SI:2489

Procurement – Operations, DCC.

Disability Issues - None

Legal Implications: All orders have been advertised by the County Council as highway authority and will be made in accordance with legislative requirements.

This page is intentionally left blank

Highways Committee

9 April 2014



**CROOK
PARKING & WAITING
RESTRICTIONS ORDER**

**Report of Ian Thompson Corporate Director, Regeneration and
Economic development**

**Councillor Neil Foster, Cabinet Portfolio Holder Regeneration
and Economic Development**

1. Purpose

- 1.1. To advise Members of objections received to the consultation concerning changes to the proposed traffic regulation order in Crook
- 1.2. To request members to consider the objections made during the formal consultation exercise.

2. Background

- 2.1 Following successful implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement in Durham District in 2008 and County Durham North in 2011, the County Council expanded this practice into the South of the County in June 2013. Enforcement of all waiting restrictions within the town was undertaken by the County Council from this time.
- 2.2 The County Council were contacted by the Crook Community Partnership (CCP) on behalf of a number of business owners in the town. The business owners were concerned that the existing restrictions were having a detrimental effect on trade within the town.
- 2.3 Discussions between the County Council, the CCP and the business owners took place and a plan of proposed restrictions was drafted up for the town.
- 2.4 Initial consultation letters, plans and response cards were delivered to all properties to be directly affected by the proposals. This letter was delivered on the 20th September with responses to be returned by the 11th October 2013.

- 2.5 The scheme was advertised formally on site and in the local press on 15th January 2014 until 5th February 2014.

3 Objection 1

- 3.1 The objector states that parking restrictions are detrimental to business and that they will likely displace customers to supermarkets.

4 Response

- 4.1 At present there are various restrictions within the town centre that have been implemented over many years to control traffic movements and parking. Whilst it may be true to say that inappropriate restrictions could be detrimental to the local economy, this is not considered to be the case in this instance. There has been a lengthy consultation exercise with several interested business owners from within the town. It is anticipated that the restrictions proposed will improve vehicular turnover and thus improve the accessibility within the town for potential customers.

5 Objection 2

- 5.1 The objector states that parking permits for business owners should be issued.

6 Response

- 6.1 The aim of the County Council is to provide a vibrant town centre where potential customers can easily access shops and services. It is anticipated that the restricted waiting bays we propose to implement will go some way towards meeting this objective and we would not look to reserve a bay for an individual business. The majority of the on-street areas will be free of restrictions on Sundays and between 6pm-9am on every other day of the week.

7 Objection 3

- 7.1 The objector feels that they will lose business as there is no parking directly to the front of their premises on Hope Street.

8 Response

- 8.1 To achieve a vibrant and viable town centre, the correct balance of kerb space usage is required. In this case we have tried to maximise the amount of short stay parking in the town centre but we have remained mindful that other users need to be supported. In the case of this objector, it is proposed to locate a loading bay to the front of their premises. At present, the majority of the southern end of Hope Street is

covered by a 'no waiting 9am – 6pm' restriction. In the new proposals, there is potential for approximately 15 vehicles to park within 60 metres of this business and we therefore consider this to be a reasonable solution.

9 Objection 4

- 9.1 The objector is opposed to the creation of limited waiting bays to the rear of Hope Street. They fear that these bays will impede the way they operate their business and can see no real need for them.

10 Response

- 10.1 During the initial consultation exercise with the local business owners, the rear of Hope Street was identified as an area where additional parking capacity could be achieved. At present the area is unrestricted and in the proposal there is a mixture of unrestricted, 30 minute parking and loading only restrictions.
- 10.2 Whilst it is accepted that these bays will not be used as regularly as those to the front of Hope Street, they are still considered to be a convenient parking area that is close to the likely destination of any visitor to the town centre.

11 Objection 5

- 11.1 Two objections were received from residents who live on the periphery of the Town Centre. Whilst they concede that the scheme is good for local business owners they are concerned as to where residents will be able to park. Initial enquiries as to whether residents parking permits could be introduced were also received.

12 Response

- 12.1 The section of North Terrace near the residential properties is currently subject to a mix of restrictions, namely Monday – Saturday, 9am-6pm, 30 minutes, no return within 30 minutes and 'no waiting 9am-6pm'. It is proposed to leave the existing 30 minute parking bays as they are and amend the 'no waiting 9am-6pm', so that it can be used by taxis during the day and is unrestricted after 6pm.
- 12.2 In this instance we are not amending the restrictions immediately to the front of the residential properties and as such we would expect the residents to park their vehicles as they do at present. Residents would be permitted to park in the parking bays to the front of their properties all day on a Sunday and between 6pm-9am every other day of the week.

12.3 The current County Council guidance for residential permits does not encourage the allocation of on street limited waiting areas for permit usage. Should displaced long term non-residential parking become an issue within residential areas of the town then consideration may be given to implementing permit zones.

13.0 Local member consultation

The Local Members have been consulted and offer support to the proposals.

14.0 Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the objections and proceed with the implementation of the Crook Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order.

15 Background Papers

Correspondence and documentation on Traffic Office File and in member's library.

Contact: Lee Mowbray Tel: 03000 263588

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital

Staffing – Carried out by Strategic Traffic

Risk – Not Applicable

Equality and Diversity – It is considered that there are no Equality and Diversity issues to be addressed.

Accommodation - No impact on staffing

Crime and Disorder - This TRO will allow effective management of traffic to reduce congestion and improve road safety

Human Rights - No impact on human rights

Consultation – Is in accordance with SI:2489

Procurement – Operations, DCC.

Disability Issues - None

Legal Implications: All orders have been advertised by the County Council as highway authority and will be made in accordance with legislative requirements.

This page is intentionally left blank



Durham
County Council

**STRATEGIC
TRAFFIC
MANAGEMENT
CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF
REGENERATION & ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT**

COUNTY HALL, DOREM, DEI 604

Project Crook Parking & Waiting Restrictions	Project/Drawing No. COB001a
Drawing Location of Objectors	Rev.
Scales NTS	

Rev/Sheet	Drawn By	Name	Date	Approved By	Name	Date	Sign	Description of Amendments
	LM		March 14					

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey materials with the permission of Ordnance Survey
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or
civil proceedings. Durham County Council, LA 100049055, 2013.

This page is intentionally left blank