

## Highways Committee

8 March 2012

Unc Aldin Grange Terrace, Bearpark  
Proposed No Entry



---

### Report of Terry Collins, Corporate Director Neighbourhood Services

Councillor Bob Young, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic Environment

---

#### Purpose of the Report

- 1 To advise Committee of representations received to the proposed introduction of a no entry restriction at the junction of Aldin Grange Terrace and the C17 in Bearpark.
- 2 It is recommended that the Committee endorse the proposals having considered the representations to the proposals and proceed with the implementation of the no entry restriction.

#### Background

- 3 Representations have been received from the local County Councillor Rev Crooks on behalf of residents about difficulties being encountered due to the narrow and blind corner at the bottom of the rear street.

#### Proposals

- 4 The site was investigated and the most appropriate option was to introduce a no entry restriction preventing vehicles from entering the rear street from the C17. A one way restriction was initially requested but discounted due to a lack of turning facility.
- 5 The no entry restriction would still allow two way operation in the rear street and would not affect larger vehicles such as bin lorries or delivery vehicles.

#### Consultation

- 6 Informal consultation was carried out with the affected residents and statutory consultees from the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010 to the 20<sup>th</sup> April 2010.
- 7 Out of the 31 letters sent to affected residents, 11 responses were received in favour and 2 against. In addition, Durham Constabulary, the Ambulance Service and the Design & Conservation team responded in favour to the informal consultation.
- 8 A letter was also received from the resident's solicitor supporting their opposition to the proposal.

- 9 A statutory advertisement of the proposals was undertaken from 10<sup>th</sup> June 2011 until the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2011. During this period 1 email was received raising a number of concerns although stating it did not constitute a formal objection.
- 10 The local Members, County Councillors Rev Crooks and Mark Wilkes are in support of the scheme.

### **Representation and responses**

- 11 Representation 1

A number of points were raised by a resident and echoed by their solicitor

The respondent is not aware of any collisions at this location.

*Response: The proposal is being introduced due to residents' concerns about the potential for collisions due to the blind and narrow corner at the bottom of the rear street. Indications from residents were that there had been several near miss incidents at this bend.*

The proposal is likely to increase the risk to pedestrians and in particular residents' children who play in the rear street.

*Response: The proposal will increase the numbers of vehicles travelling west to east in the rear street however the overall numbers of vehicles using the rear street would not increase. Whilst it may be common place for children to play in streets, the highway authority can not condone such practice but would rely on parents to supervise their children when in the highway.*

Waste bins are placed in the rear street reducing its width and the issue of bin collections.

*Response: The rear street is currently used as a two way road and this would continue. The bin lorries would still be able to drive along the street and exit onto the main road as they currently do, however should they wish to turn around they could use the unmade hardstanding area.*

During winter weather vehicles are left on the unmade area and the proposal will force more vehicles onto this area.

*Response: The proposal will not increase the instances of this happening however it is the resident's choice whether to use this area as parking or not.*

Introduce a centre line / junction marking and ban HGVs from entering from the C17.

*Response: The road is not wide enough to consider centre markings being only 4m wide and it is not current practice to provide such markings in residential streets. Banning HGVs would be similar to what is being proposed by the no entry restriction but would still allow the potential of conflict at the narrow blind bend.*

The rear street is used as a short cut from the Colliery Rd to the C17 and should be made access only. The speed limit should be reduced to 10mph or 15mph.

*Response: The use of access only restrictions in residential streets is not one that is supported by the Council or Durham Constabulary as they are open to abuse and require significant enforcement resource. Speed limits of 10 or 15mph are not permitted on the public highway.*

12 Representation 2

The proposal will force people to use a more dangerous junction (Colliery Road).

*Response: The visibility on the main road is adequate for the speed of the road and should not constitute a danger if motorists drive with due care and attention.*

Cars would be travelling at greater speed in the rear street.

*Response: The proposal does not prevent two way traffic flows along the rear street but only prevents entry at the eastern end from the C17, so there should not be any increase in vehicles speeds.*

Introduce a mirror to improve visibility into the access road.

*Response: The provision of mirrors is strictly limited by the Department for Transport and this location would not meet their criteria for the installation of one. Measures such as the proposal would be expected to be introduced as an alternative to the use of a mirror.*

13 Representation 3

The proposal will prevent the use of the side road by cyclists forcing them to use the busier Colliery Road junction.

*Response: An exemption for cyclists to this restriction could potentially create a dangerous situation where vehicles emerging round the narrow blind corner could come into conflict with cyclists from the opposite direction. Whilst it is appreciated that the Colliery Rd junction is busier this junction is considered acceptable for use by cyclists.*

An alternative solution would be to permanently close the lane at the eastern end of the terrace to all motorised traffic.

*Response: The rear street does not feature a turning head for traffic and would require vehicles to reverse the full length of the street and onto Colliery Road, this is not considered to be a suitable alternative.*

### **Recommendations and reasons**

- 14 It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the representations and proceed with the implementation of the no entry restriction.

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance – Funding from the Local Area Members Allowance**

**Staffing – None**

**Risk – None**

**Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty – None**

**Accommodation – None**

**Crime and Disorder – None**

**Human Rights – None**

**Consultation – As described in the report**

**Procurement – None**

**Disability Issues – None**

**Legal Implications - None**