



Report of Corporate Management Team

Ian Thompson Corporate Director of Regeneration and Local Services

Councillor Brian Stephens, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Local Partnerships

Electoral division(s) affected:

Sedgefield

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 In accordance with part 3 of the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to decide 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 Executive Summary

- 2.1 Within Civil parking Enforcement operational guidance, the County Council are committed to regularly reviewing traffic regulation orders to ensure that the restrictions held within them are relevant and appropriate.

2.2 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Proposals:

2.21 Rectory Row

The traffic regulation order (TRO) is to remove a section of 'restricted waiting 8am-6pm' restrictions (single yellow lines) and remove a section of 'no waiting

at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) on Rectory Row to improve unrestricted parking availability in the area.

2.22 Spring Lane

The traffic regulation order (TRO) is to introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) to reduce obstructive parking, improve the visibility and road safety around the junction of Spring Lane.

2.23 The Square/ High Street

The traffic regulation order (TRO) is to remove a section of 'restricted waiting' restrictions and introduce 'limited waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 2hrs no return within 2hrs' parking bays to improve the parking availability in the area and allow a high turnover of vehicles to improve the local economy on The Square.

To also introduce 'limited waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 2hrs no return within 2hrs' parking bays on the High street on an unrestricted section of highway to improve the parking availability in the area and allow a high turnover of vehicles to improve the local economy.

To also amend the existing 'limited waiting' parking bays on the High Street from '2hrs no return within 2 hrs' to 'Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 2hrs no return within 2hrs' to harmonise restrictions within the town.

2.24 North End/ White House Drive

The traffic regulation order (TRO) is to amend the existing 'no waiting at any time' restrictions to 'no waiting and no loading/unloading at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) to reduce obstructive parking and improve road safety on the junction of North End/ White House Drive.

2.3 Non-Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Works:

The following works are not included in the legal TRO and no action needs to be taken by members. The information has been provided for members as objections have been received during the TRO consultation process and will be detailed in this report.

2.31 Rectory Row – Non-TRO Works

Two pedestrian buildouts are being introduced to improve the safety of pedestrians during school pick up and drop off time. This will improve the visibility and distance to cross Rectory Row for school children, parents and other pedestrians.

White lining will be introduced to mark out unrestricted parking bays on the north side of Rectory Row with only hatching required on the south side, this is

mandatory to go in next to the pedestrian buildouts to show the edge of the carriageway for vehicles and in the interest of road safety.

2.32 Rectory Row & Stockton Road Junction – Non-TRO Works

The introduction of a pedestrian buildout will reduce the road width and crossing distance for pedestrians crossing Rectory Row and will also include a layby to maintain parking availability. The works are to improve road safety for all road users.

3 Recommendation(s)

3.1 Committee is recommended to:

Endorse the proposal in principle to proceed with the implementation of the Sedgfield: Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

4 Background

4.1 Requests have been received to address ongoing obstructive parking, visibility, safety issues within the town.

4.2 The initial consultation exercise was undertaken with statutory consultees and directly affected frontages from January 2019 to April 2019.

4.3 There were objections received at this point from directly affected frontages. Support was received from Durham Constabulary and Local County Councillors. A decision was made to progress with the TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) and move to the formal consultation stage.

4.4 The proposals were advertised formally on site and in the local press between 31st May 2019 – 21st June 2019.

4.5 There were 14 objections in total during the consultation period. 4 relating to the legal Traffic Regulation Order and 10 relating to other highway works which will form part of the wider project.

4.6 Rectory Row

Requests have been received from the Local County Councillors and the Town Council to increase parking availability on Rectory Row. The TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) will include the removal of single and double yellow lines to give additional parking along the road.

There is support from Durham Constabulary for these works. There have been 2 objections to the proposals.

Objection 1 & 2 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

Objector 1 & 2 are residents of Rectory Row and have also objected at the informal consultation stage.

They objected to the proposals but provided no further comments.

Response

The proposals were sent out to statutory consultees as required by the relevant legislation, plans and letters were sent to all directly affected frontages and formally advertised online and on site as per the legal requirements

The proposed removal of single and double yellow lines along Rectory Row is to improve parking availability for residents and visitors to the town. The location will be unrestricted so that vehicles can park in these locations for an unlimited duration, which should also benefit the residents.

Without any detail from the objector, it is difficult to comment specifically on the objection.

4.7 Spring Lane

A request was received from a local County Councillor to improve the visibility and road safety around the junction of Spring Lane. The TRO will include the introduction of double yellow lines to reduce obstructive parking around the junction.

There is support from Durham Constabulary. There has been 1 objection to the proposals.

Objection 1 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

The objector is a local resident of West End near to the junction of Spring Lane and has also objected at the informal consultation stage.

They initially called Durham County Council to discuss the proposals as they were concerned where the double yellow lines would end. It was explained that the restrictions will not go as far as their property. At that point the resident was not wishing to object to the proposals.

During the consultation period the objector returned a response then objecting to the proposals. They wanted someone to visit the site to see if vehicles park on the corner which they claim they do not. They continue to enquire what alternative parking will be offered.

Response

The proposals were sent out to statutory consultees as required by the relevant legislation, plans and letters were sent to all directly affected frontages and formally advertised online and on site as per the legal requirements.

The proposals were requested by the local County Councillor due to numerous reports of obstructive parking and visibility issues at this location. Members from Durham County Council traffic team have visited the site and deemed the proposals necessary in the interest of road safety to improve the visibility when exiting Spring Lane onto West End.

There is alternative unrestricted parking available in this area and it is not considered necessary to have a further site visit as requested by the objector.

4.8 The Square/ High Street

A request was received from the local County Councillor and Town Council to improve parking availability on The Square. The proposed changes will include the amendment of the current 'restricted waiting 8am-6pm' restrictions (single yellow lines) and the introduction of 'limited waiting 2hrs no return within 2hrs Mon-Sat 9am-6pm' bays. These changes are proposed to allow a higher turnover of vehicles to hopefully boost the local economy and improve parking availability in the town.

There are existing 'limited waiting 2hrs no return within 2hrs' bays on the High Street there was a request to harmonise the restrictions to be in line with others in the area. Therefore, the existing restriction will be amended to 'limited waiting 2hrs no return within 2hrs Mon-Sat 9am-6pm'.

There is also support from Durham Constabulary. There has been 1 objection to the proposals.

Objection 1 (Objected at the formal consultation stage)

The objector is a local resident and a member of the Town Council who has objected at the formal consultation stage.

They state they are objecting to the proposed limited waiting bays on The High Street as they consider the area should be left as existing without restrictions.

They continue to state that any restriction will only cause current users who are mainly people who work locally to park round access roads to The Square, which will affect residents and businesses causing even more problems that are experienced at present.

Response

The proposals were sent out to statutory consultees as required by the relevant legislation, plans and letters were sent to all directly affected frontages and formally advertised online and on site as per the legal requirements.

The proposals were requested by the Town Council to improve the turnover and availability of parking for visitors and customers to use the local shops and businesses. If the location is occupied by vehicles commuting to work, where the vehicle is left there for the full duration of the day then this will impact on the income to the local economy and have a negative effect of the productivity of the local businesses.

There is alternative unrestricted parking available in this area for commuter parking.

4.9 North End/ White House Drive

A request was received from a local County Councillor to improve road safety and reduce obstructive parking on the junction of North Road and White House Drive. The proposed amendments include the alteration of the current 'no waiting at any time' restriction (double yellow lines) and the introduction of 'no waiting and no loading at any time' (double yellows with kerb ticks).

There is support from Durham Constabulary. There has been 1 objection to the proposals.

Response

The proposals were sent out to statutory consultees as required by the relevant legislation, plans and letters were sent to all directly affected frontages and formally advertised online and on site as per the legal requirements.

The proposals are to reduce obstructive parking on the junction of North End and White House Drive. Members from Durham County Council traffic team have visited the site and deemed the proposals necessary in the interest of road safety to improve the visibility, accessibility and reduce obstructive parking for road users and pedestrians.

Objection 1 (Objected at the formal consultation stage)

The objector is a local resident who has objected at the formal consultation stage.

They state that the proposals will only push the problem of cars parking in Sedgefield further out into residential areas causing problem for residents and in particular White House Drive, the objector also is concerned that wagons will still continue to load and unload in the area of the restrictions as they have no alternative point to do so.

5 Non-TRO Works (Information provided for members reference and no action is required)

These works are to be carried out at the same time as the introduction and amendments of the TRO restrictions in Sedgefield to reduce the impact on residents and visitors to the town.

The works are not included in the legal TRO and no action needs to be taken by members. The information has been provided for members as objections have been received during the TRO consultation process and will be detailed in this report.

5.1 Rectory Row

Sedgefield Primary School and concerned parents have made several requests over the years for road safety improvements to be made on Rectory Row. They are concerned about the potential for child pedestrian and vehicle conflict at the Burton Mews / Rectory Row junction.

Two pedestrian buildouts are being introduced to improve the safety of pedestrians during school pick up and drop off time. This will improve the visibility and distance to cross Rectory Row for school children, parents and other pedestrians.

White lining will be introduced to mark out unrestricted parking bays on the north side of Rectory Row with only hatching required on the south side, this is mandatory to go in next to the pedestrian buildouts to show the edge of the carriageway for vehicles and in the interest of road safety.

There is support from Durham Constabulary. There are 4 objections relating to the intended works.

Objection 1 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

Objector 1 is a resident of Rectory Row and has objected at the informal consultation stage. Their objection is not relevant to the proposed TRO scheme.

They state that they are concerned about the drainage outside no.8 due to camber of the road and that puddles already form.

Response

The proposals for both the TRO (removing 'restricted waiting and no waiting at any time' restrictions (double and single yellow lines) and the pedestrian build out and white lining works) were sent out together to inform residents of the combined works. The buildouts and white lining works are down to a Durham County Council traffic officers' decision if it is to be introduced for road safety or improvement works and is within their delegated powers.

During the design stage when preparing to introduce a pedestrian buildout there will be surveys undertaken along with guidance from Durham County Councils drainage team to determine gully (drain) locations and will then be included in the scheme, this should address any drainage issues highlighted by the objector.

Objection 2 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

Objector 2 is a resident of Rectory Row and has objected at the informal consultation stage. Their objection is not relevant to the proposed TRO scheme.

They state that they are objecting to the white lining works proposed outside no's. 1-5 Rectory Row. They continue to state that their neighbours from numbers 2,3 and 5 are also in agreement with the objection.

Objector 2 states that they will be formally objecting to the white lining in front of their property.

Response

The proposals for both the TRO (removing 'restricted waiting and no waiting at any time' restrictions (double and single yellow lines) and the pedestrian build out and white lining works) were sent out together to inform residents of the combined works. The buildouts and white lining works are down to a Durham County Council traffic officers' decision if it is to be introduced for road safety or improvement works and is within their delegating powers.

Durham County Council traffic officers have determined that the white lining on the south side of Rectory Row outside the residential properties are not required in regard to road safety and would only be added with the resident's support to formalise parking. Therefore, this section of white lining will be omitted from the proposals.

However, the white lining for marking the unrestricted parking spaces and to show the edge of the carriageway is still required on the north side of Rectory Row as a road safety measure due to the direction of moving traffic towards the buildouts, there is also a requirement for white hatching to either side of the crossing points.

Objection 3 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

Objector 3 is a resident of Rectory Row and has objected at the informal consultation stage. Their objection is not relevant to the proposed TRO scheme.

They state that they are against the introduction of the pedestrian buildouts and white lining. They believe the introduction will reduce easy access for their elderly parents and result in them having to park further away from their property.

The objector continues to state that the proposed markings were not in place when they purchased the properties and they allege that the markings will impact on any future sale of their property and value.

They also state that the white lining is not in keeping with the conservation area of the village green. They state that no other properties around the village green or in fact Sedgefield have such markings.

Response

The proposals for both the TRO (removing 'restricted waiting and no waiting at any time' restrictions (double and single yellow lines) and the pedestrian build out and white lining works) were sent out together to inform residents of the combined works. The buildouts and white lining works are down to a Durham County Council traffic officers' decision if it is to be introduced for road safety or improvement works and is within their delegating powers.

The introduction of the pedestrian buildouts is in the interest of pedestrian safety as located so close to a school and is the only available route when exiting the school by foot or vehicle. The proposals are in place to improve the overall safety of all road users.

The white markings will be omitted near to properties 1-5 Rectory Row as they are not required for road safety, however white hatching next to the buildouts and the markings on the north side are mandatory to show the edge of the carriageway and gives additional unrestricted parking availability.

With the removal of single and double yellow lining from Rectory Row and the introduction of the buildouts and white lining that the available parking spaces have been increased to benefit the residents and visitors to the town.

Objection 4 (Objected at the informal consultation stage)

Objector 4 is a resident of Rectory Row and has objected at the informal consultation stage. Their objection is not relevant to the proposed TRO scheme.

They state that the proposals are a good layout but without permit parking makes it impactable. They allege that on the 9th Feb 2019 at 7.30pm there were 25 vehicles parked around Rectory Row.

They continue that there is a lack of parking and the shape of the raised pavement and restriction zone outside no.8 is too much and unnecessary.

Response

The proposals for both the TRO (removing 'restricted waiting and no waiting at any time' restrictions (double and single yellow lines) and the pedestrian build out and white lining works) were sent out together to inform residents of the combined works. The buildouts and white lining works are down to a Durham County Council traffic officers' decision if it is to be introduced for road safety or improvement works and is within their delegating powers.

Residential permit parking will only be considered for residential streets within commercial areas which are subject to a high demand for long stay commuter parking, Rectory Row is not deemed within the direct commercial area and therefore would not be considered. Durham County Councils Parking Policy section 14 7.52 also states 'Permit parking areas will not be used to address problems associated with school gate parking'.

In a location such as Sedgefield where available parking is limited permit parking would not be a viable option as these restrictions result in displacement of parking affecting neighbouring streets and can impact on a town's vitality and economic wellbeing.

The pedestrian buildouts have been deemed necessary to improve the safety of pedestrians and school children during drop off and pick up times and will also formalise parking in the location. The buildouts have been designed to have the least amount of impact on current available parking.

The two buildouts on the south side of Rectory Row are to be introduced over the current 'School Keep Clear Mon-Fri 8am-6pm' restriction where vehicles are not permitted to park during the restricted duration. It is advised that vehicles should not be parking within 10m of the junction with Burton Mews in the interest of road safety, therefore the buildouts should not have any impact on parking in this location.

The two buildouts on the north side of Rectory Row are to be introduced over the current single and double yellow lines where vehicles are not permitted to park on the restrictions between 8am-6pm, these restrictions will be removed as part of the TRO and white lining introduced to increase unrestricted parking availability in the area.

5.2 Rectory Row & Stockton Road Junction

Reports have been received from residents regarding obstructive parking and road safety issues around the junction of Rectory Row and Stockton Road. Sufficient evidence has been received by Durham County Council to amend the road layout in the interest of road safety.

The introduction of a pedestrian buildout will reduce the road width and crossing distance for pedestrians crossing Rectory Row and to also including a layby to maintain parking availability. The works are to improve road safety for all road users.

There is support from Durham Constabulary. There are 6 objections relating to the intended works.

Objection 1

Objector 1 is a resident of Rectory Row. They state that they live opposite to the junction and cannot recollect any problems with regards to parking or accidents. They believe that there is nothing wrong with the current layout, so why spend money fixing a problem that doesn't exist.

They continue to state that they believe only one resident is in favour of the scheme and is simply undemocratic for one individual to get his own scheme adopted.

They state that the new proposals do not show how many parking spaces will be available, seems like one or two. They continue to state at the moment there is space for up to three vehicles. The objector then states if residents cannot park here they will have to park on the main road? They continue to allege that the scheme is likely to decrease safety for both vehicles and pedestrians at this junction.

The objector also states that the main road is at its narrowest point near to the junction and cars parked in the new bays will restrict the view of vehicles exiting Rectory row, they allege this will decrease road safety.

The objector then finishes their objection by stating why not block off Rectory Row from the junction with Stockton Road which will allow parking spaces for residents, they allege this will stop the rat run of vehicles taking a short cut.

Objector 2

Objector 2 is a resident of Malton Terrace, opposite to the junction. They state that the extension will displace vehicles to Stockton Road, which the allege is very narrow and will slow traffic flow on a very busy road. The continue to state that the visibility will be limited and the safe passage of traffic very

difficult. The objector believes that it would be more hazardous for cars turning right onto Stockton Road and that parking on Rectory Row will increase.

They also state that the proposals will add to the problems with parking in Sedgefield and increase the potential for accidents. They feel that by parking on Rectory Row causes no risk or obstruction and benefits the residents of the village.

Objector 3

Objector 3 is a resident of Rectory Row. They state that they believe the footpath doesn't need extending. They continue to state that they have lived at this location for twelve years and allege that in that time there have been no accidents involving cars or pedestrians and feel that it is a waste of resources and money with the plans at the request of just one resident.

Objector 4

Objector 4 is a resident of Rectory Row. They allege that there has never been an incident in the area, why spend money on something that is not needed. They believe that vehicles exiting Rectory Row will have obscured vision and can cause accidents and put lives at risk.

They continue to state that the current view is clear and safe and believe the proposals make the junction dangerous. The objector then alleges that any kind of changes that prevent drivers seeing each other and pedestrians would be a ludicrous decision. They also state that the proposals are directly opposite to the Golden Lion car park and will cause confusion for motorists, and that any pedestrians trying to cross Stockton Road will be unable to see approaching vehicles.

Objector 5

Objector 5 is a resident of Rectory Row. They state they are unaware of any accidents at the junction and have never had problems with cars parking on the footpath or on the road. They continue to state that the proposals will be opposite to a pub car park entry and exit and by altering the area as proposed could in fact cause potential problems. They also believe that there could be visibility problems for vehicles exiting Rectory Row.

Objector 6

Objector 6 is a resident of Rectory Row. They state the current layout is very open and provides excellent visibility. They continue to allege that the proposed layout will reduce the visibility and risk people turning right onto

Stockton Road into the path of cars travelling south. They are also concerned that there will be one less space for vehicles to park on the new layout.

Response

The request to improve the area was passed to Durham County Council traffic officers along with photographic and video evidence of the road safety concerns from several residents. Proposals were then drafted.

The proposals were sent out to all directly affected frontages to receive comments and feedback prior to introducing the pedestrian buildout and layby. This was an exercise to inform residents and to find out if they also had any evidence and concerns. There were four residential properties in favour of the scheme.

The works will be carried out in conjunction with the TRO scheme to reduce impact on residents and visitors of the area. The decision to introduce the buildout has been made by Durham County Council traffic officers under their delegated powers. The evidence gathered was enough for Durham County Council traffic officers to make a decision that changes to the area were required due to road safety concerns.

The proposals will allow 2-3 vehicles to park in the layby adjacent to Stockton Road, the design has been checked to ensure there will be improved visibility and tested on an AutoCAD programme (AutoTrac) to ensure large vehicles will be able to turn to both the east and west when exiting Rectory Row without issue.

There is alternative unrestricted parking available in this area if the layby is full. The proposed buildout will also improve the visibility and reduce the distance to cross Rectory Row for pedestrians. The buildout will also narrow the carriageway to reduce undertaking and entering Rectory Row on the wrong side of the carriageway which is a safety concern.

There was video evidence provided showing a vehicle travelling east on Stockton road turning right into Rectory and past an oncoming vehicle on the wrong side of Rectory Row forcing a second oncoming vehicle to mount the footpath. This evidence proved that the road width is too wide, allowing vehicles to park on either side reducing space for vehicles entering Rectory Row. The proposals will stop this happening and improve safety for all road users.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 It is recommended that Members agree to endorse the proposal in principle to proceed with the implementation of the Sedgfield: Waiting

and Parking Restrictions Order. 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

\\dch-3900\arc2-sys2\$\TRAFPROJ\06 REGULATION DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION\Settlement\Sedgefield\Traffic Regulation Orders (Parking Restrictions)\2018 December

Contact: Peter Broxton

Tel: 03000 263986

Appendix 1: Implications

Legal Implications

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

Finance

LTP Budget.

Consultation

Is in accordance with SI:2489.

Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty

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

Human Rights

No impact on human rights.

Crime and Disorder

This TRO will allow effective management of traffic to reduce congestion and improve road safety.

Staffing

Carried out by Strategic Traffic.

Accommodation

No impact.

Risk

Not Applicable.

Procurement

Operations, DCC.

Appendix 2: Location of Proposals

