

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Meeting of **Highways Committee** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Thursday 10 November 2022 at 9.30 am**

**Present:**

**Councillor R Ormerod (Chair)**

### **Members of the Committee:**

Councillors D Boyes, C Kay, K Earley, J Higgins, J Howey, G Hutchinson (Vice-Chair), R Manchester, E Mavin, D Oliver, E Peeke, I Roberts, K Robson, A Simpson, A Sterling, F Tinsley, M Wilson and D Wood

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **2 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute members.

### **3 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **4 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Higgins declared an interest in Agenda Item 8 as it was in his division and he was the treasurer for Wingate Community Centre. He noted his intention to speak as local member but would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Wood declared an interest in Agenda Item 9 as it was in his division. He noted his intention to speak as local member and the Chair agreed he could be present during consideration of the item.

### **5 Chester-Le-Street and Birtley Parking & Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 - Report of Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which advised of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Chester-le-Street and Birtley and requested that they considered the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period (for copy see file of minutes).

The Strategic Traffic Manager gave a detailed presentation which included site location plans, aerial photos and photographs of the sites and details for the following restrictions;

- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on South Approach leading into Bullion Lane on both sides, to prevent obstructive parking and reduce congestion. One objection was received in the informal consultation period from a local resident who felt they were being penalised. A further objection was received from Councillor Fantarrow following the closure of the consultation period.
- To extend the existing restrictions either side of Edward Street to prevent obstructive parking and improve visibility and traffic flow for approaching road users. One objection was received in both the informal and formal consultation period from the same resident who felt the proposal would isolate tenants and further limit parking space.
- To formalise the existing markings at Elmway as 'no waiting at any time' restrictions to further prevent obstructive parking and improve traffic flow. Three objections were received in the informal and formal consultation period from local residents who felt the proposals would move the problem elsewhere and felt the double yellow lines were longer than necessary.
- To amend the current 'no waiting' element of the existing restriction at Front Street to 'no stopping except taxis, 6pm-6am'. Two objections were received in the informal consultation period from local businesses who stressed that parking outside their businesses was necessary for quick pick ups and drop offs.
- To formalise the advisory markings as 'no waiting at any time' restrictions, which will allow enforcement to prevent obstructive parking and improve access/egress within Tuart Street. The informal consultation initially included proposals to extend existing permit restrictions into Tuart Street, however, a satisfactory in-favour majority was not achieved and these proposals were withdrawn. Six objections were received in the informal and formal consultation period from local residents, only one directly objected to proposed 'no waiting at any time' restrictions.

Mr Rennie addressed the Committee on behalf of himself and the residents of Elmway. He clarified that they did not object to double yellow lines being put in

place but felt the length of the lines was far longer than required. He noted the site meeting that took place in May 2021 and advised that Councillor Tracie Smith had planned for additional parking at the rear of the garages and had a plan for how this would be financed but stated no information regarding this had been received since. He noted some residents had mobility issues and explained that one resident was housebound and required family to visit daily and access to parking was important. He noted he had lived at Elmway for 17 years and was aware of only one incident during this time indicating the area was not dangerous. He explained the community currently got along well but expressed his concern that the implications of the lines could create ill feeling due to vehicles being forced to park in other areas of the street. Mr Rennie concluded that he understood the rationale for the 'no waiting at any time' restrictions but requested a further inspection to discuss the length of the lines and to discuss the additional parking suggested at the rear of the garages, along with a timeline for when the work could be implemented.

Councillor Sterling sympathised with the residents of Elmway and noted the challenges when restrictions were in a location that included flats. She asked if there was anything members could do to support the residents with regards to the additional parking at the rear of the garages. The Strategic Traffic Manager advised that this was not within his remit, however he was aware that there would need to be an understanding of the public utility costs and if the work could fit into the Highways timeline. The Traffic Engineer informed the Committee that he had spoken with the relevant Highways officer and preliminary designs had been drawn up but further discussion was necessary to identify if there was a reasonable budget to cover the work.

With regards to the proposals at Bullion Lane, Councillor Sterling asked if the residents of Lumley Close had parking outside of their homes. The Strategic Traffic Manager advised that they appeared to have driveways and expected any new development to include sufficient parking.

Councillor Wood understood the frustration of the residents of Elmway but acknowledged that the process for Highways was time consuming however noted it was reassuring to hear that Councillor Tracie Smith had been involved. With regards to the proposals at Bullion Lane, Councillor Wood asked if there had been an objection from the local member. The Strategic Traffic Manager explained Councillor Fantarrow had submitted an objection on behalf of the residents, and although this had been received outside of the objection period, it had been accepted. The Traffic Engineer explained that the report stated that local members were in favour of the proposals as there had not been sufficient time to amend the report following receipt of the objection from Councillor Fantarrow. It was established that Councillor Fantarrow was not present at the meeting.

Councillor Mavin asked if a further site meeting for Elmway was possible as requested by Mr Rennie. The Strategic Traffic Manager agreed this could be

arranged if Members felt it was necessary and the location of Elmway could be removed from the Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022.

The Legal Officer (Planning and Highways) asked Members to clarify if the site meeting was in relation to the proposal that was in front of Committee or if it was to consider the area at the rear of the garages where additional parking had been suggested. The Strategic Traffic Manager confirmed the site meeting would be in relation to the double yellow lines and Mr Rennie agreed.

Councillor Sterling acknowledged five residents from Elmway had attended the meeting which indicated their care and proposed a further site meeting be arranged. She suggested the location of Elmway be removed from the Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 and **moved** the remaining four locations to be endorsed. This was **seconded** by Councillor Howey. Councillor Boyes felt that proceeding with the proposal for Elmway could create ill feeling amongst residents and he confirmed that he supported a further site meeting.

Councillor Kay asked if AAP funding had been secured for the additional parking at the rear of the garages. The Traffic Engineer advised that the budget for this was still undecided. Councillor Wood commented that he was uncomfortable with how funding had been described.

The Legal Officer (Planning and Highways) confirmed that the location of Elmway would be removed from the Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 as agreed by members and that a further site meeting with representatives from Durham Constabulary, the local member and residents be arranged to find a compromise in the extent of the restrictions.

## **Resolved**

That the location of Elmway be removed from the Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022.

That the proposal in principle, to amend the Chester-le-Street & Birtley Parking and Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Order, excluding the location of Elmway, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers be endorsed.

## **6 Langley Moor, Meadowfield, Brandon & Browney Parking & Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 - Report of Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which advised of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Langley Moor, Meadowfield, Brandon and Browney and

requested that they considered the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period (for copy see file of minutes).

The Traffic Management Section Manager gave a detailed presentation which included site location plans, aerial photos and photographs of the sites and details for the following restrictions;

- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions at A690, High Street for the extent of the hatched markings to further prevent vehicles from parking in an obstructive manner. Three objections were received in the informal and formal consultation period from local residents who felt the restrictions were too harsh.
- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on the western side of the junction at Sawmills Lane to improve visibility and access/egress for approaching road users. One objection was received from a directly affected property.

Councillor Tinsley confirmed that he knew the two locations well and asked if a negative impact on traffic flow at High Street was anticipated. The Traffic Management Section Manager did not foresee any issues with traffic flow but was happy to monitor this. He commented that there would be some displacement of vehicles but that this would be minor.

With regards to Sawmills Lane, Councillor Tinsley asked if the objection received from Stoneacre Garage was on operational grounds. The Traffic Management Section Manager noted that no information had been received to indicate this. Councillor Tinsley **moved** the proposal to be endorsed.

In response from a question from Councillor Kay regarding traffic flow at High Street, the Traffic Management Section Manager explained that with it being a minor junction that any increase in traffic flow would be minor.

With regards to Sawmills Lane, Councillor Kay asked whether parked cars were problematic throughout the day or only during school times. The Traffic Management Section Manager confirmed vehicles were parked throughout the day and were generally visitors to the nearby houses. The Legal Officer (Planning and Highways) was confident that the parked vehicles were not parents from the local Primary School.

Councillor Howey agreed with the proposals although expressed concern that the proposal at High Street risked moving the current problem. Councillor Howey **seconded** the proposals be endorsed.

**Resolved**

That the proposal, in principle, to amend the Langley Moor, Meadowfield, Brandon & Browney Parking and Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Order, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers be endorsed.

## **7 Spennymoor Parking & Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 - Report of Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which advised of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Spennymoor and requested that they considered the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period (for copy see file of minutes).

The Strategic Traffic Manager gave a detailed presentation which included site location plans, aerial photos and photographs of the sites and details for the following restrictions;

- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions either side of the newly developed access road leading to Festival Walk Car Park, as well as either side of the access road leading from Holborn/Oxford Road into Aldi, to prevent obstructive parking and improve traffic flow. Three objections were received in the informal and formal consultation period from local residents and businesses.

Councillor Sterling asked if there was an option for permit holders only parking. The Strategic Traffic Manager explained this would incur a cost for residents and was not deemed necessary. He further explained that there was a criteria for permit parking and the location did not meet the criteria.

Councillor Howey asked if the Festival Walk carpark was free of charge. The Strategic Traffic Manager confirmed that it was free and there was no limit on the amount of time vehicles could be parked.

Councillor Sterling **moved** the proposals to be endorsed and this was **seconded** by Councillor Mavin.

### **Resolved**

That the proposal, in principle, to amend the Spennymoor Parking and Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Order, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers be endorsed.

## **8 Wheatley Hill, Wingate, Quarrington Hill & Deaf Hill Parking & Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Amendment Order 2022 - Report of Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which advised of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Wheatley Hill, Wingate, Quarrington Hill and Deaf Hill and requested that they considered the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period (for copy see file of minutes).

The Strategic Traffic Manager gave a detailed presentation which included site location plans, aerial photos and photographs of the sites and details for the following restrictions;

- To introduce 'limited waiting, Monday-Saturday, 8am-6pm, 1 hour no return within 2 hours' restrictions for the extent of this layby to facilitate short stay access to nearby services/facilities and reduce obstructive parking. The bays will be unrestricted on an evening to facilitate overnight parking for any surrounding residential properties. Two objections were received in the informal and formal consultation period from directly affected frontages who felt it was unfair for residents who did not have off-street parking.

Councillor Higgins addressed the Committee as local member and thanked the officers for bringing the item to the meeting. He advised that complaints had been received from the chairperson at Wingate Primary School, residents, and parents, regarding congestion and parking. He had witnessed vehicles parking in the layby for full days when sufficient off street parking was available. To his knowledge none of the properties located on front street including the travel agents had objected to the proposal and stated that the Community Centre had car parking facilities. He confirmed that he fully supported the proposal as did the Police.

Councillor Higgins left the meeting.

Councillor Sterling expressed concern with users of the community centre as sessions for users could last up to three hours but noted Councillor Higgins had pointed out that the car park at the community centre had car parking facilities.

Councillor Earley believed it was a firm proposal and that sufficient car parking was available in the area and **moved** the proposal to be endorsed. This was **seconded** by Councillor Tinsley.

### **Resolved**

That the proposal, in principle, to amend the current Wheatley Hill, Wingate & Deaf Hill Parking and Waiting Restrictions, Traffic Regulation Order, with the final

decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers be endorsed.

## **9 Pelton, Perkinsville and Ouston Parking & Waiting Restrictions Amendment Order 2022 - Report of Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth which advised of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Pelton, Perkinsville and Ouston and requested that they considered the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period (for copy see file of minutes).

The Strategic Traffic Manager gave a detailed presentation which included site location plans, aerial photos and photographs of the sites and details for the following restrictions;

- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on both sides of the junction of Newbridge Banks to Pelton Lane. One objection was received in the informal consultation period.
- To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions at Station Road to Stony Lane. Two objections were received in the informal consultation period from residents to felt they would not be able to park outside of their home and could affect any future sales for the properties.

Councillor Wood addressed the Committee as local member and confirmed that he was in support of the proposals for both locations. With regards to Station Road to Stony Lane, he advised that visibility was poor when cars were parked on both sides of the junction. In terms of Newbridge Banks/Pelton Lane Junction he stressed the main concern was vehicles parked on the side of the road as this forced large vehicles and buses to travel on the wrong side of the road. He expressed his gratitude for the work that officers had done with the proposals.

Councillor Howey noted the proposals were sensible for safety reasons and **moved** the proposals to be endorsed. This was **seconded** by Councillor Sterling.

Councillor Robson agreed the proposals made good sense.

### **Resolved**

That the proposal, in principle, to amend the Pelton, Perkinsville and Ouston Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers be endorsed.