



**Geoff Paul, Interim Corporate Director of Regeneration and Economic Development.**

**Councillor Carl Marshall, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Economic Development.**

**Electoral division(s) affected:**

Chilton.

**Purpose of the Report**

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

**Executive summary**

- 1 Chilton Industrial Estate (Chilton Way & Avenue One).

A request was received from Durham County Council's Business Engagement Team Manager on behalf of local business owners to address obstructive parking and improve access, visibility and safety for HGV's and road users within the industrial estate. There have been 15 objections (all from Care Connect who are Durham Council employees who have their work place situated on Chilton Way near to Durham County Council Depot and car park.) and 12 responses in favour of the proposals.

## 2 Durham Road, Chilton

A request was received from local residents and the County Councillor to introduce formal restrictions to address obstructive parking, improve visibility and safety issues. There is support from the Local County Councillor. There have been no objections and three residents in favour of the proposals.

### **Recommendation(s)**

Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Endorse the proposal and recommend that the Corporate Director of Regeneration and Economic Development proceed with the implementation of the Chilton: Waiting and Parking Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **Background**

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 Requests were received to address ongoing obstructive parking, visibility and safety issues within the Chilton area.

### **3 Chilton Industrial Estate**

3.1 A request was received from Durham County Council's Business Engagement Team Manager on behalf of local business owners to address obstructive parking and improve access, visibility and safety for HGV's and road users within the industrial estate.

3.2 The initial consultation exercise was undertaken with statutory consultees and directly affected frontages between July 2019 and September 2019. There were 15 objections received from Care Connect who are Durham Council employees who have their work place situated on Chilton Way near to Durham County Council Depot and car park.

3.3 An email was sent to all objectors explaining why the restrictions are being proposed to improve road safety and to request further feedback. There were 4 replies confirming their objection.

3.4 A meeting was arranged with the Durham County Council's Business Engagement Team Manager (on behalf of the local businesses), the County Fleet Manager (on behalf of Durham County Council Depot) and Telecare Care Connect/ Control Manager (on behalf of Care connect). There was an agreement that there is enough car parking for Care Connect staff in the depot car park, and that there is a health a safety issue and the proposals are beneficial to all road users.

3.5 A decision was made to progress with the TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) and move to the formal consultation stage.

3.6 The proposals were advertised formally on site, online and in the local press between 14<sup>th</sup> December 2019 – 4<sup>th</sup> January 2020. There were no formal objections.

### **4 Durham Road, Chilton**

4.1 A request was received from local residents and the County Councillor to introduce formal restrictions to address obstructive parking, improve visibility and safety issues.

- 4.2 The initial consultation exercise was undertaken with statutory consultees and directly affected frontages in July 2019 to September 2019. There is support from the Local County Councillor. There have been no objections and three in favour of the proposals.
- 4.3 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, online and in the local press between 14<sup>th</sup> December 2019 – 4<sup>th</sup> January 2020. There were no formal objections.

## **5 Objections – Chilton industrial Estate**

### Informal

- 12 response in favour of the proposals
- 15 responses against the proposals

### Formal

- No formal objections

### Objections 1-15

Objector 1 is an employee of Care Connect. They state there is not enough secure parking at the moment for council staff.

Objector 2 is an employee of Care Connect. They state that they understand the need in some areas for double yellows but the proposals cover a large amount of area and there are large amounts of people work in the area, they would like to know where all these people are suppose to park as there is limited parking areas that is why cars park on the roadside. They also state that if the main issue is the number of HGVs then why does all staff have to struggle to find parking, the problem is the companies whose HGV vehicles park up and need to have deliveries scheduled and not parked on the roadside.

Objector 3 is an employee of Care Connect. They state there is not adequate parking for staff.

Objector 4 is an employee of Care Connect. They state there is not enough parking space for everybody that works here, and the car park they do have access to spaces are too small and vehicles get damaged.

Objector 5 is an employee of Care Connect. They state there are a lot of units in the area who need to use the roadside for parking as there is not enough spaces, especially in the council car park for all staff. If plans go ahead where would they be proposed to park?

Objector 6 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they are not happy at all, there has never been adequate car parking, but don't know why we get asked as it will be going ahead anyway. Maybe thoughts could be put to better use on a car park system which could be safer for them and their cars at Chilton depot. They add also that they have we have had to endure the wagons parking up on a night on both sides of the road, which has put them in danger every day and night.

Objector 7 is an employee of Care Connect. They state the area does not have adequate parking for the amount of staff working in the depot. Also, the cars are being damaged in the DCC car park which is why staff park their cars on the roadside.

Objector 8 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they are absolutely against this proposal and hope there is going to be adequate parking provided as at present there is not. The car park provided is not secure and their car has been damaged several times parking in this location, is there an option of offering staff car parking in the depot?

They also continued to state that large HGVs turning into the wood recycling plant are parking waiting for access near the DCC control room which blocks the road throughout the day. This has a knock-on effect on Chilton Way with access and entry issues for all. The refuse wagons also park on Chilton Way after leaving the depot, causing obstruction on the curve of the road and they are surprised there has not been a serious accident. There is not sufficient parking bays in the car park and would like the car park extending at the DCC depot. They agree that some areas need marking but prior to this all businesses should be consulted as their HGV vehicles do not consider other road users. Multiple wagons are found to park up after leaving the premises obstruction all vehicles. when starting and ending a shift at the control room, depot and other business users then the volume of traffic is doubled and so is the parking issues, staff leaving and starting a shift try to get spaces with HGVs also leaving the power plant at peak times. Some days cars are parked right to the top of Chilton Way simply for the reasons stated in this section.

Objector 9 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they do not think the proposals are a good idea and that they also cause issues. On viewing the proposals and taking into account all staff working at Chilton depot, the car parking spaces that are available are not sufficient. They understand that the parking situation is causing issues and safety concerns, due to the amount of staff have to park on Chilton Way all the way to the substation. They think the other areas proposed do need double yellows as the flow of traffic does become a problem at peak times. They feel the proposals need to be reviewed to benefit both traffic management and also DCC staff members.

Objector 10 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they are not happy with the proposals due to the inadequate parking that is not secure at the DCC

depot control room facility at present. The parking provided is used by refuge staff, street wardens, control room staff as well as admin and other DCC staff. In the past when using the car park, if available their vehicle has been damaged. They would like this to be looked at and maybe adding further parking. They claim that the issue is not the staff, it is the HGV vehicles that park dangerously all the way up the road and drive too fast causing problems for all workers in the area. They also would like lines only placed where appropriate. They have parked on Chilton Way for 10 years and drivers sleeping in wagons has never been a problem until the unit nearby opened and why can't wagons use the access at avenue 2 as it will solve lots of problems.

Objector 11 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they strongly disagree and think it's appalling that themselves and colleagues work 12 hr shifts and have to arrive early now to get parked, the proposal will cause more issues and stress. They would like further investigation carried out with the wagons that park over night which take up numerous spaces.

Objector 12 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they are totally against this as there will be nowhere to park. The car park is always full due to the volume of cars that is why we must park where currently do. Cars also gets damaged when parking in this location and the objector's car was scratched. You would also have to arrive 15mins early to park and walk the distance because of how far you have to now park away. Will we have permission to park in the depot?

Objector 13 is an employee of Care Connect. They state there is not enough parking bays for all cars and there needs to be new spaces if this goes ahead.

Objector 14 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they are opposed to the proposals as it will limit our staff to be able to park. The car park is usually full by the time they start at 7am as most of the bin men and other staff are parked before we do. They have been made aware from other colleagues their cars have been damaged in the car park, so wouldn't feel safe leaving their car there. In the winter it is also hard to park in the car park due to lots of vehicles there. It is also very dark on a night when finishing at 7pm and do not feel safe walking to my car as it is very poorly lit.

Objector 15 is an employee of Care Connect. They state they object to the double yellows as in the day there are sometimes 31 vehicles parked on the road outside the DCC building up to TYK factory. There is no space in the car park, we work 7am-7pm shifts and am a lone female and do not feel safe going to the car park in the hours of darkness. The wagons into the wood recycling plant across the road from the control room completely block the road waiting for access via the gates, the bin wagons leaving the depot park up which I do not understand why and causing a massive obstruction, and this

is an accident waiting to happen. Car park needs extending and they park on the roadside and cars will be parked all the way up.

## **6 Response**

There are unrestricted sections of highway as well as the car park outside the Durham County Council depot within the Industrial Estate away from unit accesses which are available to park in. Vehicles parking on any section of highway or car park are parked at their own risk, however it is deemed safer to park within the car park outside of DCC Depot where it is found has enough available parking space.

Numerous objectors have recognised the safety issues with HGVs parking on the highway causing obstruction and access issues for moving traffic, therefore supporting the proposals in some sections. The proposals will reduce the obstruction issues from HGVs which will ensure they park away from unit access along the unrestricted sections of highway.

The introduction of the proposals should improve the flow of traffic and improve visibility in the affected areas especially around shift change and peak times.

The majority of the units that have HGVs attending their premises have been in favour of the proposals to improve the safety for all road users.

Speed issue should be reported via the Durham Constabulary's local Police and Communities Together (PACT) meetings. Details of the meetings taking place can be found online or by telephoning Durham Constabulary on their non-emergency telephone number 101.

## **7 Conclusion**

- (a) It is recommended that Members endorse the proposal and recommend that the Corporate Director of Regeneration and Economic Development proceeds with the implementation of the Chilton: Waiting and Parking Restrictions Order. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **8 Background papers**

- (a) Correspondence and documentation in Traffic Office File

L:\TRAFPROJ\06 REGULATION DESIGN &  
IMPLEMENTATION\Settlement\Chilton\Traffic Regulation Orders (Parking  
Restrictions)\July 2019

---

## **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

---

