

**Objections to the Traffic  
Regulation Order North End  
Parking Area**

---

**Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, Regeneration and  
Economic Development**

---

**1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To advise members of 12 objections received following the formal advert of a Traffic Regulation Order for North End Area, the effect of which would be to introduce a Controlled Parking Area

This report requests that Members endorse the proposal to proceed with making the Traffic Regulation Order.

**2.0 Background**

- 2.1 The introduction of parking control is considered an effective tool in the delivery of the Council's transport objectives and delivery of the measures set out in the Local Transport Plan. Members are aware of and have subscribed to the introduction of parking control as stated in the adopted policies of the Local Transport Plan. The aim of this Order is to balance the conflicting demand for parking from residents, visitors and commuters and address the problems displacement can create, in areas of mixed residential and commercial businesses. Concerns have been raised by residents, via local elected Members, regarding parking issues associated with long stay parking by staff and visitors to nearby workplaces such as hospital and college in the Dryburn Area and commuters to further afield such as Newcastle, resulting in residents experiencing great difficulty parking in their street.

- 2.3 Initial information regarding proposals was provided to residents of the North End Area in November 2010 (Controlled Parking Area). The parking restrictions will apply between 8.00am and 6.00pm, Monday to Saturday. A maximum of three Resident Permits will be issued per household.

- 2.4 North End Area included the following Streets:-

North End	Springfield Park
North Crescent	Springwell Road
South Crescent	Fieldhouse Lane
The Grove	Flassburn Road
Springwell Avenue	Larches Road
Shawcross Close	Fieldhouse Terrace

- 2.5 A drop in session was held at County Hall on the 18<sup>th</sup> March and 20<sup>th</sup> March 2010, to allow interested parties to view the information and discuss proposals with officers. Following the drop in session amended proposals were sent to residents and a ballot undertaken on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2011. The results of the residential ballot are as indicated in the attached table.
- 2.5 Although a substantial proportion of residents within the North End Area were in favour of the scheme, some streets were not, these included Boste Crescent and Old Dryburn Way. As a result of the ballot these streets were not included in the final scheme.
- 2.6 In accordance with the Statutory Instrument 2489 (The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996) proposals were formally advertised in the press (Durham Times) and posted on street on the 13<sup>th</sup> May 2011, and maintained for 21 days.

### **3.0 Objections**

As a result of the formal advertising of the Regulation Order known as "The County Council of Durham (North End Area) (Parking and Waiting Restrictions) 2011", letters of objection were received from 12 people. A summary of the objections are as follows.

#### **Objector 1 The Grove, Durham**

The objector believes there is not a problem in The Grove and does not want unsightly street furniture such as payment metres. It will inconvenience his family and tradesmen. Does not want to pay for parking.

#### **Response**

There are no proposals for pay and display in this area and therefore the only street furniture will be signing. These will be located on existing posts and lighting columns where possible to reduce street clutter.

If parking controls are introduced in this area the result will be to remove commuter parking and free up parking spaces for residents and their visitors.

Permits are not provided free to residents as an income is required which directly contributes to operational costs. Department for Transport guidance on parking control states that, where possible, it should be self-financing. Where parking control operations are not self-financing, authorities need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. Residents

in Durham City and Framwellgate Moor Area currently pay £30 per annum per permit, it is intended that North End Area will be the same.

#### **Objector 2, The Grove, Durham.**

The objector believes the street is too narrow and to allow parking on both sides will cause an obstruction. The objector would like No Waiting At Any Time on one side of the road.

## **Response**

If controls are introduced in The Grove there are no intentions to mark out bays and it would be expected that residents and their visitors park considerately within the area. If bays are marked out or waiting restrictions applied on one side of the street parking availability will be reduced thus restricting availability and options for residents.

### **Objector 3 Springfield Park, Durham.**

The objector does not want the scheme to run on a Saturday, but run on a Monday to Friday 9am – 4pm. She would like her friends and family to park freely outside her house.

## **Response**

The current restrictions in the Durham City and Framwellgate Moor area operate from Monday to Saturday and 8am to 6pm. It is generally accepted as good practice to apply a consistent approach to operation times to avoid confusion to drivers. Failure to control parking in this area when parking is controlled in the surrounding areas, would lead to parking by non residential vehicles on uncontrolled days.

Permits are not provided free to residents as an income is required which directly contributes to operational costs. Department for Transport guidance on parking control states that, where possible, it should be self-financing. Where parking control operations are not self-financing, authorities need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. Residents in Durham City and Framwellgate Moor Area currently pay £30 per annum per permit, it is intended that North End Area will be the same.

### **Objector 4 Springfield Park, Durham**

The objector does not want the scheme to run on a Saturday.

## **Response**

See response from Objector 3.

### **Objector 5 Fieldhouse Terrace, Durham.**

The objector does not have a problem with cars being left for several days in his street and believes it brings life into the area. He believes less parking will result in higher speeds through the area. He objects to people paying to park on the road, believes it will encourage more people to pave front garden, to accommodate cars. He believes scheme is unnecessary, unreasonable and be a detrimental to the area.

## **Response**

North End scheme is in response to concerns raised by residents and local councillors regarding problems as a result of commuter parking in residential streets. It is evident from the ballot results that the majority of residents wish the scheme to go ahead.

## **Objector 6, 7 and 8**

These objectors are not residents in the area but commute to work by train and park at North End.

## **Response**

The objectives of the proposals are to restrict parking in the North End area to residents and visitors. Concerns were raised by residents and local Councillors regarding the amount of commuter parking.

## **Objector 9 Springwell Road**

Objecting on the grounds of safety. The junction between Fieldhouse Lane and Springwell Road has very bad visibility. It's the busiest junction and has no footpaths. Particular problems with vehicles travelling on the wrong side because of parked vehicles.

## **Response**

If the proposals go ahead then this will reduce the amount of on street parking and improve visibility. If the permit scheme goes ahead and there is still an issue of parking at this junction, then the introduction of No Waiting at Any Time can be looked at.

## **Objector 10 Springwell Avenue**

The objector does not want the scheme. There is no parking problem particularly on a Saturday. They are disappointed at the poor level of consultation believes it did not fully explain the scheme would run from Monday to Saturday. Concerned about allowing a private company to run the scheme which is not in the public interest.

## **Response**

The ballot tested the views of all residents and the result confirmed that the majority of residents did consider that permit parking would be of benefit in the area. Whilst some residents do not currently suffer a problem with commuter parking if controls are placed in areas that do have a problem there will inevitably be a displacement of vehicles to uncontrolled areas thus causing them a problem. See objection 3 response regarding Saturdays, on all letters and plans it was identified as being Monday – Saturday 8am- 6pm. NSL Ltd as a representative of Durham County Council is required to ensure parking restrictions are observed and enforced in a fair, accurate and consistent manner.

### **Objector 11 The Grove**

The objector has been monitoring his street regarding parking problems and believes there is not a problem. He is concerned that the scheme is to include Saturdays and that it will inconvenience his visitors. Believes other residents are unaware it will include a Saturday.

### **Response**

See objection 10 response.

### **Objector 12 Whitesmocks Avenue**

The objector appreciates there are parking problems in North End but believes the introduction of a permit parking scheme will not solve the problem. This will only push the cars into the next location, which she believes will be Whitesmocks Avenue and St Nicholas Drive. This displacement will cause problems in a narrow street like Whitesmocks Avenue, which already has people parking their vehicles all day. She thinks putting waiting restrictions on one side of the road at St Leonard's School would improve access and allow some parking, or applying no parking for an hour in the middle of the day to prevent all day parking. She believes we should liaise with employers and try and encourage staff not to use their cars, and make the station parking fees more reasonable.

### **Response**

Whitesmocks Avenue is separated from the proposals by the A167, it is unlikely that commuters will migrate to this location. However the situation will be monitored if there is cause for concern then an appropriate solution can be investigated.

## **6.0 Recommendations and Reasons**

- 6.1.1 The Committee is recommended to endorse my proposal to set aside the objections and proceed with the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised and introduce parking controls in the areas detailed in this report. The changes to Parking Control will have a significant impact on parking demand in the area.

The parking supply and demand will continue to be monitored with a view of taking any remedial action as deemed appropriate.

### **Background Papers**

Office Files

---

**Contact: Sarah Thompson Tel: 0191 383 6536**

---

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance** – Demand Management

**Staffing** – Carried out by Strategic Traffic

**Risk** – Not Applicable

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

**Accommodation** - No impact on staffing

**Crime and Disorder** - This TRO will allow effective management of traffic to reduce congestion and improve road safety

**Human Rights** - No impact on human rights

**Consultation** – Is in accordance with SI:2489

**Procurement** – Operations, DCC.

**Disability Issues** - Blue Badge holders are exempt from the restrictions for up to 3 hours

**Legal Implications** – Enforceable TRO