

AGENDA ITEM:

**REPORT TO APPEALS &
COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE**

16 SEPTEMBER 2016

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF
ECONOMIC GROWTH &
DEVELOPMENT**

**PROPOSED RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS SCHEME –
STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE**

1.0 SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek Members' views on 9 unresolved representations received, following statutory advertising of a proposal to introduce permit parking / 2 hours limited waiting in the roads identified as the immediate station area of Eaglescliffe. To facilitate traffic movements, no waiting at anytime restrictions are included within the advertised traffic Order.

Eaglescliffe station has been refurbished and the car park has been extended, following completion of the works, Network Rail introduced parking charges at £2 all day.

Temporary waiting restrictions and a free waiver scheme were implemented for the duration of the refurbishment works, which involved a total closure of the car park throughout the works, to address residents' concerns regarding potential obstruction and road safety issues arising from the displaced parking. Alternative off street parking was provided at Quarry Road.

74% of respondents supported the proposed residents parking scheme thereby achieving the threshold level (at 66%) of support for a permanent scheme in the immediate station area to be progressed.

To summarise; 4 of the representations are in regard to the proposed no waiting at anytime restrictions on Swinburne Road, 2 representations from the same address are to the proposed no waiting at anytime restrictions on Elmwood Road and only 3 representations are connected to the residents parking aspect.

This report presents the response of the Director of Economic Growth and Development to the representations. It is not considered appropriate for the Director of Economic Growth and Development to consider the representations directly as he would effectively be reviewing his own decision.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:-

- (i) Members give consideration to the representations received during the statutory process, also to the comments in response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development, as detailed in this report.
- (ii) The proposed modifications to the advertised traffic Order, outlined in the report, are noted and agreed.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 A temporary scheme (see drawing TM4/7 in **Appendix 1**) remains in place pending the outcome of this permanent zone 'E' scheme, it was implemented to address potential obstruction and road safety issues arising while works were carried out at the station car park in October 2014 by Network Rail. A full closure of the car park for the works' duration was necessary. Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm restrictions prohibit parking in the immediate station area between Clarence Road and Dunottar Avenue, residents were issued with a free waiver to display in their vehicle and those of their visitors enabling them to park on the restrictions without receiving a penalty charge notice.
- 3.2 To assist businesses, limited waiting restrictions were introduced on Station Road also on a temporary basis. Monday to Saturday, 9am to 5pm, 2 hours limited waiting with a no return within 2 hours, were implemented and assisted traders by encouraging turnover of on street parking nearest the businesses for customers, which may otherwise have become fully occupied by displaced, long stay parking from the station.
- 3.3 Car parking was made available at Quarry Road on the east side of Yarm Road which is to remain regardless of the outcome of this meeting. Off street parking there is free of charge as it had been for the duration of the works, 23 spaces are provided.
- 3.4 A parking survey carried out prior to the improvements to the station car park, of the roads within the immediate station area found medium stay parking was occurring, the average length was around 3.5 hours. 32 (11%) vehicles were recorded as parking in this area all day, most of which (15 vehicles) were on Albert Road. Increased popularity of the Grand Central Rail Service to London plus the parking charges have resulted in concerns that patrons' long stay parking on street could adversely affect residents' ability to park near to their homes. Swinburne Road and some properties on Albert Road rely only on parking on street.
- 3.5 The temporary arrangement is simply not a practicable, long term solution and the temporary legislation used to implement the scheme is no longer appropriate because the station works are complete (May 2015). The waiver scheme has a completely different back office administration, the waiver is not a permit, it allows parking as an interim arrangement on the temporary yellow lines not in a residents parking bay. If the permanent scheme is not implemented, the temporary waiver scheme will be removed and the previous uncontrolled parking situation will resume, as per prior to the works at the station.
- 3.6 Residents must purchase a permit for vehicles registered to their property if they wish to park on street in the designated marked bays during the operational hours of the proposed permanent residents parking scheme. The number of residents permits is restricted to two per property and a visitor permit may be purchased. The annual charge for residents permits, to cover administration, is £10 for each vehicle. Visitor permits, where applicable cost £10 and business permits, where applicable, are charged at £50 per year. Business permits are provided where the vehicle is moved frequently throughout the day in the course of business. Businesses that use a vehicle infrequently or solely as a means of travel to and from work will not qualify for a business permit. Resident/visitor/business permits would all be applicable in the proposed zone 'E'. A permit does not guarantee a space, it allows parking during the scheme operational hours if a space is available but does not restrict permit holders to parking in any specific street, they may park in any of the streets included within the zone. The Council cannot guarantee a space on public highway. Part of the assessment criteria is that at least two thirds of households that respond from within the identified zone should be in support of the scheme if it is to be progressed further.

- 3.7 Residents permit parking is only necessary for the main part of the day 9am to 5pm and be applicable Monday to Saturday to prevent all day commuter parking in most zones and in this area it would prohibit rail patrons parking for several days. Parking is permissible overnight (5pm to 9am) and on Sundays and Bank Holidays without a time limit or permit.
- 3.8 To accommodate businesses' needs for customers and maintain turn over of bays, it is considered that the bays in zone 'E' can be dual use as 2 hours limited waiting, no return within 2 hours Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm. This means that vehicles parked in any of the on street bays should either display a valid permit or blue badge, or move on once the 2 hours of limited waiting ends. Priority for convenient parking near businesses is for customers and visitors rather than staff to encourage commercial growth.
- 3.9 In residents parking schemes, the bays for permit holders are marked out with a white dashed box and it is usual for the remainder of kerbside space throughout the zone to be restricted, with yellow lines, to prevent opportunist parking by non permit holders potentially being displaced to those areas, where it may be obstructive or a road safety issue. Therefore, additional double yellow lines are proposed as part of the residents parking scheme to protect the areas in between the white bay markings and at junctions/accesses. Some restrictions outside of the extent of the residents parking zone were requested via the consultation process and were included as part of this advertised traffic Order because it is more efficient to do so.
- 3.10 Members should be aware that some (3) representations have been resolved by proposing a modification to the advertised Order with regard to the no waiting at anytime restrictions on Swinburne Road and Dunottar Avenue. The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue at the Swinburne Road junction were advertised at 17 metres. It is proposed that is reduced to 6 metres on the east side from the access to the church car park going partly across the frontage of the church and is reduced to 5 metres on the west side. On the east side of Swinburne Road the restrictions are suggested to be reduced to 6 metres from the car park access going south partly across number 24 Swinburne Road. Parking bays would be extended into these three areas to replace the advertised double yellow lines. The proposed restrictions on the west side of Swinburne Road adjacent to No 1 are proposed to be removed from the scheme and no lining will be laid in that location, as agreed with the affected resident. The removal of the proposed restrictions on both sides of the southern end of Swinburne Road and along the south side (adjacent to number 24) of the access road to the church car park would maintain current parking practices and would be unrestricted (no markings laid).

4.0 PROPOSED MEASURES (see Drawings TM2/210A & TM17/08A in Appendix 2A & 2B)

A permanent traffic regulation Order has been advertised for on street parking bays in the immediate station area to be restricted to residents, visitor or business permit holders, blue badge holders or free 2 hours limited waiting, no return within 2 hours, Monday to Saturday between 9am and 5pm. The parking controls would not apply overnight, Sundays, or Bank Holidays. All zone permits are issued to people whose duties require multiple visits to properties within a permit zone.

To facilitate traffic movements, no waiting at anytime restrictions were included within the advertised traffic Order. No waiting at anytime restrictions are represented on the ground as double yellow lines.

5.0 CONSULTATION

- 5.1 An initial consultation took place with 455 properties as part of the feasibility process to identify the extent of the scheme. Responses were split into 3 areas; immediate station, wider station and east side of Yarm Road. Immediate station covers Clarence Road up to and including Dunottar Avenue and wider station covers Witham Avenue up to and inclusive of Elmwood Road. Residents of roads on the east side of Yarm Road that is

Clifton Avenue, Clifton Gardens, Ashville Avenue and Tees Bank Avenue were also included in the first consultation for their attention as a neighbouring area but they were not intended to be included within the residents parking scheme.

Table 1 - summary of first consultation for the 3 areas.

	IMMEDIATE STATION AREA	WIDER STATION AREA	AREA EAST SIDE OF YARM ROAD
IN SUPPORT OF RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING SCHEME	63%	40%	50%

- 5.2 The temporary waiver scheme appeared to have potentially clouded the views of respondents to the proposals with around a quarter objecting to payment of a permit and indicating a preference for the temporary free waiver scheme to continue. A repeat consultation with the immediate station area was required since the level of support fell only slightly short of the 66% required for progression to ascertain that residents fully understood that the temporary scheme will in any case not be continued so that their views on the matter were fully informed. At that stage the wider station area was removed from the scheme because the level of support for progression was not achieved.
- 5.3 The second consultation with immediate station area achieved 74% of respondents in support of the proposals. Support for the permanent proposals was not achieved in all roads; Yarm Road (25%), Railway Terrace (60%) and Clarence Road (57%) were below the level of support for progression. Note it was not intended to physically mark bays on Yarm Road or Railway Terrace, it was anticipated that those areas would be eligible to purchase a permit to park in the zone and that remains the case. Bays were to be marked on Clarence Road, however, since this was against residents wishes and it was geographically feasible, Clarence Road was removed from the final scheme so no bays will be marked and residents will not be eligible to purchase a permit. There are also no bays to be marked on Victoria Road where there are no properties which could continue to be used as overspill parking.
- 5.4 The Officers' Traffic Group were initially consulted at their meeting on 17 September 2015 and updated at subsequent meetings since then. This is where consultation with the Police and the Council's Enforcement Service is undertaken at the feasibility stage, it is a long-standing forum for discussing relevant transport related issues within the Borough attended by representatives from Cleveland Police in addition to Council Officers and public transport agents.
- 5.5 Local Ward Councillors were consulted on the proposals. Responses received did not confirm views either way.
- 5.6 Preston Parish and Egglecliffe & Egglecliffe Parish Councils were consulted. A response in agreement with the proposals was received from Egglecliffe & Egglecliffe Parish Council.
- 5.7 In February 2016, the Director of Economic Growth and Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport, agreed to the advertising of the proposals, via decision record EGDS.T.141.15

6.0 Statutory Consultation

- 6.1 The statutory consultation was conducted as required by the "Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1989" as amended. In practice, this involved publishing a public notice in the "Herald & Post", site notices were posted on the

affected highway. Copies of the site notice, plan and draft traffic Order were available on the Council's website for the duration. Statutory consultation ended on 2 June 2016.

- 6.2 9 representations remain unresolved following Statutory advertising and exchange of correspondence. Copies of the correspondence exchanged are given as received in **Appendix 3**. The main points of the objections are summarised as follows with a response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development.

Objections summary - residents parking

6.3 **Dr P. Dodd, 590 Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0DF**

The principle of setting up residents parking permits is a lot of effort and loss of freedom, to save a few car parking spaces for residents. Rail users do not get much chance to park in those streets that are heavily parked already so these residents will not see much, if any change. I hope that these measures are not to assist in Northern Rail's efforts to make money.

No amount of restrictions will generate much space on the streets that are already densely parked. They generate restrictions (loss of freedom) and now a proposed small cost to those who park on streets where there is usually car parking space.

In London, a better way is to have a nominated 1 hour slot, where the parking restrictions apply 11 until 12 Monday to Saturday. Anyone without a permit on the single yellow line would be out of compliance and this would stop rail users leaving their cars for the day, let alone a number of days. I would remove all but safety parking restrictions. This saves the residents the cost of permits and may make Northern Rail reconsider its charges.

There are some specifics to the double yellow lines proposed that do not make sense:

- a) There are small back alleys that are going to get double yellows both sides. If anyone parks there, the alley is blocked because the width is only that of one car. This becomes an obstruction.
- b) Witham Avenue and Dunnotar Ave are wide roads. Whilst there may be a safety need for double yellows close to junctions (but not 20 m), double yellows along much of the length seem extreme. On Witham, there are two examples of white entrance markings which seem to be much more sensible than having 20 feet of road clear of parked cars because of double yellows.
- c) Sunday morning and weekday evening times are quiet times for parking in these two streets. To have parking restrictions will not be welcome to these buildings that provide a public service. Could the time bands be more amenable in these roads?

6.4 **Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development**

Your address would be included on the list of properties eligible to purchase resident and visitor permits should you wish to park in the zone when the proposed controls would apply. Parking bays would not be marked on Victoria Road and parking there would for the most part continue to be unrestricted with the exception of proposed restrictions at the junctions where parking should in any case not occur.

The £10 charge per year for resident/visitor permits is an administration cost for processing applications rather than a revenue generating stream and is the same charge as other residents parking schemes in the Borough at Hardwick, central Stockton and Yarm, the costs have not increased since these scheme were established. Residents in permit parking schemes have generally welcomed their introduction and consider them to be effective at tackling commuter parking issues and a benefit to their daily lives. 74% of respondents supported the proposals. The scheme suggested as an alternative still relies upon display of permits so would not forego the back office processing or the associated charge.

The station car park is privately owned and managed, the decision to implement charges was thereby within their right, however this resulted in concerns for residents that patrons of the station would park on street to avoid paying. The Council has progressed the advertised scheme in line with residents parking criteria to protect the area from motorists who may otherwise park on street for lengthy periods to avoid the charges in the station car park adversely affecting local residents' ability to park near to their property.

In response to point ref a; the proposed double yellow line restrictions are to assist traffic management and road safety by preventing potential opportunist parking or parking being displaced where parking bays would not be marked because they would be too close to a junction or access. Whilst parking may not currently occur in these locations it could potentially do so and therefore it was considered sensible to include restrictions to protect those areas and minimise future nuisance and issues arising for residents. In some cases the restrictions were requested by residents to address their ongoing concerns relating to traffic movements.

To point ref b; the principle of white keep clear lining and double yellow lining is essentially the same, that is to keep the area clear of parking although a white line is not backed by a traffic Order. The opportunity to convert the white markings on Witham Avenue to yellow lining was taken as part of this residents parking traffic Order since double yellow lining is considered by the Department for Transport to be more clearly understood by motorists. A request for waiting restrictions to be extended on Witham Avenue up to Dunottar Avenue was also specifically received during the consultation. The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue are suggested to be modified as per paragraph 3.10.

In reply to point c; the proposed controls would not apply on Sundays or after 5pm on weekdays therefore enabling parking for patrons of All Saints Church on Dunottar Avenue in addition to their private car park. Furthermore, the proposals allow parking for up to 2 hours by non permit holders. On Witham Avenue parking would be prohibited at the junctions and accesses where it should not occur for road safety reasons and was highlighted to be an issue via the consultation.

6.5 Mr. C Wilson, 618 Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0DQ

Residents voted against the proposal but were then consulted again on the same scheme. The scheme progressed is not the scheme that was consulted upon as it excludes Clarence Road and removes restrictions on Victoria Road which are used by Yarm Road residents. Clarence Road and Yarm Road are part of the temporary scheme so should be included in the permanent scheme. The temporary scheme suits all residents. Implementation of additional double yellow lines will result in parking chaos. Residents of Albert Road that do not want to pay for a permit will park on Victoria Road increasing congestion in that area.

6.6 Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development

The second consultation with the immediate station area was required as described in paragraph 5.2.

The removal of Clarence Road from the scheme is in accordance with local residents' wishes. Analysis of replies showed Clarence Road residents were not supportive of the proposals in either consultation (40% support in the first consultation and 57% support in the second). Respondents did not want parking bays to be marked and objected to charges for a permit. Unfortunately marking the bays and the charges for permits are not negotiable factors and since it was geographically feasible, Clarence Road was removed from the proposals taken forward. Parking will thereby return to being uncontrolled, for which no permit is required, reverting to the situation that was in place prior to commencement of works at the station.

You would not be prohibited from parking in Clarence Road or Victoria Road (except at the junctions). The proposed parking controls would not apply on a Sunday or after 5pm, therefore you may park in zone 'E' such as on Albert Road at those times in addition to during the hours of control, albeit limited for up to 2 hours. Furthermore, your address will

be eligible to purchase a permit to enable you to park in any of the marked bays within the zone.

The existing temporary scheme cannot continue, as described in paragraph 3.5.

6.7 My Dentist, 13 Station Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0BU

8 employees travel to and from the practice to work on a daily basis. We are being penalised for providing a service to the public. We are concerned about where staff would park and how it would affect our practice/patients.

We already have a lot of complaints from patients regarding where they can park as the majority of patients are elderly so need to park as close as possible, we are losing a lot of patients. We do not think it is acceptable to pay to park for work, the costs would be in the region of £480 per year for a full time employee. The majority of staff are female so parking further away and walking a distance in the dark is a concern.

6.8 Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development

The residents parking controls would not apply to Blue Badge holders who may park for as long as they wish providing a Blue Badge is correctly displayed and they may also park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours providing that it is not dangerous or obstructive, in accordance with the Blue Badge Scheme. Parking for patients would be improved upon from the current temporary arrangement and the previous unrestricted arrangement when on street availability was scarce, since they would be able to park in the area as near to the practice as possible if a space is available, for up to 2 hours between 9am and 5pm without displaying a permit. Furthermore, parking after 5pm would also be without a time limit. The current temporary scheme only allows parking on Station Road for 2 hours where capacity is limited, the ability to park anywhere within the zone for 2 hours must improve upon this for patients and ultimately the success of the practice. Long stay staff parking on Station Road must reduce capacity and availability of convenient spaces for patients, 8 staff vehicles parked on street would take up almost all of the on street parking.

Staff parking is thereby also possible for up to 2 hours without a permit and the car park at Quarry Road will remain operational, unrestricted parking there is for 23 spaces. The walking route from the car park is street lit and can be reached via the residential area through Swinburne Road-Dunottar Avenue-Witham Road which are to be reduced to 20mph speed limit or via Yarm Road. The Yarm Road route would be travelling on the east side crossing at dropped kerbs across 2 residential side roads which are to be 20mph and crossing using the pedestrian phase at the Yarm Road traffic signals at The Avenue/Station Road. Staff may use the scheme to their benefit and move their vehicle from the car park at 3pm and park on street as near as an available space will allow in the area for 2 hours without a permit which will take them to the end of the controls at 5pm. Parking is therefore permissible within the advertised proposals during the hours of darkness. Note sunset in December is around 3.50pm and sunrise is around 8am.

The station car park is privately owned and managed so the Council has no control over charges imposed by the owners, the Council has however progressed the advertised scheme to protect the area from motorists who may otherwise park on street for lengthy periods to avoid the charges which would affect patients' ability to park near to the practice as well as residents parking near their homes. It is not unusual for commuters to pay to park their vehicle near to their place of work, this would be the case for example in Stockton town centre where staff park in long stay pay and display car parks that are typically located on the outer edge of the town centre. Business permits are not applicable since a vehicle is not frequently used throughout the day in the running of the dentist's business.

The same objection from My Dentist Head Office was withdrawn when the above information was provided.

Objections summary – Elmwood Road no waiting at anytime restrictions

6.9 Lesley Douglass, 46 Elmwood Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AF

These proposals will have a significant impact on my ability to park outside my own home as the double yellow lines proposed are to be put directly at the front of my house and also the side, which will give me no opportunity to park outside my own property. This will also be the case for many of my neighbours as approximately 10 less cars will be able to park at the Elmwood / Myrtle / Beechwood area.

It was quite clearly decided in the consultation that there was no need for any changes in the parking situation in the Myrtle/Elmwood Road area. Please advise the rationale for the double yellow lines.

One notice on a lamppost is insufficient for the scale of these proposals and the detrimental impact it will have on my daily living and financial point of view and also that of my neighbours. I suggest a full consultation is undertaken, with full engagement of the residents in the area.

6.10 Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development

The restrictions proposed would cover the front of your property to the extent of approximately 5 metres from the junction and to the side of your property by approximately 6 metres from the junction. A car length is typically quoted as 6 metres long therefore to clarify you would be prevented from parking to the front although there would be capacity for at least 2 vehicles to the side of your property where parking would not be restricted.

The Highway Code advises motorists not to park opposite, or within 10 metres of a junction and the proposals are in accordance with that practice, although to maximise capacity the lengths proposed here are already less than recommended.

Requests for restrictions to prevent parked vehicles obstructing sight lines and improve the turn in/out at this location were specifically requested by 2 local residents during the initial public consultation exercise. Restrictions are also proposed at the Elmwood Road / Yarm Road junction to keep pedestrian crossing points across the junction clear of parked vehicles and again to assist traffic movements into and out of the area. No other waiting restrictions are proposed on Elmwood Road therefore maintaining capacity in areas where parking does not cause road safety or traffic management issues.

The update letter (**Appendix 4**) sent following conclusion of the consultation advised that residents parking was not going to be progressed for the wider station area although requests for double yellow lines were received and were being considered. Furthermore, the letter highlighted the additional waiting restrictions requested were for the crossroads of Elmwood Road / Beechwood Road. The update letter advised that Statutory advertising as the next step in the process would follow.

In view of your objection a modification to remove the 5 metres length of restrictions to the front of your property only is proposed. This is based on the western end of Elmwood Road being a short cul-de-sac serving around 10 properties. Parking to the side of your property is already maintained within the proposals. Myrtle Road and Beechwood Road are through routes serving many properties and since the crossroads was specifically highlighted via local residents through the consultation those restrictions should be retained within the advertised scheme to address their ongoing concerns here.

6.11 Peter Hutchison, 46 Elmwood Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AF

Issues as outlined in paragraph 6.9 from same address with same modification proposed.

6.12 Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development

As response in paragraph 6.10

Objections summary – Swinburne Road no waiting at anytime restrictions

- 6.13 **Joanne Lambert, 4 Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AA**
At no point in the consultation documents did it mention addition of double yellow lines. Please advise where it made clear there would be addition of double yellow lines to the area.
Based on lack of consultation and public engagement and the detrimental effect this would have for me personally both financially and ease of daily living I object to the double yellow lines.
- 6.14 **Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development**
The plan accompanying the first consultation (drawing TM17/08 in **Appendix 5**) indicated the new yellow lining, that plan also showed an extended residents parking scheme up to the Elmwood Road area. A large scale version was available on the Council's website for the duration of the consultation. The proposed yellow lining as far as Swinburne Road is concerned is as per that original plan and would not cover any part of the frontage of number 4.
Also see paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10. In regard to Swinburne Road a modification reducing the extent of restrictions has been proposed as a compromise and has resolved some representations made.
- 6.15 **Nicola Boyes, 18 Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AA**
I object to the introduction to double yellow lines which will be enforced on to Swinburne Road. Parking is already a huge issue on this street and would be worse if the yellow lines are introduced. The street could lose up to a minimum of 13 car spaces and I really can't see how this would benefit the street at all.
- 6.16 **Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development**
As response in paragraph 6.14 and modification proposed in paragraph 3.10. A car length is typically quoted for the purposes of highway schemes as 6 metres. The original proposals included 28 metres of new double yellow lining on Swinburne Road and 33 metres on both sides of the access road adjacent to 24 Swinburne Road. The modification proposes that is reduced to 6 metres on Swinburne Road and also maintains parking on the south side of the access road. Therefore, the advertised proposals would have reduced capacity by 10 vehicles and the modification would reduce capacity by 1 vehicle. However, it should be noted that the maximum number of vehicles (25) observed during the parking survey prior to works at the station could still have been accommodated within the originally advertised proposals.
- 6.17 **Aimee and Nick Hill, 17 Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AA**
We object to additional double yellow lines on or near Swinburne Road. The church congregation and railway users are causing extreme speed and traffic. We need further designated free parking and wardens not restrictions. My car has been damaged due to the church congregation lack of respect of residents when a car tried to park in a tight space. Also I have suffered personal injury when a driver refused to slow down whilst I left my car resulting in my only option to push myself against my vehicle and severely damaging my fingers.
- 6.18 **Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development**
As response in paragraph 6.14 and modification proposed in paragraph 3.10.
A speed limit reduction from 30mph to 20mph throughout the area is also being progressed (no objections at Statutory advertising were received to that traffic Order). The personal injury and vehicle damage should be forwarded to the Police as a moving vehicle offence for appropriate action to be considered if the offending vehicle details were obtained at the time.

6.19 Georgina Burke, 16 Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0AA

I believe that the double yellow lines on Swinburne Road and up the alley way to the church car park will worsen the already dire parking situation. There are 24 households on Swinburne Road, the majority of which have two cars. It is already difficult to find a parking space on Swinburne Road and we often have to drive some way up Dunottar Avenue to park. It is even more congested when there are events on at the church. The proposals will result in the loss of spaces, which is contrary to one of the aims of this scheme.

I am also concerned that there are no parking restrictions around the Elmwood Road/Pinewood Road crossroad, which gets especially busy around school drop off and pick up times. It is extremely dangerous crossing Elmwood Road onto Pinewood Road from the school because of the volume of traffic, particularly in front of the shop on Elmwood Road.

6.20 Response from the Director of Economic Growth and Development

As response in paragraph 6.14 and modification proposed in paragraph 3.10.

Comments regarding Elmwood Road/Pinewood Road are noted although any restrictions in this area are likely to receive objections from affected residents along similar opinions to those of residents on Swinburne Road who are keen to maximise parking capacity on street. This location was not raised as a concern during the consultation.

The restrictions around Elmwood Road/Beechwood Road were specifically requested through the original consultation hence they have been included in the advertised proposals although objections to their imposition have been received. Permit holders would be eligible to park in any street throughout the zone.

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of the first statutory notice was £1,235.25. A second notice would be required if the proposals progress to the traffic Order being made, the total for the statutory advertising element would be £2,470.50. Note since the proposed modifications are less restrictive than advertised it is not anticipated that a repeat first advert and Statutory consultation are required.

Amendments to the signing are estimated at £4,883.58. Amendments to the lining would be required, detailed estimates have not been prepared but are anticipated to be in the region of £1,750. The estimated costs of £9104.08 would be met from the Local Transport Plan budget 2016/17.

8.0 POLICY CONTENT

The Council propose to make the Order for; for preserving, or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs' and 'facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)'.
The proposal to control commuter parking in residential areas is consistent with the Local Transport Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The required level of support from the immediate station area was achieved through the second consultation. Requests for amendments through the consultation and the Statutory consultation have been incorporated where practicable.

It is recommended that the representations are over ruled and the scheme with the outlined modifications on Swinburne Road, Dunottar Avenue and Elmwood Road is implemented.

Director of Economic Growth and Development
Contact Officer : **Gillian Spence**
Tel No : **01642 526720**
E-mail address : **gillian.spence@stockton.gov.uk**

Environmental Implications

The proposed restrictions would require additional street clutter in terms of new signs and posts and there is no conservation area variant for the white lining works to mark out the parking bays.

Community Safety Implications

None.

Background Papers

Officers' Decision Record TS.T.75.14 – 2014 temporary waiting restrictions
Cabinet Member Report EGDS.T.71.15
Cabinet Member Report EGDS.T.141.15
Officers' Traffic Group meeting September 2015, min 158/15 refers.
Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Education Related Item?

No.

Ward(s) and Ward Councillors:

Eaglescliffe Ward Councillors; L. Tunney, S. Houghton and P. Dennis.
