

**Decision Session – Executive Member For
Transport and Planning**

17 May 2018

Report of Corporate Director of Economy and Place

**Lumley Rd / St Luke’s Grove Ward Committee Scheme, Parking
Restrictions – Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)**

Summary

1. This report provides details of objections raised to the recent advertisement of no waiting and no stopping restrictions in Lumley Road and St Luke’s Grove, Clifton. It also reports the receipt of a petition requesting that residents’ parking is offered as an alternative to the advertised restrictions.

Recommendations

2. The Executive Member is asked to approve:
 - i) Option 2: Acknowledge receipt of the petition and objections. Offer the residents of both streets a final ballot on the options of either providing residents parking or implementing the proposals as advertised (**Annex D**) with the minor amendments shown in **Annex F**. Pre-approve the next step dependent on the result of the vote as set out below:
 - a) If residents’ parking is favoured, approve advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) with any objections reported back to Executive Member Decision Session.
 - b) If the restrictions scheme is favoured approve making of the order and installation of the restrictions.

Reason: To provide residents an opportunity to make an informed decision as to how they would like to address the parking problems in their streets following receipt of a petition calling for residents parking.

Background

3. Clifton Ward Councillors approached the Transport team after receiving complaints about damaged verges and missed bin collections on Lumley Road due to the level of on street parking.
4. Lumley Road is close to St Peter's School and within easy walking distance of the hospital and therefore experiences inconsiderate / antisocial parking by commuters and visitors to both establishments. This has caused issues for waste collections, deliveries and school run traffic accessing Clifton Green School (Lumley Road serves a pedestrian access to the school). The ward committee is seeking to address the problem and requested that proposals be developed.
5. A number of options were drawn up and a meeting was held with residents in September 2016. This meeting helped to shape the scheme by gauging residents' feelings towards various proposals and enabled the development of a final option for consultation. At this stage ward members responded positively to the scheme and requested that the brief be widened to include St Luke's Grove to reduce the chance of simply displacing the problem to the adjacent street. This was considered sensible and a scheme was developed for wider consultation.

Proposals

6. The scheme which was issued for consultation (**Annex A**) proposed the rationalisation of on-street parking and the introduction of waiting restrictions on both Lumley Road and St Luke's Grove. To offer protection to verges signs have been incorporated onto bollards where possible and extra bollards are provided at the junction of Lumley Road and St Luke's Grove.
7. Consultation took place in July/August 2017. The consultation letter stated that the proposals needed the support of at least 50% of local residents in order to be progressed. In total, we received 46 responses out of 60 (a 77% response). 32 of the 60 households (53%) supported the proposals whilst 13 (22%) objected. One offered no opinion (2%).
8. Despite this overwhelming response in favour of the proposals, there were a few concerns raised which needed further consideration. These were as follows:

- Approved full width dropped kerb vehicle crossings for No.17, 19 and 21 Lumley Road, which coincided with the proposed location for parking bays.
 - The proximity of one of the parking bays to the junction potentially hindering turning movements of larger vehicles at the junction.
 - The lack of restrictions in the St Luke's Grove turning head, which provides an emergency access onto Burton Stone Lane and is occasionally blocked by inconsiderate parking.
9. Ward members have supported the scheme throughout the process and following the results of the consultation they were advised of the issues and how they impacted the original proposals. Members were keen to move the scheme forward without delay and so it was suggested that an amended scheme be prepared taking into account the residents comments and concerns. This is shown in **Annex B**.
 10. The members reviewed the amended proposal and were happy to support moving the scheme to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertisement stage, without the need for further consultation outside of the regulatory process.
 11. Details of the revised proposal were submitted to the Assistant Director for Transport, Highways and Environment (**Annex C**).
 12. Approval was granted to advertise the TRO to allow the introduction of the proposed parking restrictions. If objections were received, these were required to be reported to Executive Member via a Decision Session report. The scheme could be progressed if no objections were received.

Traffic regulation Order Advertisement

13. The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 9th February and 2nd March 2018 with a notice in the local press, notices posted on street and letters delivered to all residents of Lumley Road and St Luke's Grove and two residents of Burton Stone Lane whose vehicle access is from Lumley Road. This equates to 60 properties in total and is consistent with the original consultation exercise. A copy of the letter is provided as **Annex D**.
14. Responses were received from 38 residents (63% response).

32 objected to the proposals (53% of the total number of households)

2 wrote in support of the scheme (3%)

4 raised queries but did not explicitly object to the proposals (7%)

22 provided no response (37%)

15. The response level to the TRO was slightly lower than the initial consultation. This may be due to the TRO process only inviting objections. However, objection to the scheme has increased with a majority of residents now not favouring the scheme, in contradiction to the results of the original consultation.

16. The reasons for objection are outlined below with officer responses:

i) Majority of the proposed bays are not big enough to fit two cars.

Officer response: The proposed bays are designed as per UK guidance on parallel parking bays (6m in length, 2m wide). The provision of larger bays that are unable to fully accommodate two vehicles may lead to vehicles parked over driveways with the potential to causing an obstruction.

ii) Yellow lines across driveways stop residents parking here.

Officer response: To ensure the scheme works as intended and to keep the street free for access by residents, visitors and deliveries etc. it is necessary to restrict the areas available for parking including across residents driveways.

iii) Restrictions in the turning head on St Luke's Grove leave residents of numbers 30 and 33 nowhere to park. Photos provided by the residents (**Annex E**) show how parking occurs at present.

*Officer response: Both properties have off street parking for a single vehicle but for convenience the residents choose to park on street. On-street parking directly in front of a property is not a guaranteed amenity but in this case as no concerns have been raised with regard vehicles struggling to turn a compromise could be to reduce the restrictions to allow this parking to continue. A proposed amendment to the advertised restrictions is provided as **Annex F**, which would allow on street parking for 1 vehicle at each property operating on a first come first served basis. Whilst still allowing emergency access via the alleyway to Burton Stone Lane.*

- iv) Imposition of double yellow lines down the one side of St Luke's Grove will only lead people clamouring to park on the opposite side.

Officer response: The restriction was designed to maintain access along the street after reports of vehicles unable to complete deliveries and missed refuse collections. Whilst this will lead to parking on one side of the street only, vehicles will only be able to be parked where they do not cause an obstruction to the footway, resident's driveways or the free passage of vehicles. At 4.3m wide St Luke's Grove is not wide enough to provide marked parking bays and maintain a suitable running lane for traffic. The design is a compromise due to the narrow width available.

- v) The lack of on street parking to be provided on Lumley Road inconveniences anyone with two or more cars.

Officer response: The majority of properties along both streets have some off-street parking provision. If the residents want to keep the street clear to ensure access is maintained then it may be necessary for additional vehicles to be parked away from the property. The scheme provides 8 on-street parking spaces which are available on a first come first served basis at all times. Additional space is available Mon – Sat 5pm – 8am and all day Sunday when the single yellow lines are not enforceable.

- vi) Visitors including health care professionals may not be able to park in the street of the house they are visiting and may have to walk.

Officer response: This is correct, however, emergency vehicles are exempt from waiting restrictions. Additionally loading and unloading can still be undertaken on double or single yellow lines.

- vii) Plan is a major change to what was originally consulted on and no further consultation has been carried out.

Officer response: The scheme advertised under the TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) is an amended version of the scheme which was originally consulted upon. The reasons for these amendments are detailed in the background section of the report and were covered in the letter issued to residents notifying them of the TRO advertisement. The scheme was progressed directly to TRO to avoid further delays to the scheme and was approved by the ward

members and the Assistant Director for Transport, Highways and Environment.

- viii) The proposals penalise residents and owners.

Officer response: The proposals seek to reduce the amount of inconsiderate on-street parking to ensure that the street is not obstructed by parked vehicles. To achieve this there will have to be some disruption to the level on street parking residents currently have.

- ix) Resident's parking was not offered as an option.

Officer response: Residents parking had been previously balloted for in 2014 and was turned down by the residents at the time. Residents parking schemes cannot be reconsidered for 3 years after an unsuccessful ballot. Therefore at the time of scheme inception (Summer 2016) residents parking could not be considered as an option and was therefore not investigated.

- x) Proposed plan will reduce property prices and make it difficult to sell or rent properties.

Officer response: The proposals seek to reduce the amount of on-street parking to ensure that the street is not obstructed by parked vehicles. Officers are not qualified to say if a reduction in on street parking through parking restrictions would increase or decrease property values.

- xi) Proposed plan doesn't cover Sundays when rugby games are played at the football ground.

Officer response: The decision to not restrict parking on a Sunday was based on feedback from the initial residents meeting and was not raised as a concern during initial consultation. The new stadium at Monks Cross is due to open in Summer 2019 meaning no rugby matches will be played here thereby removing the parking demand and allowing residents to park more freely during these times.

- xii) Proposal doesn't stop anyone parking on the grass verges.

Officer response: The scheme seeks to encourage users not to park on the verges through the use of marked bays and bollards

where appropriate. This helps to reduce street clutter and retain the grass as suitable soak away drainage. If verge parking is still an issue following the introduction of the proposals this would need to be reviewed again.

17. As part of the TRO responses a petition was received (**Annex G**) which states:

“The undersigned of each property (who is an owner/resident) as identified is:

- a) Opposing the proposed plan as put forward for the reasons given in the petition. By opposing we ask that the proposed plan as advertised on 9th February 2018 is rejected.*
- b) Where indicated has provided a suitable alternative by way of a Residents Parking Permit zone.”*

The petition was signed by 31 residents with 24 of these residents indicating they were in favour of residents parking. However, it should be noted that the residents were not provided with any information regarding how a residents parking scheme might look or the ongoing costs to them if it were installed.

18. To reiterate the points made in paragraph 16 comment ix) residents of both Lumley Road and St Luke’s Grove were balloted in 2014 on a proposal to provide a residents priority parking zone. The scheme was not supported at the time and was not progressed. Background papers are provided in **Annex H**. This option could not be reconsidered as part of this scheme but as a significant amount of time has passed since the first vote then it could be offered as an option if the Executive Member considers it reasonable.

Ward Councillors

19. Ward councillors have been kept informed of the development of the scheme and have supported the proposals throughout this process. As the works are funded through the Clifton Ward Committee budget they have not provided comments for inclusion in this report as it could be considered a conflict of interest. They have however expressed that they are keen to introduce measures which solve the initial problems brought to them by the community and which are supported by the majority of the residents.

Options

20. The following options are provided for consideration by the Executive Member:
- Option 1: Do nothing.
 - Option 2: Acknowledge receipt of the petition and objections. Offer the residents of both streets a final ballot on the options of either providing residents parking or implementing the proposals as advertised (**Annex D**) with the minor amendments shown in **Annex F**. Pre-approve the next step dependent on the result of the vote as set out below:
 - a) If residents' parking is favoured, approve advertisement of the TRO with any objections reported back to Executive Member Decision Session.
 - b) If the restrictions scheme is favoured approve making of the order and installation of the restrictions.
 - Option 3: Acknowledge receipt of the petition and objections, but approve the scheme as shown in **Annex D** with reductions to the extent of the restrictions as shown in **Annex F** and reject the call for residents parking.
 - Option 4: Approve the scheme with any amendments to the restrictions the Executive Member feels necessary.

Analysis

21. Doing nothing would not address the problems with inconsiderate parking residents are experiencing. Therefore, option 1 is not supported by officers.
22. The advertised restrictions (**Annex D**) have received objections from just over half the residents, which should be considered and so option 3 is not recommended.
23. However, the majority of the objections were received in the form of a group submission which calls for residents parking to be considered as an alternative. Officers are concerned that those residents who signed up to the petition may not be fully aware of how residents parking would need to be implemented on street and the ongoing costs associated with such a scheme.

24. Option 2 proposes that a final round of consultation is undertaken to allow residents to choose between the proposals in Option 3 or a residents parking scheme. This will ensure that residents can make an informed decision as to how they would like to tackle the problems they brought forward.
25. The response to the two stages of consultation has resulted in no clear steer from residents as to how they wish to proceed. A final consultation with limited options should serve to clarify which way the residents would prefer to control parking in the affected streets.
26. The implications of this option are added time and cost. However, Ward Councillors are supportive of finding a solution which the majority of residents can agree on and have committed to funding these next stages of consultation if Option 2 is approved.

Council Plan

27. The recommendations in this report relate to the Council Plan priority “a council that listens to residents”. Giving residents a chance to vote on the two options which are now available demonstrates that the Council are delivering a service which works in partnership with the local community to try and solve the problems they have experienced.

Implications

28. The following implications have been considered:
 - **Financial** – The investigation and consultation process has so far cost £3,500k, the costs of proceeding with the recommendations in this report are estimated to be between £4k and £7k dependent on the outcome of the ballot and can be covered by the budget available from the Ward Committee.
 - **Human Resources (HR)** There are no HR implications.
 - **One Planet Council / Equalities** - There are no One Planet Council / Equalities implications.
 - **Legal** - There are no legal implications.
 - **Crime and Disorder** There are no crime and disorder implications.
 - **Information Technology (IT)** There are no IT implications.
 - **Property** There are no property implications.

Risk Management

29. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified and described in the following points:

Financial – There is a financial risk to the Clifton Ward Committee as the recommendation has a budgetary implication.

External – The recommendation creates a risk to the future of any scheme if there isn't a majority in favour of one of the schemes offered for ballot.

Both are considered minor risks and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Contact Details

Author:

Ben Potter
Engineer
Transport

Tel No. 01904 553496

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Corporate Director – Economy and Place

Report Date 30.04.18
Approved

Specialist Implications Officer(s) List information for all

Wards Affected: Clifton

All N/A

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Officer in Consultation – 25/11/2014, Approval requested to take no further action regarding a recent request (petition) for Residents'

Priority Parking in Lumley Road and St Luke's Grove following consultation with residents.

Annexes

Annex A – Consultation Plan and Letter (20 July 2017)

Annex B – Amended scheme plan

Annex C – Assistant Director Decision Sheet

Annex D – TRO Advertisement Letter, Notice and Plan

Annex E – Residents photos sent in support of objection

Annex F – Amended turning head restrictions – St Luke's Grove

Annex G – Petition

Annex H – OIC Report Nov 2014 Residents' Parking Lumley Rd & St Luke's Grove

Abbreviations

TRO – Traffic Regulation Order