

Highways Committee

13th January 2023

Lanchester and Langley Park

Parking & Waiting Restrictions
Amendment Order 2023

Ordinary Decision/Key Decision No.



Report of Corporate Management Team

Amy Harhoff Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth

Councillor Elizabeth Scott, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Economy and Growth.

Electoral division(s) affected:

Lanchester and Esh & Witton Gilbert

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of objections received to the consultation concerning changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Lanchester and Langley Park.
- 1.2 To request that members consider the objections made during the informal and formal consultation period.
- 1.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to decide, in principle only, whether to proceed with the Amendment Order, which will then guide the Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy and Growth in the exercise of delegated decision making. The final decision is therefore one for the Corporate Director, under delegated powers.

2 Executive Summary

- 2.1 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 Representations have been received requesting a review of existing, and provision of additional, restrictions in Lanchester and Langley Park.
- 2.3 Having considered these requests, Officers have determined that the changes listed below would be of benefit in terms of improving road safety and reducing congestion. It is therefore proposed to amend the current Lanchester and Langley Park Parking and Waiting Restrictions Traffic Regulation Order, to allow the identified changes to be implemented.
- 2.4 Local Members and Durham Constabulary have been consulted and raised no objection to the proposal.
- 2.5 Consultation Period:

	From	To
Statutory Consultation 1	30-Mar-22	20-Apr-22
Informal Consultation	26-May-22	16-Jun-22
Formal Consultation 1	29-Sept-22	20-Oct-22
Statutory Consultation 2	28-Oct-22	18-Nov-22
Formal Consultation 2	17-Nov-22	8-Dec-22

3 Recommendation(s)

- 3.1 Committee is recommended to:

Endorse the proposal, in principle, to amend the Lanchester and Langley Park Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order 2023, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

4 Proposal, Objections & Responses

- 4.1 The proposed locations for the TRO that received objections during the consultation stages are detailed below.

4.2 **Location 1 – Front Street, Lanchester** (Introduce ‘no waiting at any time’ and ‘no waiting, Monday - Friday, 8am - 4pm’ restrictions)

Proposal background

The C57 Front Street is a main route located off the A691 Durham Road, Lanchester and is predominantly used by vehicles wishing to access housing estates in the west of the village. It is also used regularly by vehicles accessing the two primary schools in the immediate vicinity and is a bus route.

As a result of the above, the street can be subject to extremely high levels of obstructive parking particularly at school pick-up and drop-off times, which causes issues with visibility, traffic flow and road safety for all users. This was reported to the County Council by Local Elected Members and residents.

It is therefore proposed to introduce a combination of ‘no waiting at any time’ and ‘restricted waiting (Monday – Friday, 8am-4pm)’ restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in areas of significant road safety concern, whilst maintaining a level of parking provision for local residents/visitors outside of peak congestion times.

Informal Consultation, conducted: 26/05/22 – 16/06/22

Total Properties balloted	Number in favour	Number opposed
19	11	0

First Formal Consultation:

Consultation dates	Expressions in favour	Expressions against
29/09/22 - 20/10/22	1	2

Second Formal Consultation:

Consultation dates	Expressions in favour	Expressions against
--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

17/11/22 - 08/12/22	0	0
---------------------	---	---

Summarised objections & responses:

Objections:

Two people have objected to this proposal at the formal consultation stage, the reasons for these objections have been summarised below:

- “The proposals leave Fenhall Park as the nearest available parking location.”
- “Putting restrictions in place will only move the parking issues elsewhere.”
- “Why not introduce a pick-up/drop-off lane on the schools land.”

DCC Response:

- “It is important that we take a balanced approach to tackle the issues reported to us. Unfortunately, all parking restrictions will inevitably lead to a degree of vehicular displacement. Motorists will often seek out the next nearest unrestricted areas to park close to their destination. At this location, the parking restrictions have been proposed on main routes where obstructive parking proves problematic, disrupting traffic flow and leading to road safety concerns. Once restrictions have been put in place, we monitor them to see how they are working and their effects. This can result in additional changes being made later on.”
- “Unfortunately, Durham County Council can only introduce enforceable restrictions on the public adopted highway. We do not have the powers to impose requirements onto the school to make changes to their on-site traffic management systems.”

See appendix 3 for full details of the objection(s).

4.3 **Location 2 – A691 Durham Road/A6076 Howden Bank/Bishops Meadow, Lanchester** (Introduce no waiting at any time restrictions)

Proposal Background

The A691 is the main route between Derwentside and Durham with an average daily traffic count of approximately 9,100 vehicles travelling through Lanchester. Towards the north-west of the village is St Bede’s Catholic School and Sixth Form, which generates high traffic volumes on the A691 Durham Road, the A6076 Howden Bank and within the Bishops Meadow estate.

Both Local Elected Members and residents made the County Council aware of the high levels of obstructive parking, particularly at school pick-up and drop-off times, in this area which causes issues with visibility, access and road safety.

It is therefore proposed to introduce ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions on the A691 Durham Road, the A6076 Howden Bank and Bishops Meadow.

Informal Consultation:

No informal ballot consultation was conducted for this location as it was considered no properties/frontages were directly affected.

First Formal Consultation:

Consultation dates	Expressions in favour	Expressions against
29/09/22 - 20/10/22	1	5

Following the first formal consultation, the proposals were amended to mitigate the potential displacement of parking into unsuitable areas. This was then formally consulted on again.

Second Formal Consultation:

Consultation dates	Expressions in favour	Expressions against
17/11/22 - 08/12/22	0	3 (2 of which were made by previous objector to the proposals)

Following the second formal consultation, Durham County Council's Traffic section met with the Local Members for this area to discuss the objections and come to an agreement on how to proceed. It was agreed that a 40-metre section of the 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on the western side of Howden Bank, south of the junction with St Bede's Court, would be removed to reduce the displacement of parking into the St Bede's Court.

These amended proposals are supported by Durham Constabulary.

Summarised objections & responses:

Objections:

6 people have objected to this proposal during the formal consultation stage, the reasons for these objections have been summarised below:

- “St Bede’s Court is already used as a drop-off point where cars park on and across drives and the proposals will only push more vehicles into the busy estate”
- “The proposals will move parking further north towards Ornsby Hill”
- “Why has the eastern side of Howden Bank been included? It is unnecessary as people do not park here.”
- “Bishops Meadow and Fenhall Park benefit from this proposal where St Bede’s Court does not. Why can’t resident only parking be introduced in the neighbouring estates? Why can’t double yellow lines be introduced throughout the cul-de-sac?”
- “Why isn’t St Bede’s School looking into providing adequate traffic management systems on their own land?”

DCC Response:

- It is important that we take a balanced approach to tackle the issues reported to us. Unfortunately, all parking restrictions will inevitably lead to a degree of vehicular displacement. Motorists will often seek out the next nearest unrestricted areas to park close to their destination. At this location, the parking restrictions have been proposed on main routes where obstructive parking proves problematic, disrupting traffic flow and leading to road safety concerns. Once restrictions have been put in place, we monitor them to see how they are working and their effects. This can result in additional changes being made later on.
- Obstructive parking such as cars parking over driveways / on footways should be reported to Durham Constabulary on their non-emergency phone number (101).
- The eastern side of Howden Bank has been included to mitigate potential future issues of displacement. Leaving this section unrestricted would provide drivers with a place to legally park on a section of carriageway, close to a busy junction that would cause road safety concerns and issues with traffic flow.
- The restrictions at Bishops Meadow and Fenhall Park have been proposed to keep the junction areas clear of parked vehicles. There are already existing restrictions on the junction into St Bede’s Court / A6076 Howden Bank.

- Durham County Council’s parking policy sets out the requirements for an area to qualify for parking and waiting restrictions (Section 7). Point 7.5 states *“Parking restrictions should not be used in predominantly residential areas to control inappropriate parking. Any Obstruction offences should be dealt with by the local constabulary through enforcement where necessary.”* We would not therefore look to introduce double yellow lines within the cul-de-sac in this instance. In addition to this, introducing restrictions around the full extents of the cul-de-sac would limit residents from parking outside of their own properties.
- Durham County Council’s parking policy also sets out the requirements for an area to qualify for permit parking (Section 7). An area must meet all of the criteria to be considered for permit parking. The criteria listed in the policy shows that St Bede’s Court would not meet the criteria for permit parking with section 7.52 stating *“Permit parking areas will not be used to address problems associated with school gate parking.”*
- Unfortunately, Durham County Council can only introduce enforceable restrictions on the public adopted highway. We do not have the powers to impose requirements onto St Bede’s School to make changes to their on-site traffic management systems.

5 Conclusion

- 5.1 Having considered the evidence of obstructive and inconsiderate parking and the objections to the proposals, Officers remain of the view that it is necessary to introduce the proposals in order to address the identified highway safety issues. Accordingly, it is recommended that Members agree in principle to endorse the proposal to proceed with the implementation of the Lanchester and Langley Park Parking and Waiting Restrictions Amendment Order 2023, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

6 Background papers

- 6.1 Correspondence and documentation in Traffic Office File:

\\dch-3900\arc2-sys2\$\TRAFPROJ\06 REGULATION DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION\Settlement\Lanchester & Langley Park\Traffic Regulation Orders (Parking Restrictions)\2022 February

Author(s)

[Daniel Morgan]

Tel: 03000 262879

[Lee Mowbray]

Tel: 03000 263693

[Kieron Moralee]

Tel: 03000 263368

[Dave Lewin]

Tel: 03000 263582

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.

Climate Change

This TRO will allow for effective management of traffic to reduce congestion, reducing the overall amount of CO2 emissions.

Human Rights

Any interference with human rights is considered to be necessary in accordance with the law and proportionate in order to address highway safety issues.

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



Appendix 3: Objection Details

Objection to the Proposals at Location 1

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 October 2022 21:17

To: Highways Orders

Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Lanchester & Langley Park Prohibition & restriction order 2022

Dear Sir

Whereas I support the traffic management around the schools, the current proposals appear to be leaving Fenhall Park as the nearest available parking slot. Since the EP school changed its exit point a few years ago. Fenhall park is virtually impossible to access around school times. We as residents already have difficulty in receiving deliveries at these times. These proposals are likely to make our position as Fenhall Park residents even worse. Surely you must have realised this obvious effect and I suggest that we are also protected

Yours sincerely [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Objection to the Proposals at Location 1

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2022 22:24

To: Highways Orders

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Parking Order F.A.O Helen Lynch

Dear HELEN LYNCH

Head of Legal & Democratic Services County Hall, Durham, DH1 5UL

Re; (ref: 34773) (PROHIBITION & RESTRICTION OF WAITING & LOADING) ORDER 2010 (AMENDMENT NO. 1) ORDER 2022

As a resident of Victoria Terrace Lanchester, I would like to comment on the proposed parking restrictions.

I do not feel that further restrictions in Lanchester itself will solve any issues around the school

drop off and collection time parking at either school.

I moved to Victoria Terrace eighteen months ago because of the placement of the property and the surrounding roads being available for my visitors to park.

If the council were to put in double yellow lines in one area, it will just move the problem to another part of the locality- and will not solve the problems that we have now with parking.

I would like to suggest putting in a parking lane at St. Bede's and the EP school (why not take an area of the playing field at each location) to create a pick up and drop off snake lane that would accommodate all the vehicles, and keep the traffic off the main roads?? Similar to the bus lane we have currently at St. Bede's?

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 October 2022 17:41

To: Highways Orders

Subject: [EXTERNAL]:Prohibition & Restriction of Waiting Order 2010
(Amendment no.1)ORDER 2022

Ref: 34773

I refer to the above proposed Order under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. As a resident of St. Bede's Court I support the proposal subject to a modification on the extent of the restriction as proposed.

St Bede's Court is already used a drop-off and collection point for students from St. Bede's RC School and Sixth Form College. The original road layout was designed to serve the 18 properties which latterly increased when Foxwood Court was developed. The design of the estate road was never intended to include multiple off road parking above the two visitor parking bays which provide 6 bays in total. Inconsiderate parking and turning manoeuvres already present an unnecessary hazard to residents and other road users often resulting in vehicles backing-up onto the A6076 at peak-times. The estate footpaths are limited in their extent with the majority of the road separated from private gardens by low level kerbs which allow easy encroachment.

I note from the proposed order that Bishops Meadow and Fenhall Park will benefit from the parking restrictions extending into the development. Based on this principle, I would like the Highways Dept. to give due consideration to extending the parking restrictions for the whole of St. Bede's Court for the same proposed daytime hours. My concern is that with the new restricted parking on the A6076, St Bede's Court will become the only section of public road in close proximity to the school where students can be dropped-off and collected. This will increase the level of traffic onto a once quiet cul de sac which is not designed to carry. I appreciate that the parking problem is not an easy issue to resolve. Enforcement of the regulation will (I assume) fall to Durham CC and will only receive gesture compliance by many parents and will be difficult to maintain. Double yellow lines are only suitable on main roads and will be visually intrusive on a small residential development. The long-term solution must be with the school to provide adequate traffic control systems on their land which is safe, workable and takes into account the increasing number of students who are ferried to school in private transport.

I look forward to receiving your response on the matters raised.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 October 2022 21:47

To: Highways Orders

Subject: [EXTERNAL]:ref: 34773 - PROHIBITION & RESTRICTION OF WAITING & LOADING) ORDER 2010 (AMENDMENT NO. 1) ORDER 2022

Hello

I wish to raise issue and object to the proposal as it currently stands, specifically to points 'b' and 'c', both in relation to the A6076 Howden Bank.

Whilst I agree something needs to be done, this proposal offers absolutely no solution whatsoever to volume of cars parking, provides absolutely no alternative parking solution and in fact will, without doubt, create greater problems than it solves.

Ref 'b': By restricting parking on the west side of the A6076 from the junction with the A691 to the entrance to St Bede's Court simply moves the parking of cars further north and closer to the dangerous bend in the road at Ornsby Hill. This is a dangerous bend which often has traffic at school times already backed up beyond the 30mph zone into the 60mph zone with cars travelling at high speed, downhill, on the brow of a hill, into a blind bend.

Additionally it will very likely move additional parking to the section of the west side of the A6076 north of Ornsby Hill up to the entrance with Maiden View. This is a section of road as mentioned above which is currently a National Speed Limit zone with cars travelling legally at up to 60mph (but often above that) with an inadequate and substandard (therefore dangerous) footpath used by many more schoolchildren than ever before due to the recent completion of 47 new builds at Maiden View. Leaving this section as unrestricted parking under the current proposal is increasing the risk of serious accident to road users and pedestrians.

There cannot be a worse possible scenario created by this proposal.

Ref 'c': This is completely unnecessary as no cars park on this section of the road, however, due to the proposal for point 'b', you're likely to create further dangerous parking and therefore it will be necessary to make this section very clear that there should be no parking.

The question has to be asked as to why St Bede's school, the ultimate source of the problem, is not providing additional parking for drop off/pick up utilising its own land by redesigning its bus terminus and/or the land to the west of the main buildings and/or the hard base sports areas? Just pushing this problem further down the road into more dangerous areas does not resolve the problem but merely makes it someone else's problem! Has this been discussed or investigated?

A suggested alternative to the Council's proposal is to make the entire length of the western section of the A6076 a 'No Parking' zone from its southerly junction with the A691 to beyond the entrance with the Maiden View estate, but in doing so making the Maiden View estate a 'Residents Only' parking zone, to avoid problems for residents and access to Willowburn Hospice.

In addition, and with reference to the other proposals for further parking restrictions in Lanchester, there is no provision for alternative parking locations. In making the current proposal it is assumed that this is because there are just causes to make restrictions based on current excess, dangerous and restrictive parking at these sites.

Therefore, again, there is no actual solution to the lack of parking facilities in the village. Where is the proposal to provide parking space for that which is proposed to be removed?

The village already has insufficient parking, so this proposal simply exacerbates the problem whilst providing no solutions! Please advise what the solutions are? Making some minimal volume zones 'limited time parking' does not alleviate any of the problems the proposals will cause.

I look forward to your response.

██████████

██████████████████

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 October 2022 18:33

To: Highways Orders

Subject: [EXTERNAL]:Prohibition & Restriction of Waiting Order 2010
(Amendment no.1)ORDER 2022

Ref: 34773

I refer to the above proposed Order under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. As a resident of St. Bede's Court I support the proposal subject to a modification on the extent of the restriction as proposed.

As a resident of St Bedes Court, I have to raise my concerns that St Bedes has not been included within the order. I understand that Bishops Meadow and Fenhall Park will benefit from the parking restrictions. I am therefore writing to ask that St Bedes Court is also taken into consideration for these restriction benefits. If not, then I fear that this will increase the level of traffic onto a quiet cul de sac which is not designed to accommodate such potential volume of traffic and has either elderly residents or as in our case a young family who will be leaving and arriving at school drop off times. A massive potential risk in my opinion. I understand the challenges of managing school related traffic, however, there must be a better long-term solution than the intrusion this would place on the residents of St Bedes Court.

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 October 2022 14:12

To: Highways Orders

Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Howden Bank No Parking Restriction ref 34773

I have today noticed the sign affixed to the lamppost relating to the above.

I agree entirely BUT ONLY WITH AMENDMENT.

Something needs to be done as someone will be killed.

However at St Bedes Court where I reside it is already twice daily pandemonium and this restriction will only make it much much worse.

We currently have numerous people parking on our actual driveways and also blocking drives and the small estate in general. The proposal will make it significantly worse if that is possible.

Also children urinating in our gardens while waiting to be picked up. There will be a death here too with daily altications between people waiting and people waiting and elderly residents.

I want you to amend the proposal to include St Bedes Court like Bishops Meadow.

And provide policing measures.

Kindly acknowledge my proposed amendment.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 December 2022 17:14

To: Traffic Consultations; Lee Mowbray; Cllr Douglas Oliver; Cllr Mike McGaun

Subject: [EXTERNAL]:Re: Lanchester and Langley Park Traffic Regulation Order 2022

Further consultation due to amendments made to the A691 Durham Road/A6076 Howden Bank/Bishops Meadow proposal

I wish to add a further comment to my previous comments on this proposal.

As I have said from the outset I agree with the proposal on the main highway as it is required for safety reasons however, to implement the proposal in isolation with total disregard for the follow on repercussions is NOT acceptable.

It is acknowledged currently we have a serious parking/pick up problem at St Bedes Court (the estate is very small and has almost no paths)

It is also acknowledged that the main highway proposal will exacerbate the problem.

To respond to our concerns saying you the residents of St Bedes can dial 101 the police is insulting.

We are all aware the Police have a lot on their plate and to knowingly add their workload with the current proposal and not to take into account the bigger picture is extremely crass indeed.

To be positive, I suggest you provide some measures to the neighbouring estates which you know will be affected, eg yellow lines, residents parking signage etc. and look at providing appropriate designated parking areas.

The Local Authority MUST look at the consequences of where the school parking/pick up/drop off will be dispersed to on implementation of the highway proposals.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 October 2022 19:37

To: Traffic Consultations

Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Lanchester and Langley Park traffic order 2022

I refer to your correspondence addressed to Andrew Hampton and other residences in St Bedes Court re the parking issues pertaining to the drop off and pick up of schoolchildren attending St Bedes School.

I live at 5 St Bedes Court and experience traffic and unreasonable parking in our small estate twice daily during school term time.

On occasions accidents and prangs have been narrowly avoided only due to the diligence of residents who are fully aware and exasperated by the volume of traffic using St Bedes Court for their drop off/pick ups. Double parking at the entrance to the estate is common leaving only the narrowest of gaps to manoeuvre through.

If the proposed parking regulations are implemented then this issue will worsen 100% as more drivers will attempt to locate convenient unrestricted parking spots.

For this reason I ask that the residents concerns are fully explored and therefore object to the proposals in their current form.

The only sensible way forward is to fully restrict St Bedes Court parking to residents only. Failing which we shall be overwhelmed by parked/parking vehicles during school start/finish times.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection to the Proposals at Location 2

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 October 2022 14:02

To: Highways Orders

Cc: richard.holden.mp@parliament.uk

Subject: [EXTERNAL]: No Waiting Restrictions Lanchester

Ref 34773: To Whom it may Concern

I am very concerned about the proposed waiting restrictions for Lanchester.

The proposed restrictions a, b, c, & d are likely to see a displacement of traffic from the A6076 Howden Bank area into St Bede's Court.

We are residents of St Bede's Court and already have problems with parents, of students at St Bede's School, dropping off and picking up. Personally I have had parents reverse on to my drive and park across the drive.

The displacement will increase the numbers parking in the street and as the street is a cul-de-sac cars have to turn; this in itself will cause problems for traffic flow.

Your orders notice states that a copy of the draft order and supporting documents may be inspected at Lanchester Library. As of yesterday the library had not received this.

We look forward to your comments.

Regards

[REDACTED]