

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **Highways Committee** held in Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham on **Friday 5 June 2015 at 9.30 a.m.**

Present:

Councillor G Bleasdale in the Chair

Members of the Committee:

Councillors C Kay (Vice-Chairman), D Bell, O Gunn, D Hicks, K Hopper, O Milburn, J Robinson, P Stradling, M Wilkes, R Young and J Gray

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Allen, B Armstrong, H Bennett, I Geldard, D Hall, S Morrison, R Ormerod, J Rowlandson and J Turnbull.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor J Gray was substituting for Councillor J Turnbull.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4 Declarations of interest

Councillor Wilkes declared a pecuniary interest in Item No. 5 (Unc 12.31 Hustledown Road, South Stanley) as he part owned a property on a neighbouring street.

5 Unc 12.31 Hustledown Road, South Stanley - Speed Cushions

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood Services regarding representations received to proposed traffic calming measures on Hustledown Road, South Stanley (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Committee were informed that the location had speed related issues and Durham Constabulary had made representations to the County Council in 2014 regarding the amount of high speed traffic using Hustledown Road. They had requested that a more permanent solution be found to the problem as resources would not allow for a constant presence from the police.

The Committee then received a presentation detailing:

- the location of the proposed restrictions;
- an aerial view;
- the location of buildouts;
- a technical drawing of the buildouts, give way; and
- the driving view along the road.

The Strategic Highways Manager informed the Committee that the report stated that local Councillors had not commented on the scheme. However, Councillor Davinson had made some comments on the scheme during the consultation which related to the access to the area by the Fire Brigade. The Strategic Highways Manager confirmed that the Fire Brigade had been consulted on the proposed scheme and didn't raise any issues.

Three representations had been made by one objector relating to the advertising process of the consultation, their dislike of road humps generally which they felt caused damage to vehicles and the costs relating to the installation of road humps which they felt could be better used towards highways maintenance. The Strategic Highways Manager confirmed that the relevant notices were placed on-site as per the statutory consultation period. No properties were directly affected by the section of carriageway. The expenditure for the scheme was being funded from a specific traffic management solutions budget and the traffic calming measures would be installed in accordance with national guidance.

Councillor Wilkes referred to the Council's 20mph policy being introduced at some schools across the County and expressed concern that people using this route would potentially detour through neighbouring streets should the proposals detailed in the report be introduced.

The Strategic Highways Manager informed the Committee that from their experience, it would be unlikely that motorists would consider taking a longer diversionary route to avoid the proposed build-outs and therefore didn't anticipate it having an effect on neighbouring streets, however, the situation would be monitored.

Resolved

- (i) That the recommendation in the report be agreed; and
- (ii) That traffic on neighbouring streets be monitored accordingly, once the scheme had been implemented.

6 Peterlee - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Amendment Order

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development regarding parking and waiting restrictions at Peterlee (for copy see file of Minutes)

The Strategic Traffic Manager explained that traffic regulation orders were always under review and Peterlee was an area which had been subject to large areas of change over recent times. A number of amendments affecting existing waiting restrictions proposed for Howletch Primary School, Pennine Drive and Grampian Drive had not received any objections. One objection had been received to changes proposed for Judson Road. The

scheme in this particular area had been devised following a request by a Senior Facility Engineer for Caterpillar, Peterlee who explained that very large vehicles and movements accessing and egressing Judson Road were extremely difficult due to the amount of cars parking on grass verges and either side of the road. A site visit was held with the representative and scheme involving the introduction of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restriction was drawn up.

The Committee heard that there was one objection to the proposal, submitted by an employee from Caterpillar. Whilst the objector accepted the need for the situation to be addressed, he expressed concern that the proposal would affect a local mobile caterer and the nearby 'Learning Centre of Light', particularly if they were to hold any large attendee events.

In response, the Strategic Manager informed the Committee that the restrictions had been plotted accordingly in relation to access and egress to the Caterpillar plant. It was noted that the facility had around 1200 off-road car parking spaces which was deemed sufficient to accommodate vehicles from workers on shift patterns at the plant.

In response to point raised about the Learning Centre of Light, the Committee were informed that the venue had its own access to an off street parking facility and anyone visiting the site could use the car park facilities or park in nearby unrestricted streets.

Suggestions to install fencing and boulders would not be considered as they would be classed as obstructions and would not remedy the issues of accessibility to the Caterpillar plant, and in some cases, could actually worsen the situation.

Councillor Kay felt that the site had more than generous car parking facilities available for all the staff of different shifts and there was no reason for people to park their vehicles which caused difficulty to the large vehicles and vehicle movements, other than for convenience of it being closer to the site entrance.

Resolved

That the recommendation in the report be agreed.

7 Wolsingham - Parking and Waiting Restrictions Order

The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Economic Development regarding a proposed traffic regulation order at the Causeway, Wolsingham (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Causeway had been subject to a seasonal restriction whereby waiting was prohibited between 8am to 6pm from April to September. The seasonal restriction was removed in early 2015 and replaced with a 'no waiting at any time' restriction at bends and access points, essentially to maintain visibility and assist with the provision of passing points for motorists due to the narrow nature of the carriageway. No objections had been received to the proposal at the time. Since the introduction of the newer restrictions, the Council had received representations from some residents who had experienced some problems accessing/egressing their properties, partly due to the initial restrictions being aligned with building features incorrectly identified on the base ordnance survey plans.

Three slight modifications had been proposed opposite the entrances of No. 2 The Causeway and The Tower Mews. It was also proposed to reduce the restriction at the northern end of the Causeway to minimise impact on residents of the eastern side.

The Strategic Manager then summarised the objections detailed in the report. The Committee were informed that a total of four respondents had submitted various objections to the proposals. The objections received stated that the current restrictions were adequate and that further restrictions would reduce parking and cause additional problems. Other objections cited the loss of further parking spaces and the potential for traffic speeds to increase. There had been no recollection of any collisions or accident history in the area.

One objector had expressed concern about a neighbour who had not been resident at her property for a time, due to illness. There was a view expressed that the resident may have mobility issues on her return home and the introduction of the proposed parking restrictions could negatively impact upon the resident.

The Strategic Traffic Manager acknowledged the issue highlighted and explained that attempts to ascertain the facts surrounding the neighbour and their requirements had been unsuccessful. It was felt that this could not be taken into account until such time as the resident returned to their property. The Committee were also informed that the proposed restrictions would allow for pick-up/drop off at the location or if the person held a blue badge, they would be able to park at the location for three hours, providing they were not causing an obstruction.

The Strategic Manager also informed the Committee that one objector who could not be present at the meeting had made further representations about the loss of parking spaces, would increase the speed of vehicles in the Causeway area, disadvantage other residents and there was no need to put in further restrictions for the convenience of others and asked the Council to reconsider the scheme.

Councillor Shuttleworth, one of the local Members who could not be present at the meeting had emailed the Senior Committee Services Officer and asked for his representation to be conveyed to the Committee. Councillor Shuttleworth had not made any previous representations as he believed that the additional measures would not create any issues, given that there had been no objections previously in the area concerned.

Councillor Shuttleworth stated in his representation that 'a number of people had now responded to the proposed scheme, and issues had been raised, at the Causeway, Wolsingham. He asked if the Committee would be minded to carry out a review of the parking arrangements after three months of operation. He had made this request because over one year ago, he had been contacted by someone with severe disability issues, who was concerned about any parking restrictions, and he had been unable to contact them.

Councillor Robinson felt that the suggestion made by Councillor Shuttleworth appeared fair under the circumstances and suggested that the Corporate Director, should consider implementing the proposals as detailed in the report and then reviewed after three months of operation to take into account the representations made by the resident who had been

unable to be contacted. Councillor Stradling seconded the suggestion made by Councillor Robinson.

The Strategic Manager explained that the County Council could review the scheme after three months of operation which would hopefully allow for time to discuss the residents needs of whom Councillor Shuttleworth and one other objector had referred to.

Resolved

That the recommendation contained in the report be agreed and that once the scheme was implemented to review its operation after three months.