

## Highways Committee

10 June 2016

### Durham City (South West) PARKING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS ORDER 2016



---

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

**Councillor Neil Foster, Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Economic Development**

---

#### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 In accordance with part 3A of the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to make a decision in principle only which will then guide the Corporate Director in the exercise of delegated decision making. The final decision is therefore one for the Corporate Director, under delegated powers.
- 1.2 To advise Members of an objection received to the consultation concerning changes to the traffic regulation order in Durham City (South West).
- 1.3 To request that members consider the objection made during the informal and formal consultation period.

#### **2 Background:**

- 2.1 A request was received from a resident of Grape Lane to change Grape Lane from being part of Zone I to becoming a zone of its own, Zone GL. Residents of Grape Lane were consulted on these proposals and were made aware that should the proposals go ahead, they would no longer be able to use their permits in other areas of Zone I and would have to use existing pay and display facilities to park on-street.
- 2.2 The consultation was sent to 36 residents on 15 October, 2015. The responses received were 2 against, 23 in favour and 11 did not respond. There were no objections received from any of the Statutory Consultees. As the majority of residents had voted in favour, the proposals were progressed and were formally advertised on-site, in the local library and in the local press on 17 March until 8 April 2016.
- 2.3 There were no objections raised during the formal advertising period, however an objection (objector 2) was received on 19 April 2016. Although the objection was received outside of the formal dates, following advice from Legal Services, the objection was allowed to stand and Objector 2 has been invited to attend Highways Committee.

2.4 As the objection was received outside of the statutory objection period the objector was advised that they would be invited to come along, but they would only be asked to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.

### **3 Objection.**

3.1 The objector is a resident of Crossgate, opposite Grape Lane. Crossgate forms part of Zone I, so as a resident the objector's resident permit currently allows them to park in Grape Lane.

3.2 When the objection was received, although it was out of the formal advertisement period, it is considered a valid objection

3.3 Crossgate is currently 'resident permit holders OR pay and display Monday – Saturday 8am – 6pm'. The objector requested that the pay and display aspect be removed and allow that length of on-street parking be made 'permit holders only'.

### **4 Response:**

4.1 Crossgate is a popular street for parking for visitors to the City. Reducing the pay and display option in any part of the street would be detrimental to the parking offer and also confusing to users.

4.2 The most appropriate way to manage demand and increase turnover of space to address the competing demands of commuters, residents and visitors is to increase the charge for pay and display parking. Crossgate is currently 50p per half hour, an increase to 80p per half hour would displace a proportion of non-resident vehicles into nearby areas where there is spare capacity. (Please note change such as this would be subject to a separate process).

### **5 Local member consultation:**

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

### **6 Recommendations:**

6.1 It is recommended that Members resolve that they are minded to agree to the removal of Grape Lane from Zone I and make it a stand-alone zone, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

### **7 Background Papers:**

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

---

**Contact: Rachael Smith Tel: 03000 263587**

---

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance** – LTP Capital (Approx. cost - £2000)

**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** - None

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