

Highways Committee

5 June 2015

Wolsingham Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order



Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Economic Development

1. Purpose

- 1.1. To advise Members of objections received to the consultation concerning changes to the proposed traffic regulation order in Wolsingham.
- 1.2. To request that members consider the objections made during the consultation period.

2. Background

- 2.1 Following the successful implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement in Durham District in 2008 and County Durham North in 2011, the County Council expanded this practice into the South of the County in June 2013. Enforcement of all waiting restrictions within the settlement was undertaken by the County Council from this time.
- 2.2 The County Council are committed to regularly reviewing traffic regulation orders to ensure that the restrictions held within them are relevant and appropriate.
- 2.3 In March last year a public consultation event was held at Wolsingham Library and comments invited as to how the waiting restrictions within the settlement could be improved. An initial plan drafted by County Council Officers was presented at this meeting. This event was well attended and a number of suggestions were taken forward and added to the proposals which formed the basis of the plans sent out during the informal consultation stage.
- 2.4 Prior to this point The Causeway was subject to a seasonal restriction which meant waiting was prohibited, April – September, 8am – 6pm. It was decided to remove the seasonal restriction and replace it with No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions at bends and access points. Restrictions at these points were to maintain visibility whilst also assisting with the provision of passing places for motorists using this narrow carriageway.

- 2.5 Plans showing the extent of the proposed restrictions were sent to local residents early last year and as no objections were received, the restrictions were introduced early in 2015.
- 2.6 The intention of the restrictions was to provide safe access and egress for the properties on the western side of the Causeway, as well as creating passing places.
- 2.7 Following implementation of the restrictions on site, residents from No 2 The Causeway and the Tower Mews requested that the restrictions be extended, as they are still experiencing difficulties accessing/ egressing their properties. This was is part to the initial restrictions being aligned with building features incorrectly identified on the base Ordnance Survey Plans.
- 2.8 As a result of these requests slight modifications are proposed to the NWAAT restriction opposite the entrance to No 2 The Causeway and The Tower Mews entrance which services 7 properties. It is also proposed to reduce the NWAAT at the northern end of The Causeway to minimise the impact on residents of the eastern side. Details of the proposals are as shown on the attached plan.
- 2.9 The proposals were advertised formally on site and in the local press on 25th March until the 15th April 2015. In this period 4 objections were received.

3 Objection 1

- 3.1 The objector feels that the existing lines work well and that extending them will reduce parking by 3 spaces and cause problems for residents.

4 Response

The proposed extension of No Waiting restriction opposite the accesses will reduce parking by 2 spaces; however the proposals reduce the No Waiting restriction at the north end of The Causeway by 1 car length. Overall only 1 parking space will be lost along the length of the street.

5 Objection 2

- 5.1 The objector is also concerned about the overall loss of parking spaces a set out above. The objector is also concerned about a neighbour suggesting that they are not currently resident at the property but will soon be returning home after illness and will have mobility issues as a result of the proposed restrictions.

6 Response

- 6.1 The objector has not stated the address of the neighbour and as such we have been unable to confirm if the additional restriction will be immediately outside of their property or if the concern relates to a more general point about the loss of parking. To date we have no correspondence from the neighbour. If the issue

relates to the neighbour being picked up and transported by others and they are in possession of a disabled badge then they can park for up to 3 hours on a No Waiting At Any Time restriction providing they are not causing an obstruction. If the neighbour needs access to their own vehicle it would be more appropriate if we could amend the restriction to suit their specific needs once they have returned to their property.

7 Objection 3

- 7.1 The objector states that there have been no collisions, accidents or traffic problems. The accesses for those properties were given planning permission and they have their own private parking spaces. The objector feels that the current system works well and the parked cars slow vehicles down.

8 Response

- 8.1 Whilst there have been no recorded accidents in the last 5 years at this location, residents on the western side of The Causeway have expressed their concerns about accessing and egressing their properties.

No 2 The Causeway finds it increasingly difficult to reverse into his driveway if a vehicle is parked opposite. The resident has reported a number of near misses when he cannot egress his driveway in a forward gear.

The access into the Tower Mews serves 7 properties. It is a very narrow access road. If vehicles are parked opposite, vehicles especially vans accessing or egressing cannot achieve the necessary swept path without carrying out multiple manoeuvres on The Causeway.

9 Objector 4

- 9.1 The objector has 3 reasons for objected to these proposals.

1) It will restrict the parking available to the dwellings on the east side. Properties on the west side have private driveways. The location of the accesses should have been considered during the planning application stage.

2) An accident to their knowledge has not occurred and the vehicles parked on the east side slow vehicles down. The objector states that fewer parked cars along this street will increase the speeds of vehicles.

3) The objector states that the residents along the street require parking. Within their property they will soon have 6 people of driving age. The objector mentions their concern about where they can park. The recreation ground and Demesne Mill shut their gate on an evening; the market place now has a restriction on the parking.

10 Response

1) The introduction of these restrictions will improve access and egress to No 2 The Causeway and the 7 properties in Tower Mews. The proposed extension of No Waiting restriction opposite the accesses will reduce parking by 2 spaces; however the proposals will reduce the No Waiting restriction at the north end of The Causeway by 1 car length. The west side of The Causeway is within the Conservation Area and therefore No 2 and the Tower Mews were restricted in changing the frontage of their properties and boundaries.

2) As response 3 above.

3) Overall the number of parking spaces is reduced by 1 car space, previously the restriction on The Causeway was No Waiting 8am – 6pm on both side from 1st April to the 30th September and therefore this is less restrictive than the previous arrangement.

11 Local member consultation

The Local Members have been consulted and offer no objection to the proposals.

12 Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the objections and proceed with the implementation of the Wolsingham Parking & Waiting Restrictions Order.

13 Background Papers

Correspondence and documentation on Traffic Office File and in member's library.

Contact: Sarah Thompson Tel: 03000 263589

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – LTP Capital

Staffing – Carried out by Strategic Traffic

Risk – Not Applicable

Equality and Diversity – It is suggested that an issue could arise to one resident however the resident in question has not responded to any of the consultation materials..

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 - None

Legal Implications: All orders have been advertised by the County Council as highway authority and will be made in accordance with legislative requirements.