



Highways Committee

Date Friday 10 June 2016
Time 9.30 a.m.
Venue Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham

Business

Part A

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Substitute Members
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 March 2016 (Pages 1 - 2)
4. Declarations of interest, if any
5. Sedgefield - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order 2016 - Report of Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development (Pages 3 - 6)
6. Durham City (South West) - Sedgefield - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order 2016 - Report of Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development (Pages 7 - 10)
7. Stanhope - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Amendment Order 2016 - Report of Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development (Pages 11 - 16)
8. 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
2 June 2016

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 Hicks, K Hopper, O Milburn, S Morrison, R Ormerod,
J Robinson, J Rowlandson, P Stradling, F Tinsley, J Turnbull,
M Wilkes, R Young and B Kellett

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **Highways Committee** held in Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham on **Wednesday 2 March 2016 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, O Gunn, K Hopper, O Milburn, J Robinson, J Rowlandson, P Stradling, F Tinsley, J Turnbull and B Kellett.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors I Geldard, D Hicks, S Morrison, R Ormerod and R Young.

2 Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest in relation to any items of business on the agenda.

5 Sedgefield - Parking and Waiting Restriction Order 2016

The Committee were informed by the Legal Adviser that the Council had received a pre-action protocol letter of intended judicial review proceedings from the legal representatives of one of the objectors, United Parcel Service. Given that the letter had only been received in the office within a few hours before the meeting, the Committee were advised that consideration of the item should be deferred to a future meeting, to ensure that the letter could be given proper consideration and responded to accordingly.

Resolved

It was resolved unanimously that the item be deferred to a future meeting.

6 Proposed installation of 2no bus shelters on Spa Road, Gainford

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development regarding a proposal to erect two bus shelters on Spa Road, Gainford (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Committee were informed that the request for bus shelters in the area had arisen from residents of Gainford, to Gainford Parish Council. Two main bus services utilised the bus stops at the proposed locations and the scheme would be fully funded by Gainford Parish Council. Ownership and future maintenance of the bus shelters would be the responsibility of the County Council, as per their maintenance programme.

The Committee were informed that two objections had been received regarding concerns that the shelters would cause unsightly obstructions, increase anti-social behaviour and that the design and materials of the shelters would not fit in with the disposition of the village, given that it was a conservation area.

In response to these objections, the Committee were informed that the fully glazed design of the shelters allowed them to blend into the surrounding environment, that similar shelters were used in other conservation areas around the County, and, that a seat would not be provided for in the shelters, to deter congregation of youths and anti-social behaviour.

In response to concerns by the Committee regarding the lack of a seat in the proposed shelters, the Highways Officer explained that it was a case of striking a fine balance. On one hand, a seat would undoubtedly be beneficial for the elderly and infirm, however, on the other hand, it could attract and encourage youths to congregate in the area, hence the reason to omit one in the shelter design.

Councillor Robinson queried why Gainford Parish Council would not be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the shelters. The Committee were informed that the County Council could ask the Parish Council to maintain the shelters, however, the County Council wished to maintain the same standard as similar shelters across the County.

Councillor Milburn queried the design of the proposed shelter and queried why there were no 'ends' to the shelter, which offered little to no protection from the elements. The Committee were informed that the Council needed to maintain a 1.8 metre wide footway, hence the design. It was accepted that a bus shelter without ends did offer very little protection.

Resolved

That the Committee, having considered the objections, recommend to the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development that the proposal be agreed, with the final decision being made in accordance with the Council's scheme of delegation.

Highways Committee

10 June 2016

Sedgefield PARKING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS ORDER 2016



Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director for Regeneration and Economic Development.

Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Economic Development

1. Purpose

- 1.1. In accordance with part 3A of the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to make a decision in principle only which will then guide the Corporate Director in the exercise of delegated decision making. The final decision is therefore one for the Corporate Director, under delegated powers.
- 1.2. To advise Members of objections received to the consultation concerning changes to the traffic regulation order in Sedgefield.
- 1.3. To request that members consider the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period.

2. Background

- 2.1 Following the successful implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement in Durham District in 2008 it was introduced into the Southern part of the County in 2012. Enforcement of all waiting restrictions within this area was undertaken by the County Council from this time.
- 2.2 The County Council are committed to regularly reviewing traffic regulation orders to ensure that the restrictions held within them are relevant and appropriate.
- 2.3 A request was received from Sedgefield Neighbourhood Watch Panel to introduce waiting restrictions on Salters Lane Industrial Estate to address parking and road user issues generated by parking on the verges and footways. Introducing waiting restrictions will also help to address the aesthetic issues caused by parking on the verges and address ongoing maintenance liabilities.
- 2.4 In the past, industrial units on Salters Lane have been left without electricity and internet because the utility cables below the verges have been exposed and damaged by repetitive parking on the verged areas. Pedestrians have, on occasions, had to walk in live traffic around vehicles parking over the footpath.

- 2.5 In July 2015, business owners and managers on Salters Lane Industrial Estate were informally consulted on proposals to introduce waiting restrictions on Unclassified Salters Lane.
- 2.6 At this point, Objector 1 raised an objection to the proposals on the basis that the parking is not an all-day issue and does not warrant such excessive measures.
- 2.7 The objector also advised that occasionally there is more than one HGV delivery truck at their unit, so one truck may need to wait on the highway. They were advised that loading and unloading can be carried out from the waiting restrictions, as long as they are actively seen to be doing so.
- 2.8 All other responses received (7) were in favour of introducing restrictions, but expressed a wish for them to be extended further into the industrial estate. Site meetings were carried out to speak to unit managers to assess the parking problems.
- 2.9 A second informal consultation was carried out on 24 September 2015 advising that requests had been received to extend the waiting restrictions to cover the full length of the estate road. All consultees were advised the proposals would be formally advertised and that notices would be posted on site and in the local press in the near future. Should they wish to object, they should do so by following the instructions on the adverts.
- 2.10 At the formal advertising stage there was one objection received (objector 2). They wished for only one side of the road to be subject to waiting restrictions. They also requested the restrictions not be implemented (if at all) for a while to allow their business to put alternative measures in place for parking their fleet.

3 Objection 1 (objected at informal consultation stage)

- 3.1 The objector is a business owner on the estate. They believe that the problem is occasional, not constant and does not warrant such excessive measures. The objector was advised that a DCC officer would attend a site meeting if desired to discuss other possible measures to address the situation, but no such request was made.
- 3.2 The objector was advised that they could attend Highways Committee but expressed their wish not to attend, as they believed that the introduction of parking restrictions was a foregone conclusion.

4 Objection 2 (objected at formal consultation stage, in response to on-site advert)

- 4.1 The objector is a business manager of a delivery service on Salters Lane. The nature of the business requires a fleet of vehicles, some of which are HGVs. The objector was consulted informally twice, inviting comments to the proposed waiting restrictions, but there was no response given on either occasion.

- 4.2 As part of their objection, Objector 2 requested that only one side of the carriageway be subject to waiting restrictions to allow some degree of off-street parking. *(Those in favour of the waiting restrictions did not find these proposals agreeable and no agreement could be reached between both parties; therefore the Order has progressed to Highways Committee).*
- 4.3 The objector also requested that there be a degree of time allowed for their company to put remedial measures in place to make alternative arrangements for parking their fleet. This request is agreeable within reason, if the objector can give a practical timescale they can work to. *(objection received 10 November, 2015)*
- 4.4 On 1 March 2016, a request for judicial review was received from Objector 2. This was considered by Durham County Council Legal Section and the outcome was that there were no grounds for review as protocol had been followed in line with Statutory Instrument 2489.
- 4.5 On 21 April 2016, Objector 2 sent a further letter to Legal Services to expand upon their original objection. As part of the letter, they requested to meet and discuss possible options other than introducing waiting restrictions on both sides of the road, for their full lengths.
- 4.6 A meeting was proposed on Wednesday 25 May at 2pm between Objector 2, Traffic Section Manager and the requestor of the restrictions. Objector 2 did not respond to the invitation.
- 4.7 On May 26 2016 an email was sent to Objector 2 outlining less restrictive waiting restrictions outside of their Depot. Objector 2 was asked to advise in writing by no later than 5 June 2016 if they found the less restrictive proposals agreeable. Alternatively, they would be invited to Highways Committee on 10 June 2016 at 9.30am.

5 Local member consultation:

- 5.1 The Local Members have been consulted and offer no objection to the proposals.

6 Recommendations:

- 6.1 It is recommended that Members resolve that they are minded to agree to set aside all objections, endorse the proposal and proceed with the implementation of the Sedgefield: Waiting and Parking Restrictions. Order 2016 with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

7 Background Papers:

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

Contact: Rachael Smith Tel: 03000 263587

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital (Approx. cost - £1500)

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.

Highways Committee

10 June 2016

Durham City (South West) PARKING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS ORDER 2016



Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director for Regeneration and Economic Development.

Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Economic Development

1. Purpose

- 1.1 In accordance with part 3A of the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to make a decision in principle only which will then guide the Corporate Director in the exercise of delegated decision making. The final decision is therefore one for the Corporate Director, under delegated powers.
- 1.2 To advise Members of an objection received to the consultation concerning changes to the traffic regulation order in Durham City (South West).
- 1.3 To request that members consider the objection made during the informal and formal consultation period.

2 Background:

- 2.1 A request was received from a resident of Grape Lane to change Grape Lane from being part of Zone I to becoming a zone of its own, Zone GL. Residents of Grape Lane were consulted on these proposals and were made aware that should the proposals go ahead, they would no longer be able to use their permits in other areas of Zone I and would have to use existing pay and display facilities to park on-street.
- 2.2 The consultation was sent to 36 residents on 15 October, 2015. The responses received were 2 against, 23 in favour and 11 did not respond. There were no objections received from any of the Statutory Consultees. As the majority of residents had voted in favour, the proposals were progressed and were formally advertised on-site, in the local library and in the local press on 17 March until 8 April 2016.
- 2.3 There were no objections raised during the formal advertising period, however an objection (objector 2) was received on 19 April 2016. Although the objection was received outside of the formal dates, following advice from Legal Services, the objection was allowed to stand and Objector 2 has been invited to attend Highways Committee.

2.4 As the objection was received outside of the statutory objection period the objector was advised that they would be invited to come along, but they would only be asked to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.

3 Objection.

3.1 The objector is a resident of Crossgate, opposite Grape Lane. Crossgate forms part of Zone I, so as a resident the objector's resident permit currently allows them to park in Grape Lane.

3.2 When the objection was received, although it was out of the formal advertisement period, it is considered a valid objection

3.3 Crossgate is currently 'resident permit holders OR pay and display Monday – Saturday 8am – 6pm". The objector requested that the pay and display aspect be removed and allow that length of on-street parking be made 'permit holders only'.

4 Response:

4.1 Crossgate is a popular street for parking for visitors to the City. Reducing the pay and display option in any part of the street would be detrimental to the parking offer and also confusing to users.

4.2 The most appropriate way to manage demand and increase turnover of space to address the competing demands of commuters, residents and visitors is to increase the charge for pay and display parking. Crossgate is currently 50p per half hour, an increase to 80p per half hour would displace a proportion of non-resident vehicles into nearby areas where there is spare capacity. (Please note change such as this would be subject to a separate process).

5 Local member consultation:

5.1 The Local Members have been consulted and offer no objection to the proposals.

6 Recommendations:

6.1 It is recommended that Members resolve that they are minded to agree to the removal of Grape Lane from Zone I and make it a stand-alone zone, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

7 Background Papers:

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

Contact: Rachael Smith Tel: 03000 263587

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital (Approx. cost - £2000)

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

Highways Committee

10 June 2016

STANHOPE PARKING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS AMENDMENT ORDER 2016



Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development

Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder, Regeneration and Economic Development

1 Purpose:

- 1.1 In accordance with part 3A of the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to make a decision in principle only which will then guide the Corporate Director in the exercise of delegated decision making. The final decision is therefore one for the Corporate Director, under delegated powers.
- 1.2 To advise Members of the objections received during the consultation concerning the proposed introduction of a n2 hour parking restriction on Front Street, Stanhope.
- 1.3 To request that Members consider both the reasons for and those against introducing a parking restriction on part of the Front Street in Stanhope.

2 Background:

- 2.1 Requests were received from local businesses of Front Street, Stanhope for the introduction of a 2 hour parking restriction. The issues were highlighted in a Weardale Gazette article where businesses complained that there was little passing trade as kerb space adjacent to the shops was taken up by vehicles parked there for most of the day.
- 2.2 In October 2015, parking surveys were undertaken in Front Street and Market Place, Stanhope to establish parking occupancy numbers and stay durations. The survey showed that on average 15 of the 25 spaces adjacent to the shops were occupied for 4 hours or more. On the opposite side of Front Street, 14 out of 21 spaces were occupied for the same duration. Three quarters of the spaces on the Front Street and Market Place were taken by 10am and people working in the village contributed to the high occupancy levels.

3 Informal Consultation:

- 3.1 An officer visited affected shop frontages in Stanhope to discuss ongoing parking issues. The overwhelming consensus was for the introduction of a 2 hour parking restriction to support the economy of the village by discouraging all day parking and encourage a high turnover of customers in Stanhope by increasing availability. Some employees advised that they parked in the bay on Front Street, but could find alternative parking facilities in the village if necessary.

4 Proposal:

- 4.1 Traffic Section's proposal is to introduce a 2 hour restriction to the existing block paved bay that extends between the Everyday Café and Barclays Bank on Stanhope Front Street which accommodates up to 16 vehicles. This would include the introduction of 2 spaces reserved for blue badge holders only.
- 4.2 The proposal was to only restrict one bay as we are mindful of the impact this could have on the side streets given that some of the long stay vehicles would be displaced. In the early morning there is some capacity on the opposite side of Front Street as well as in the Market Place, so it is considered that not all of the displaced vehicles would end up in the side streets.
- 4.3 Photographs of the area concerned are included in Appendix 1 (point 9, 9.1 and 9.2) to this report.

5 Formal Consultation:

- 5.1 The proposed Traffic Order was advertised on 27 January 2016. Objections to the proposal were received from 8 individuals.

5.2 Objection 1-7:

- 5.3 Seven of the objectors are nearby residents who state it will make parking conditions untenable due to the impact of the displaced vehicles migrating to nearby residential areas where reduced parking space is already an issue.

5.4 Objection 1-7 Response:

- 5.5 Long stay vehicles will inevitably be displaced elsewhere in Stanhope village centre; however it is extremely unlikely that all of these displaced vehicles will migrate to the same location.
Surveys indicate that there is currently some capacity on the opposite side of Front Street and in the Market Place and the displaced vehicles may therefore be spread around, therefore reducing the impact.

5.6 Objection 8:

- 5.7 The objection was to the proposed 2 hour duration and location of the bay. The objector stated "the waiting time should be reduced to one hour" and that the

physical length of the restriction should be longer and “should be extended to number 79 Front Street”.

5.8 Objection 8 Response:

5.9 The 2 hour limit was determined after speaking with the various businesses on Front Street. Most considered that 1 hour was not sufficient time to visit multiple shops, or visit the hairdresser for example, and that 2 hours would allow more flexibility.

With regards to extending the parking restrictions, the intention is to review the impact of the initial proposal before giving consideration to extending it further.

6 Local Member Consultation:

6.1 Local County Council members and a Parish Council member were included in the formal consultation. The Parish Council had received many comments, both for and against and suggested if the proposals went ahead, that they should be implemented on a trial basis and reviewed in due course.

7 Recommendations:

7.1 It is recommended that Members resolve that they are minded to agree to set aside all objections, endorse the proposal and proceed with introducing one full bay comprising 16 spaces restricted to a maximum stay of 2 hours and two of these spaces will be reserved for blue badge holders only and proceed with the implementation of the Stanhope: Parking and Waiting Restrictions. Order 2016, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

8 Background Papers:

8.1 Correspondence and documentation is kept on a Traffic Office File and in the Member’s library.

Contact: Jon Hogarth Tel: 03000 263581

Appendix 1: Photographs

9 Photographs:

9.1 Showing the west end of the existing bay where the restriction is proposed.



9.2 Showing the east end of the existing bay where the restriction is proposed.



Appendix 2: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital, works costs are estimated at £800 plus any enforcement costs

Staffing – Carried out by Strategic Traffic Section

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 – No impact.

Human Rights - No impact on human rights

Consultation – Is in accordance with SI:2489

Procurement – Operations, DCC.

Disability Issues – The introduction of blue badge bays will assist disabled access to Front Street local services.

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