

## Highways Committee

10 June 2016

### **STANHOPE PARKING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS AMENDMENT ORDER 2016**



---

**Report of Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, 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 the objections received during the consultation concerning the proposed introduction of a n2 hour parking restriction on Front Street, Stanhope.
- 1.3 To request that Members consider both the reasons for and those against introducing a parking restriction on part of the Front Street in Stanhope.

#### **2 Background:**

- 2.1 Requests were received from local businesses of Front Street, Stanhope for the introduction of a 2 hour parking restriction. The issues were highlighted in a Weardale Gazette article where businesses complained that there was little passing trade as kerb space adjacent to the shops was taken up by vehicles parked there for most of the day.
- 2.2 In October 2015, parking surveys were undertaken in Front Street and Market Place, Stanhope to establish parking occupancy numbers and stay durations. The survey showed that on average 15 of the 25 spaces adjacent to the shops were occupied for 4 hours or more. On the opposite side of Front Street, 14 out of 21 spaces were occupied for the same duration. Three quarters of the spaces on the Front Street and Market Place were taken by 10am and people working in the village contributed to the high occupancy levels.

### **3 Informal Consultation:**

- 3.1 An officer visited affected shop frontages in Stanhope to discuss ongoing parking issues. The overwhelming consensus was for the introduction of a 2 hour parking restriction to support the economy of the village by discouraging all day parking and encourage a high turnover of customers in Stanhope by increasing availability. Some employees advised that they parked in the bay on Front Street, but could find alternative parking facilities in the village if necessary.

### **4 Proposal:**

- 4.1 Traffic Section's proposal is to introduce a 2 hour restriction to the existing block paved bay that extends between the Everyday Café and Barclays Bank on Stanhope Front Street which accommodates up to 16 vehicles. This would include the introduction of 2 spaces reserved for blue badge holders only.
- 4.2 The proposal was to only restrict one bay as we are mindful of the impact this could have on the side streets given that some of the long stay vehicles would be displaced. In the early morning there is some capacity on the opposite side of Front Street as well as in the Market Place, so it is considered that not all of the displaced vehicles would end up in the side streets.
- 4.3 Photographs of the area concerned are included in Appendix 1 (point 9, 9.1 and 9.2) to this report.

### **5 Formal Consultation:**

- 5.1 The proposed Traffic Order was advertised on 27 January 2016. Objections to the proposal were received from 8 individuals.

#### **5.2 Objection 1-7:**

- 5.3 Seven of the objectors are nearby residents who state it will make parking conditions untenable due to the impact of the displaced vehicles migrating to nearby residential areas where reduced parking space is already an issue.

#### **5.4 Objection 1-7 Response:**

- 5.5 Long stay vehicles will inevitably be displaced elsewhere in Stanhope village centre; however it is extremely unlikely that all of these displaced vehicles will migrate to the same location. Surveys indicate that there is currently some capacity on the opposite side of Front Street and in the Market Place and the displaced vehicles may therefore be spread around, therefore reducing the impact.

#### **5.6 Objection 8:**

- 5.7 The objection was to the proposed 2 hour duration and location of the bay. The objector stated "the waiting time should be reduced to one hour" and that the

physical length of the restriction should be longer and “should be extended to number 79 Front Street”.

**5.8 Objection 8 Response:**

5.9 The 2 hour limit was determined after speaking with the various businesses on Front Street. Most considered that 1 hour was not sufficient time to visit multiple shops, or visit the hairdresser for example, and that 2 hours would allow more flexibility.

With regards to extending the parking restrictions, the intention is to review the impact of the initial proposal before giving consideration to extending it further.

**6 Local Member Consultation:**

6.1 Local County Council members and a Parish Council member were included in the formal consultation. The Parish Council had received many comments, both for and against and suggested if the proposals went ahead, that they should be implemented on a trial basis and reviewed in due course.

**7 Recommendations:**

7.1 It is recommended that Members resolve that they are minded to agree to set aside all objections, endorse the proposal and proceed with introducing one full bay comprising 16 spaces restricted to a maximum stay of 2 hours and two of these spaces will be reserved for blue badge holders only and proceed with the implementation of the Stanhope: Parking and Waiting Restrictions. Order 2016, with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

**8 Background Papers:**

8.1 Correspondence and documentation is kept on a Traffic Office File and in the Member's library.

---

**Contact: Jon Hogarth Tel: 03000 263581**

---

---

## Appendix 1: Photographs

---

### 9 Photographs:

9.1 Showing the west end of the existing bay where the restriction is proposed.



9.2 Showing the east end of the existing bay where the restriction is proposed.



---

## **Appendix 2: Implications**

---

**Finance** – LTP Capital, works costs are estimated at £800 plus any enforcement costs

**Staffing** – Carried out by Strategic Traffic Section

**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** – No impact.

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

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

**Procurement** – Operations, DCC.

**Disability Issues** – The introduction of blue badge bays will assist disabled access to Front Street local services.

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