

## Highways Committee

21 November 2014

Paradise Lane, Easington Colliery  
Proposed No Waiting At Any Time



---

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

Councillor Brian Stephens, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic Environment

---

#### Purpose of the Report

- 1 To advise Committee of representations received to the proposed introduction of a No Waiting At Any Time restriction on Paradise Lane, Easington Colliery.

#### Background

- 2 Representations have been received from the local County Councillors Angela Surtees and David Boyes on behalf of residents to investigate the possibility of establishing a No Waiting At Any Time parking restriction to discourage indiscriminate parking and reduce vehicles obstructing the highway at the junction.

#### Proposals

- 3 The site was investigated and it was considered the most appropriate option was to introduce a length of No Waiting At Any Time restriction. It is hoped that this will alleviate some of the parking problems which have led to numerous complaints regarding the obstruction of the highway and general road safety. Vehicles parking at the junction create problems with visibility, access and egress for both pedestrians and drivers.

#### Consultation

- 4 The informal consultation was carried out with the affected residents and statutory consultees from the 16<sup>th</sup> of October 2013 to 4<sup>th</sup> of November 2013.
- 5 Out of the 19 letters sent to affected residents, 6 responses were received in favour and 7 against the proposal. In addition, Durham Constabulary and the Ambulance Service responded in support of the proposal.
- 6 A statutory advertisement of the proposals was undertaken from 25<sup>th</sup> June 2014 until the 16<sup>th</sup> of July 2014. During this period no formal objection was received.
- 7 The local Members, County Councillors David Boyes and Angela Surtees are in support of the scheme.

## Representation and responses

8 A number of representations were received during the informal and formal consultations.

9 Representation 1

*'This will promote parking outside the front of my property when people use the shop. In bad weather we park there until young child is in the house.'*

It is accepted that the introduction of parking restrictions, in some cases, can displace parking. We have recognised the demand for parking by only placing a restriction on one side of the road on Seaside Lane.

Parking on a public highway is on a first come first served basis and we are unable to dictate where individuals park however by only proposing restrictions where needed it is hoped that overall availability will be adequate.

10 Representation 2

*'Parking for residents will become even more of an issue than it already is. Public using the walk-in centre, already use the on street parking outside our homes instead of using the car park provided due to lack of signs for the car park. Public using the sunbed shop and the off licence at the bottom of the street will then use the parking outside of our homes as there will be no parking for local businesses.'*

The principal purpose of a highway is to facilitate the passage and re-passage of road users. As car ownership has increased, parking on-street is often tolerated having become the norm countrywide on the principle of first come, first served providing the manner of parking does not cause obstruction to other road users including pedestrians. As such residents cannot be guaranteed parking in the vicinity of their homes. We are unable to insist that drivers use available off road parking but it is hoped that by introducing restrictions on only one side of Seaside Lane drivers will have the opportunity to park in the unrestricted section where parking is available.

11 Representation 3

*'Most of the residents of Paradise Lane have more than one vehicle per household and at present they use some of the other available space for overnight parking to ensure that their cars are safe. If the restrictions were to be imposed it would mean finding alternative parking for these vehicles, we have already tried parking in the back street along with other residents but have been victim to petrol theft when we did this, and on top of that I have been regularly blocked in the street by other people having the same idea and the street is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass in the back.'*

Unfortunately, as car ownership increases at unsustainable levels nationally, this results in the type of problems described above. It is accepted that the introduction of parking restrictions in some cases can displace parking.

Residents are not guaranteed parking in the vicinity of their own homes and will have the opportunity to park on a first come first served basis as they always have done.

The issue of obstruction and the theft of fuel from vehicles are both matters for the police and should be reported on the non-emergency number 101.

12 Representation 4

*'Your proposals will have a devastating effect on these businesses and will inevitably result in job losses'.*

It is envisaged that the proposals will not impact on the amount of customers using the local businesses. Currently the trend is to park directly in front of the businesses on the junction which does not comply with parking recommendations set out in the Highway Code. It is this parking behaviour which has compromised road safety and led to the proposed introduction of these parking restrictions. Customers may still park adjacent to the businesses in the unrestricted areas.

13 Representation 5

*'There will be no one to police this on a regular basis therefore the only people who will suffer are the residents of Paradise Lane'.*

Once restrictions are in place Durham County Council's Parking Enforcement Team can enforce these restrictions as they consider appropriate.

14 Representation 6

*'I suggest it's time to introduce a parking permit for residents or some sort of system that will give residents priority'.*

The introduction of permit only restrictions inevitably results in displaced parking affecting neighbouring streets. Durham County Council's current guidance on the implementation of permit schemes is to apply a number of qualifying criteria including establishing the extent of the problems through surveys, and determining the potential displacement effects. Our approach would be to displace long stay commuter parking but not short stay visitors. Permit parking must be funded by residents and often can cause inconvenience to residents their visitors and families and may not be considered an acceptable or worthwhile solution by all residents. A permit scheme would not be considered appropriate for this location.

15 Representation 7

*'I would ask that you reconsider your proposals and remove the proposed waiting restriction from around the building known as "Valdone" leaving the proposed restrictions on the opposite side of the road and part way down Seaside Lane'.*

If the parking restrictions (No Waiting At Any Time) were amended as you describe it is envisaged that the problem of obstruction and reduced visibility

on the junction of Paradise Lane and Seaside Lane will still occur. Parking at this location is one of road safety concerns which led to the proposed introduction of these restrictions.

16 Representation 8

*'Why can't there be restricted parking times instead of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions'.*

No Waiting At Any Time restrictions were chosen as their purpose is to resolve a road safety issue which exists at all times when parking occurs on or around the junction and adjacent bus stop. A restriction less than 24 hours would not resolve this problem.

17 Representation 9

*'We have never had any complaints or anything about our customers parking near our shops off any of the residents so why do you want to change things'.*

The Council has received various representations through the local members and from residents about problems with visibility at the junction of Paradise Lane and Seaside Lane, as well as issues with obstruction when vehicles have been parked on both sides of the carriageway.

### **Recommendations and reasons**

- 18 It is **recommended** that the Committee endorse the proposals having considered the representations to the proposals and proceed with the implementation of No Waiting At Any Time restriction.

---

**Contact: [Michelle Shearer] Tel: 03000 263 685**

---

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance – Funded by Councillor Angela Surtees and David Boyes Neighbourhood Budgets.**

**Staffing – None.**

**Risk – None.**

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

**Accommodation – None.**

**Crime and Disorder – This TRO will allow effective management of traffic and improve road safety.**

**Human Rights – None.**

**Consultation – As described in the report.**

**Procurement – The Council’s in-house provider, Highway Services, will deliver the scheme.**

**Disability Issues – None.**

**Legal Implications – Enforcement of TRO by Durham County Council Parking and Enforcement.**